THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, April 7, 1966

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre for taking my place this afternoon while I made an unexpected visit to the dentist, and I understand now that you are on the second reading of Bill No. 75.

MR. SMELLIE presented Bill No. 75, an Act to amend The Municipal Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q.C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, this is the general amending statute of The Municipal Act and that we've become accustomed to each year. It's a little hard to discuss the principles of a bill such as this because there are many principles involved. I might, however, deal with some of the things that are involved in this bill that members might be interested in, and then we will attempt to answer any questions that may arise.

First of all, there are some directions given to the Municipal Board concerning the settlement of amounts due from one municipality to another where there is a change in boundaries, and members will note that the Municipal Board is authorized to prescribe that such settlements may be made over extended periods of time rather than in one lump sum. There is an amendment which would allow the investment of pension funds for municipal employees in the securities of a trust company authorized to carry on business in Manitoba, and provision is also made for the integration of municipal pension funds with the Canada Pension Plan. At the same time, the limit that was imposed upon contributions to municipal pension plans is raised from five percent of earnings to six percent in line with The Teachers' Retirement Act and The Civil Service Superannuation Fund.

In the section dealing with Community Centres, in the past the section we believed covered the cooperation between municipalities for the erection of such centres. However, a question has arisen as to whether more than two municipalities could legally join for such purpose, and you will find amendments which now provide for joining with one or more additional municipalities to make certain that this point is covered.

There is a new section added allowing for the establishment of reserve funds for municipally owned and operated utilities, which requires certain approvals by the Public Utilities Board and which would provide that the monies cannot be spent for any other purpose without the permission of that board. Some problems have arisen where we have come across municipalities who have had trouble with the accounts of unincorporated village districts within their boundaries, and in the past there has been no provision for the auditing of the accounts of the unincorporated village district by the municipal auditor, and there have been some cases where the unincorporated village districts have not in fact even filed statements of their accounts with the municipality, so there is an amendment here which would make it mandatory for the auditor to audit the statements of the unincorporated village district committee when he's doing the municipal audit.

Members will note, too, that there are some additions to the methods for the levying of taxes for local improvements. In the past generally the special tax for local improvements had been levied as a frontage tax. In some instances it has also been levied as a mill rate against the assessment of the properties involved. In many areas where there is new development going on and where the land is not necessarily subdivided when the local improvement works are desired to be undertaken, it will make a provision now that the levy can be placed against the area on an acreage basis.

Amendments are also introduced in this Act which will enable municipalities to take action to control the plant pest known as Dutch Elm disease, and there is an amendment to the section of the Act which dealt with the recoveries of money paid out by the municipality for relief or maintenance of hospitalization of their residents.

There is an amendment to the section of the Act which exempted certain properties from the imposition of municipal taxes, particularly to make it clear in the case of buildings used for the housing of the aged and infirm.

One section in which the Member for Lakeside will be interested, is the section which deals with the payment of grants in lieu of taxes on lands taken by the province for special projects of the nature of water diversions or reservoirs. This is the matter which was discussed

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd)... during the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture and which will allow the payment of grants in lieu of taxes on those properties for a period not exceeding three years. The Honourable Member for Lakeside has indicated that he felt this should be in perpetuity, but I think it's well established that for a certain works which the government undertakes that they do not in fact pay taxes on the works that they provide which give a benefit to the community, and works of this nature are providing a benefit to the community in the same way that highways and other public works undertaken by senior government do. On the other hand, it must be recognized that when these properties are taken out of taxation by expropriation of property, that in many cases hardship is imposed upon the municipality, and one of the municipalities in the area represented by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, indicated quite clearly to us what their problem was in one year, when by government action their taxable assessment had been substantially reduced. After the budgets of the municipalities and the school board had been finalized, the municipality in that case was unable to collect taxes, but they were still forced to pay to the school districts the amounts which were levied against those properties before the expropriation took place. This section will alleviate that problem and will also provide an additional two years in which the municipality will receive full taxes on all of the property expropriated for this purpose, and they will have plenty of notice in advance of the date on which -- the assessment on which they will receive grants in lieu of taxes, will cease.

There is another amendment which provides a slight change in the method of appeal from assessment where the question is a question of law. In the past the appellant has been required to take his appeal from the Court of Revision to the Municipal Board, and where it was a question of law the Municipal Board then directed the appellant to make his appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench by stated case. This amendment will require the appellant in the first instance to make his appeal from the Court of Revision to the Court of Queen's Bench on points of law. There will still be the appeal in the ordinary way to the Municipal Board on a question of quantum.

A further amendment allows for the service of notice of tax sale proceedings where the land value is less than $2,000 by registered mail. In the past the limit was $1,000 and this limit has not been changed for many years. Many municipalities complain, however, that they have many properties where adequate notice can be served by registered mail and where the values of the properties are small, and it's not felt that it is necessary to provide personal service in these cases.

I think, Madam Speaker, that these are the main matters of principle that are dealt with in the bill, and it might be of some advantage to the House if we dealt with any matters that members wish to raise rather than me try to deal with each individual amendment.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, there are a number of worthwhile amendments here which of course, as the Minister indicates, will require study. There are two points that I'd like to raise on which I'd like to get clarification from the Minister. The first is the proposed amendment that a joint tenancy, on the death of one of the joint tenants the lien shall pass on and remain on the property, and I question this approach or the principle involved because I think it is well known that on a joint tenancy, on the death of the joint owner his interest lapses completely and does not carry forward at all. Now, if the principle here is right then the whole principle of ownership and joint tenancy should be re-examined and changed. If the municipality asserts a right to carry forward its interest on the death of a debtor, then why shouldn't judgments against the debtor carry forward?

Now I am under the impression that when a husband and wife are joint tenants the lien is put against both of them so that on the death of one of them the lien still stands on the title against the other, but if the debt is owing only by one joint tenant, then, as I understand the entire principle of law of the ownership of joint tenancy, the interest or equity of the deceased has lapsed and there is no further lien on it, and I would like the Minister to amplify whether I am correct in stating that he is, by this amendment, challenging the whole concept of ownership by joint tenancies.

Now, another section that appears on the last page seems to me to put municipalities in a position of being grantors, of giving grants; I don't know the powers of the municipality to give grants, but this gives unlimited power to give substantial grants by the sale for a nominal amount of land to any person to be used for a purpose deemed by the Council to be beneficial to the residents. I think this is a very dangerous section. I think it puts municipalities, makes them subject to tremendous pressures, and I think that it ought not to be allowed without any reference of some type to some other body, unless it is clearly understood that it is a grant,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)... and if Council has the power to give land away because in its discretion it deems it advisable, then I'd like to know to what extent this type of power goes beyond the provisions in the Municipal Act normally provided for municipalities to make grants to organizations. But this isn't even an organization; this is a person; and as I see it, a municipality may think that it's a good idea to have a horse-racing track or to have a supermarket in some location or another, and the municipality owning the land could then give it for $1.00 for that purpose because the Council deems it be to beneficial to the residents.

Now I think this is a very broad power and I'd like the Minister to indicate whether he agrees with me that this power is unlimited in connection with land owned by the municipality, and whether he agrees with me that this permits the giving of something practically for free to a person - not necessarily to an institution or a body such as we might recognize, but to any person. And I think it's very dangerous, and I would like the Minister to justify it or clarify it so that we should understand exactly what is being proposed in this amendment.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member of La Verendrye, that the debate be adjourned.

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

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin) presented Bill No. 82, An Act to establish Procedures for the Acquisition of Land by Expropriation and for the Determination of Compensation for Land Expropriated and Land Injuriously affected by the Maintenance, Operation or Use of Works Constructed, Maintained or Used under Statutory Powers, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, from time to time in the House we have discussed the subject of expropriation and some of the problems attendant on the procedures respecting expropriation, and I believe the opinion has been expressed that our law with respect to expropriation ought to be up-dated and perhaps changed in some respects, and especially consolidated so that it would be readily available and the procedures would be as uniform as possible insofar as various expropriating authorities are concerned. The bill before the House, Bill No. 82, represents an attempt to do some of these things. It is a new bill dealing with the subject of expropriation and to be called The Expropriation Act.

I should explain that the general task in this connection was referred by myself to the Law Reform Committee, a committee that is established under the Attorney-General's Act by Order-in-Council, and the Law Reform Committee in turn established a sub-committee of lawyers, some of whom were members of the Law Reform Committee itself, others who very kindly undertook to serve on the sub-committee and to work on this problem. As a result of this approach, the bill which is before the members now is the result of the work in the first instance of the sub-committee, and then the work of the Law Reform Committee, because it came by way of a report to the Law Reform Committee and received consideration there, and now is before the Legislature. I may tell the members that it received very long and detailed and anxious and vigourous consideration and discussion in both the sub-committee and in the Law Reform Committee. While I was not present at any of the meetings of the sub-committee, I did spend a great deal of time with the Law Reform Committee in its considerations of the report that came before them, and a number of changes, that is, the bill in the form in which we have it now, reflects a number of changes made in the suggestions of the sub-committee as it came to them and as it now appears in the bill.

I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my own appreciation, and I am certain the appreciation of all of us, to those who gave a great deal of time in this important consideration.

I would mention that use was made by the sub-committee and the Law Reform Committee of the report of the Royal Commission in British Columbia which studied for a period of over three years the subject of expropriation, and was the commission in which the commissioner was the Honourable J. B. Kline, and this is an excellent study. Some of the recommendations in the British Columbia Royal Commission report found themselves reflected in the bill which we presently have before us. The purpose of the bill is to consolidate, simplify and codify the law in Manitoba as it relates to the general subject of expropriation, and as I indicated the other day when we were discussing it in committee stage, the bill would apply to all expropriations insofar as the Province of Manitoba has legislative jurisdiction to deal with the topic of expropriation, and perhaps I might just read, from the bill itself, the wording of the bill which

(MR. McLEAN cont'd)... provides that "notwithstanding any Act of the Legislature, " the bill which is presently before us, "the Act applies wherever an authority ....." - and I'll be discussing in a moment what is meant by the term "authority" - wherever an authority expropriates or injuriously affects land in the exercise of its legal powers, " and it is also provided that the Crown is bound by the Act. And so I may say briefly that the bill before us applies to all expropriations, where expropriations are authorized by any Act of the Legislature of Manitoba, and also it applies to expropriations by the Crown itself.

There are a large number of definitions of course in the bill, but some definitions are of particular importance. I have mentioned the matter of authority which is defined by the bill as "any person, including the Crown, in the right of Manitoba, who under an Act of the Legislature has power to acquire land by expropriation or without the consent of the owner. " And it will be recognized that that would apply, for example, to a municipal corporation, to a school corporation, a Crown agency, or Crown commission, the Manitoba Hydro Board, the Manitoba Telephone Commission, and any authority - any agency or arm of government, or branch of government - which by reason of its own statutory authority or statutory authority that is conferred, has the right to expropriate land without the consent of the owner of it.

"Authorizing Act" is defined by the bill also, is an Act, of course, of this Legislature, in which the authority is granted power to acquire land by expropriation. And again, that of course is a companion matter to the subject of the definition of "authority".

"Crown Agency" is defined as the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board, the Manitoba Telephone System, the Manitoba Hospital Commission and the Manitoba Water Supply Board.

"Highway" is defined at some lengths, and I perhaps could just briefly say that "highway" as it is defined in the bill includes anything that one would normally consider to be within that general category in our modern system of highways and means by which people travel from one place to another.

"Works" is also defined at even greater length, and again I think all the words are there to include anything which might be considered to be a public work, and on which either the government itself or a public body would extend any monies for public purposes.

I would direct members' attention to the definition of "mines and minerals", or rather to a definition relating to mines and minerals, because of the fact that it is provided that the term "mines and minerals" does not include sand and gravel, and if the honourable members wanted to get into a real debate and discussion, they might like some time to discuss this subject of sand and gravel in its relationship to mines and minerals. In any event, the point that I wish particularly to draw to the attention of the members is the fact that when, in the bill which is before us, the expression "mines and minerals" is used it does not include sand and gravel, and that if one were desirous of expropriating sand and gravel it would be necessary to specifically say so by means of the procedure to which I will refer to in just a moment.

Because there are so many matters set out in the bill and perhaps for another reason that I will also mention in just a moment, I don't want to go through step by step all of the procedures that are set out in the Act because it would take much too long and it would require a very detailed consideration. I would just say that the general procedure that is outlined by the bill is that expropriation proceedings by any authority as defined by the bill itself begin by registering a declaration of expropriation in the Land Titles Office, indicating the land that it is desired to expropriate and with the necessary particulars as required by the Act, and that service of that declaration of course must be made upon each of the registered owners who will be affected by the proposed expropriation within 90 days. There are some other features in the bill with respect to extension of time where that seems advisable and ....but basically, within 90 days of the filing of the declaration of the notice of expropriation in the Land Titles Office. It is provided that the authority shall pay to the owner what is referred to or called "due compensation" and again, that interesting topic of discussion, the real and full meaning of the expression "due compensation" for the land and for any injurious effects to other land in the parcel and for disturbance caused by the expropriation. And I indicate that only to simply point out that the bill places requirement on the authority to pay what is referred to as due compensation, and of course much of the Act is devoted to outlining how that due compensation shall be determined.

Many of the provisions in the bill are designed to assist in the settlement or agreement as between the authority and the owner as to the price to be paid, because we recognize that in most instances it is to the public advantage if the parties concerned can agree upon the price to be paid. There's we hope, a nice balance of checks to ensure that the position of both the authority and the owner or owners is protected. Whether the advantage lies with one or the

(MR. McLEAN cont'd)... other, of course, is sometimes a matter of opinion and again sometimes is a matter of debate. But I just say that what is attempted in principle in the bill, is to provide the necessary protection to all parties while at the same time creating a framework within which it is always hoped that the parties concerned will arrive at a settlement as to the amount to be paid by the authority, the expropriating authority, to the owner of the land. If that should not transpire, however, provision is made for the establishment of the Land Compensation Board - and we were discussing this briefly when at the resolution stage - whose function it will be to determine the due compensation to be paid by the authority to the owner. I just avert briefly to the fact that the Land Compensation Board would also have some other responsibilities of a more minor nature dealing with various points of procedure as the matter might proceed along; for example, applications for extension of time and related matters of that general nature would be decided by the Land Compensation Board, but primarily the Land Compensation Board as proposed by the bill would have the duty of determining in the final analysis, if agreement has not been made between the parties, the responsibility of determining the compensation to be paid; and the jurisdiction of the Board as it is set out in the bill is to hear and determine all applications made, proceedings instituted, and matters referred to or brought before it under the Act, or any other Act of the Legislature, and for such purposes to make such orders, rules and regulations and give such directions, issue such certificates, and otherwise do and perform all such acts, matters, deeds and things as may be necessary or incidental to the exercise of the powers conferred upon the board under such Act. Included in this responsibility is that of making an award with respect to compensation payable by an authority for expropriation of land or an injurious effect on land that is concerned in proceedings that are taken under this Act.

Members will recognize that this Land Compensation Board would stand in place instead of the Court, the Judge of the Court, because those matters under present law now go to a Judge of the Court, and it is proposed to substitute for the court this Land Compensation Board. It would - I think I used the expression the other day in the Committee that it would be a quasi court in the sense that it would have the same functions as a court, and it would in effect become a sort of special court dealing with land expropriation matters. I think the argument to be made in favour of this procedure is that now, since we have so many expropriations, so many occasions when authorities are taking land for one purpose or another, that the argument can well be made that we have need of those who would become specialists in this field and who would acquire a special body of knowledge to deal with problems of this nature. I did indicate, however, that I recognized that there was another side to this, and there are those who would argue that it is best to leave this function to the court where it is at the present time, and I simply point out the differing points of view. I believe that both points of view are well held and certainly stoutly defended, but the balance of our judgment would tend to be that the Land Compensation Board is a better arrangement. I would want, however, the House to know that this decision was not arrived at easily and without great consideration both in the sub-committee and in the Law Reform Committee and by some of the rest of us who had occasion to finally prepare and approve and bring forward the legislation.

I would point out that there is a right of appeal from a decision of the Board which is provided in the bill. It is an appeal to the Court of Appeal and in that sense it preserves what is the present situation, namely, the right of appeal that exists from the court.

Madam Speaker, when we were discussing this bill in the Law Reform Committee, it was the feeling of the Law Reform Committee, and as a matter of fact is a firm recommendation of that Committee to me, that more time could well be spent on the consideration of a bill of this nature, and they expressed the wish that some means would be devised whereby the bill would not receive final approval at this Session of the Legislature but might be put in such a way that it could be discussed, perhaps brought out into the public view more than was the case with the Law Reform Committee itself, and I would have to say that with that opinion I agree, having as I say sat in on many hours of discussion and heard many points of view expressed.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, it is my view, and I direct members' attention to the fact that we are proposing to refer this bill to the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders with a view that the bill remain in the Committee for consideration by such groups of people who may wish to do so as well as members of the Committee itself, between this Session and the next Session of the Legislature, in order that it would have that further consideration that would seem to be helpful. If there are those among the members who are anxious to proceed forthwith immediately, they will be disappointed at that suggestion, I'm sure, but I wanted it

(MR. McLEAN cont'd)... to be clear that we are proposing that this bill should go to the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, and that it ought not necessarily to be reported back to this Session of the Legislature. May I point out, however, or may I say also in that same connection, that if this procedure is adopted, if it's the will of the House that this bill receive second reading at this stage and is referred to the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, it of course must come back to the House at some later time as a bill and follow the regular steps of introduction, first and second reading, and of course be referred presumably to the Law Amendments Committee for consideration; in other words that there would be the very fullest opportunity for the members of the Legislature to consider this matter further when the bill came back from the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

I would hope that the members would not think that this is suggested for any reason of delay, but I would want it to be quite clear, as I say, that this procedure, not necessarily this particular procedure because I don't know that the members of the Law Reform Committee particularly were concerned about the procedure insofar as the Legislature was concerned, but that the idea of holding the bill for this lengthier consideration was suggested and recommended by the Law Reform Committee - and I don't want to hide behind them, I agree with their recommendation because I'm quite well aware of the differences of opinion that are held among those who have given some study to this topic matter, and I believe that it is in the public interest that it be handled in this way.

Madam Speaker, perhaps with that introduction or that comment, I may -- it is unnecessary at this stage to say anything further other that to recommend the bill to the House on this occasion, and subject to what I have said with respect to the procedure that I believe ought to be followed for its further consideration.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, I just want to say a few words about this very unusual procedure. It's not as unusual as it was during the previous sessions because this is the second time the honourable minister has brought in a bill which according to him received - the contents of which rather, received very vigorous study by very competent bodies. He introduces the bill, we have second reading on it, we take up a great deal of the time of the House to acquaint the members with the contents of these bills, and then we are told, Madam Speaker, that the bill will not be put through the usual procedure of going to Law Amendments, receiving third reading and becoming the law of the province. It is going to go to the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders where they will go through the bill once again, then it'll come back to the House, if it ever does, and it will be introduced, we'll again have a second reading on it and maybe that time it'll be referred to Law Amendments or maybe it'll go back to some other committee for study.

Well, Madam Speaker, within the last few days we have received about 30 different bills and it just makes it impossible for us here in the Opposition to give the attention that a lot of this legislation deserves. Some of these bills are very important, and I think we could do well by considering those bills only that we intend to deal with at this session, Instead of bringing in bills as large as this, we've spent about half an hour on this bill, without the government having any intention at all of putting it through in this session as law. Why the waste of time and effort in having the Queen's Printer print that bill, of going through all that procedure, holding up, holding up other bills in the process which the honourable minister and his colleagues hope to pass this year. We're getting near the end of the session. I really don't understand what is behind the honourable minister's thinking. I do know, I do know that there's an election in the offing and it almost appears to me, Madam Speaker, that the only reason that this bill, which is an important bill - it coversthe ground that we've wanted covered for the last several sessions; I believe it covers it well. The former bill that was treated in the same way was an important piece of legislation, probably long overdue, and I think the honourable minister knows that a certain segment of the society of the Province of Manitoba have been waiting for this legislation, and just because this happens to be an election year, surely Madam Speaker there is some place where we've got to cut off political expediency and do the business of the people of this province.

We've been in here now for nine weeks and the honourable minister told the people of the Province of Manitoba quite a number of weeks ago - I wish I'd of kept track of when he did make the announcement that there were 120 bills coming before the legislature. He knew then how many bills, he must have known what the bills were going to be and he knew the importance of them, and they haven't been presented to us in my humble opinion, Madam Speaker, in the order of their importance, because some of the most important bills have been laid before us within

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd)... the last couple of days; and I want to repeat that its impossible for the opposition to give them the attention that they deserve. And then when you get legislation that is first spoken on in this House by way of a resolution, then it is introduced, brought in for second reading, we're supposed to debate it - for what purpose? I ask the honourable minister what purpose is being served when you're going to refer that bill, or those bills now - it's not a bill any more, there's two of them now, probably more by the time we get through - are going to be referred to another committee who's going to go through the same procedure that two committees have already gone through, a sub-committee of the Law Reform Committee and the Law Reform Committee, with the assistance of the Minister, who gave it all the vigorous thought that they could, I think that the House deserves an explanation.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I've not yet had an opportunity to commence my survey of the number of committees that are going to be sitting in between sessions, if indeed they sit at all, but I would guess that there's a fair number ranging from farm machinery to - I'm guessing now - but ombudsman and about professional licensing and gasoline - is there? and it seems to me that it's going to be pretty busy between sessions. (Interjection) Oh, I'm told there may also be an election which may interfere with the holding of the committees or possibly the election can be set aside for the business of the House. I will surprise the Minister by saying that although I spoke I think rather vehemently on the question of postponing the Corrections Bill, I do not feel quite as vehement about this one because I see it as a somewhat different proposal. For one thing I don't believe that the urgency is as great - and I'm comparing it with the remarks I made on the Corrections Bill. Secondly, this is in effect setting up a new court in effect and I think does require a good deal of study. However, I'm certainly not prepared to just agree to say that yes, by all means let's put it off for a rainy day, because I think we have work to do and we ought to be doing it. Dealing with the bill itself there are a number of minor points which I don't want to deal with now and take up the time of the House. I hope that if a committee does get around to sitting on it, I will have an opportunity to comment at .... (Interjection)...

Well now, the question was raised as to nature of these appointments and it's a coincidence that I was just coming to that point; not as to who would be appointed but as to the powers - not the powers so much as the security of tenure of the people appointed. To whom will they be responsible, will there be a minister who will be able to give instructions - I don't mean as to any particular matter, but will they be subject to pressures from anybody? That's putting it bluntly. There will be work involved for this Land Compensation Board which will be dealing as between the government and individual people, and I think it's important that there shouldn't be the slightest doubt as to the independance of such a board. That's why it occurred to me to ask, and comparing it to a court, to ask the nature of the appointment that would be made. Now, there's nothing in the Act that indicates the life of appointments which makes me think that this may be one that would be subject to termination in some way, and I think we ought to have some understanding and I think that it ought to be in the Act so that the people appointed will, like a court, feel that they are completely independent.

This is the one important issue that I want to raise at this stage. Other matters I would be prepared to deal with in committee - if I ever happen to be able to form part of a committee which will be dealing with this.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, the one major matter that comes up in this Bill and which the honourable minister mentions, and that's particularly sand and gravel. Now surely there should have been some consideration given in this bill because this is the most common condition that will arise in matters of expropriation, and I think that certain amount of consideration should be given to properly define gravel and sand. It is not that impossible and it is not that difficult to define, and certainly in most of your expropriations invariably there's some land that will be involving gravel and sand. Now these two items can be explained, they can be defined, they can be surveyed and assessed properly like any other mineral. As a matter of fact the closer they are to the surface the more readily and the more accurately they can be described. Now I do know that in terms of legal terminology that probably there is a certain amount of difficulty in defining gravel and sand, but from the practical approach of these two materials there is absolutely no difficulty, and this bill if it deals with expropriation, gravel and sand are going to form a major part of the difficulty that will arise under this bill; and therefore there should be some definite effort made with the express

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd)... purpose of defining precisely what is meant by gravel and sand so that when this matter does come up it can be resolved by the bill that is set up to try and resolve these matters. I think that a great deal of effort and time should be spent to properly define gravel and sand because this is going to be a most normal type of difficulty that will be encountered by this Act.

..... continued on next page

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I personally have no objection of having the bill go to committee and holding it over. I realize fully well what the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains said, that it seemed rather unnecessary to have it introduced now and have the same thing done over again at the following session or at the next session.

However, these bills are being distributed and all members will have a chance to look at them, not only the members of the particular committee that the bill is referred to but all members will have a chance to evaluate the bill and bring up any of its weaknesses and so on. I really haven't given the bill any study as such. I naturally would like to discuss it with some people that I have contact with and therefore would like to bring up some points when we deal with it in committee. So this is all I have to say at the present time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 83, an Act to amend The Liquor Control Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, members will be glad to know that I'm not going to propose to send this Bill to the Regulations and Orders Committee to be held for a year. The bill has a number of what might be regarded as I suppose technical matters. Two items are perhaps of more particular interest than the others, making some small departure from the present provisions of The Liquor Act. I would just like to indicate the principles that are involved in the provisions of the bill. There is a provision that will provide that the Commission, The Liquor Control Commission, in the public interest may close any licenced premises. This power is given or implied with respect to most licenced premises in other sections of the Act. There is a provision for a magistrate to direct the Commission to make a prohibition order against the residence of a person convicted of an offence, that calls for a mandatory prohibition against the place from which the offence took place. Sometimes these offences are in a person's car or in a friend's house and the provision would allow the magistrate to direct that the prohibition order should be made against the residence of the person who is alleged to and who has been convicted of breaking the law. It is felt that this decision is better made at the trial by the magistrate, than subsequently by the Commission itself who are required to act on the advice of law enforcement officers. As a corollary to that there is a provision that would enable the magistrate to advise the Commission not to make a prohibition order that is otherwise mandatory, in circumstances where the magistrate feels that the mandatory order ought to be waived, as for example the illegal sale of liquor having taken place from a friend's residence without the friend's knowledge that that was being done. We have had cases of that occurring and where under the present law it is mandatory the friend's place be made a prohibited place even though he may not have been aware of the illegal activity on the part of the accused person.

There is a provision which is a departure, although it has already been mentioned in the House, which would enable liquor to be sold after the polls close on Provincial Election days, and similarly on days of voting on local sale by-laws. This would mean that any liquor store that could be open after the close of polls on an election day, could be open for the balance of the regular hours of that store, and of course would allow licenced premises that would legally be open to be open after the close of polls, and of course until their normal closing hour. This is a departure from the present arrangements, and members will know that a companion provision is in The Election Act, the amendments which are presently being considered by Law Amendments Committee which deals with this same subject matter.

I just pause to mention here that with respect to Federal Elections, The Federal Election Act prohibits the sale of liquor for the whole of the day of the Federal Election, and neither this legislation nor the legislation which is being considered under our Manitoba Licence Act would have any bearing on that situation.

The provisions in the Act relating to the charges to be made by purchasers of liquor in which they request that it be sent by express or mail, will be made by regulation of the Commission. I just mention that whereas at one time a lot of liquor was purchased through the mail and forwarded through the mail, there is relatively little of that done anymore and there is a provision simply which w uld allow the Commission to make the regulations with respect to the charges to be made for that service where it is asked for.

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) ....

There is a provision respecting the Orders-in-Council that are required in the case of licenses in Unorganized Territory. The Order-in-Council is required for the initial licence, but not annually for the issue of the licence because licences, as members will know are reissued annually, or at least they are considered annually and presumably reissued, and this would avoid the necessity of having an Order-in-Council each year as the licence is renewed, if it is renewed, by the Commission.

There is a requirement put in the bill that would require that the main persons of a corporation seeking or holding a liquor licence must be of good reputation and character. This qualification is in the Act with respect to individual people seeking licences, but now with the current trend toward incorporation of companies it is felt that the same qualifications should apply to what are referred to as the main persons in the corporation. The same general principle is extended in connection with the disqualified from holding licences.

There are some provisions in the bill respecting where beer should be stored in licenced premises, and the proposal is to allow the Commission to make regulations related to that matter. There is a provision which removes what is considered to be an unintended contradiction in regard to minors being allowed in certain licenced premises when such premises are authorized to be used for other purposes, on Sunday, or sometime other than when those premises are in use for their normal purpose.

I believe there was one instance -- well I know there was one instance because it was brought to my personal attention -- of a group holding a church service in what was normally a licenced premises, a church service held on Sunday and of course there was no liquor, and it was -- someone felt that minors who would of course not be allowed in those premises during time when liquor could be sold or served, that they could not attend the church service. This is a small matter, it is hoped to correct the situation by the provisions here.

At the present time there is in The Liquor Act a limit on the number of sacramental wine vendor licences that may be issued. As a matter of fact there are two at the present time -- I'm sorry, there are five at the present time, there's a limit of five -- it is proposed to remove that limit. We are aware of the fact that there are two application presently before the Liquor Commission which cannot be accommodated because of the limitation placed by the Act to five. The proposal is simply to remove the limit. I rather expect that there won't be too many people wanting licences for selling sacramental wine.

And finally, and this again is perhaps a fairly important change, a change that would allow airlines, aircraft, or an aircraft carrier, air carrier, to apply for a dining room licence. The proposal here is parallel exactly with the present existing legislation as it applies to railways. This would require of course an application in the regular way to be considered by the Liquor Licencing Board, and the Liquor Commission, and it would apply to specified flights, and is in respect of dining room licences only. As I say it's exactly parallel to the present existing legislation as it applies to railway passenger trains.

Madam Speaker, I recommend this Bill to the House and hope that it will be disposed of at this Session.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Minister a question? Is the Minister aware of how many provinces now grant that last request of the air carriers?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I have one dealing with the same matter. It's a question rather than an observation of the Act. If I recall correctly the present Act dealing with travel by train, this only applies, that is the granting of a liquor licence for the train only applies to those lines which travel within the province but go outside of the province as well. A line, as I understand it, a railroad line operating strictly within the province itself -- say for instance, a local line between here and Brandon -- I don't think it's permissive at the present time for that particular line to serve liquor to the travellers. If I'm correct in that, will that same apply insofar as air travel is concerned?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, if I answer the questions I assume I am closing the debate.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: No, Madam Speaker, these were questions. These were not - both members said they directed questions to you. Answering the questions isn't going to close the debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any further questions from any member?

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, this I think should be on a point of Order because the very obvious reason I think of why we have allowed questions in the past, and we have allowed

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) .... them at this Session, Madam Speaker, is that sometimes it's a timesaver as far as debate is concerned because if the Minister is allowed to answer questions then sometimes he makes it unnecessary for somebody to speak. I think it's in the interest of not only procedure, which I believe to be right, but in the interest of the economy of time I think it's a good procedure and I don't think it's ever been abused in the House in this way. Now I purposely made mine a question and I would suggest that we continue the practice of the past of allowing the Minister to answer questions.

MR. EVANS: .... point of Order being discussed, it has not been my experience as the universal experience of the past that one can answer questions up and down like in a Committee. This is a formal debate. Many times I recall the Speaker ruling that if the honourable member, the person closing the debate answered the question he's closing the debate. If however, there is a short question which will help things now I'm sure we would give consent to answering it.

MR. CAMPBELL: On a point of Order, Madam Speaker, would you consult your own records at your own convenience as to what has happened this year because I am sure that it has been dealt with already this year.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the Honourable the Attorney-General wish to answer the questions? If not he will be closing the debate.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I am in your hands. I have no objection to answering the two questions that have been asked. I only just didn't want to close off further debate on this bill.

I am not aware of the number of provinces that grant the air carriers. I know that it is in effect in Ontario. Applications or requests have been made to both Alberta and Saskatchewan and British Columbia. I do not know what action is being taken in either Saskatchewan or Alberta. I did read in the press where the Attorney-General of British Columbia said that he thought that this was a federal matter and ought to be dealt with by the federal parliament. The licence that can be granted under present legislation to railway trains, apply to both trains operated within the province as well as those that cross provincial boundary lines. And the same would be true of airlines.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move seconded by the Member for Ethelbert the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 84 an Act to amend the Consumer Credit Act for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, this is an amendment that provides that where the vendor uses the telephone, the telegram or correspondence in obtaining the sale that contract will be subject to the effect of the Consumer Credit Act,just as if he was going from door to door.

MADAM SPEAKER: All those in favour ....

MR. PETERS: Does this mean that a person getting a contract through the telephone he has three days or four days to rescind it?

MR. STEINKOPF: Actually he has two days -- it's the same effect as the door to door salesman.

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

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 85, an Act to amend the Securities Act for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER: presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, in the field of securities as in the field of consumer credit and company law and all that, there is a new look being taken at all security legislation right across Canada and it is the hope that sooner or later the federal government will step in and provide for some uniform legislation in the matter of the sale and the promotion of securities of all types. Our Act has not been commended in substance for many many years and we have now in the last year been working on a complete revision of the Security Act and didn't have it ready for this Session, but we did have some amendments ready that we thought were important enough to have them brought before the House at this time.

Some of the main points in the Bill provide that companies as well as individuals in the operation of this Act will be treated in the same manner as an individual. Specifically, it

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd.) ..... provides that a mineral interest broker may be his company as well as an individual's. The Act now provides for persons only from trading in securities and does not prohibit companies. Recently there was a decision in the Manitoba Court of Appeal handed down by Justice Freedman and he stated that an amendment of the Statute to close this obvious gap seems desirable right in the judgment. We concur with His Lordship and this amendment is before you.

There is exemption now for isolated trades not extending to persons whose usual business is trading in securities and we plan to change that with this Act and this is consistent with the provisions of the Ontario and other uniform acts of other provinces. There is necessity for clarifying a section, the meaning of which is pretty obscure and pretty technical, but the intent is that banks and loan companies and trust companies and insurance companies should be able to purchase securities whether those securities are otherwise qualified for trading in Manitoba or not. The purpose behind this is of course that banks and trust companies and the like do not need the protection of an Act of this type, they seem to be old enough to look after themselves, they're sophisticated investors, but there's a real danger that some of these institutions might be marketing securities on behalf of a client that otherwise wouldn't be marketable unless they were registered with our Securities Department. So there is a section now being provided that the combined effect of which would be to clarify the section and to prevent banks and trust companies from selling or dealing with securities that would otherwise have to be registered or in cases of primary distribution wouldn't be permitted to be handled by the banks or anyone.

There are a number of clauses that will have to be amended in order to permit the Act to be effective against companies as well as to persons. It has another important clause that has to do with the method that salesmen are using in selling investment contracts which they now can do on a door-to-door basis, or can call at a residence, but they can't do it for the sale of mutual funds and many of the companies who are in the business of selling investment contracts are also in the business of selling mutual funds. It seems logical that first of all that these two types of sales - the contract and the mutual fund sale should be combined and a simple requirement provided now that before a sale can be made on this formerly door-to-door basis, that a prior appointment be made by the intended purchaser with the vendor. Those two things are in the same section and they are probably the only major change in the Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. HUTTON presented Bill No. 89, an Act to Amend the Credit Unions Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: Speaking in terms of principle of the bill, there is an attempt being made here to tighten up the control and supervision of the Credit Unions. The Act provides for a tightening up at the local level within the Credit Union itself with the restoration of responsibilty to the Board of Directors and the provision for the appointment of the Supervisory Committees by the Board of Directors. At the present time both the Board of Directors and the Supervisory Committee are elected by the members of the Credit Union and so you get some division of authority and a bit of a reluctance on the part of Board of Directors to interfere with a Committee which is elected by the membership. Well provision is being made here in the Act to restore the authority and responsibility of the Board of Directors. If you note going through the Act some matters are defined - I'm going to use the term cheque instead of negotiable order as has been the case. There's a provision here which would allow a credit union to deposit up to 50 percent of its capital in a chartered bank or a central credit union rather than 25 percent. This is particularly applicable to the Caisse Populaires who would like to have more than 25 percent of their capital with their central organization.

On the bottom of the first page of the bill you have a reference to the Board of Directors - a change in the authority from the Supervisory Committee to the Board of Directors. Much of this is just a re-wording of the present Act. There is a restriction with respect to what can be considered paid up capital and deposits. Where a member may have borrowed money to make a deposit -- the unpaid portion of the estate or endowed loan has to be deducted from the

(MR. HUTTON cont'd.) ..... calculations. There is a provision which will restrict borrowing where the director feels that there are too many loans in bad shape being held by a Credit Union.

It's a little bit hard to deal with principles without getting into the actual consideration of these clauses one by one. For instance in respect to patronage dividends where the Board of Directors has recommended a rebate of interest on loans, such rebate and interest on loans as may be approved by resolution passed at the annual meeting, but no such rebate shall be approved if the rate of dividends paid on shares is less than the interest paid on deposit.

Now there's a change also in respect to the right of the directors to appoint a treasurer and a manager under the present reading of the bill. They must be the same person. This provides that they can be the same person or they may be two separate individuals, and it really accommodates the larger Credit Unions.

The matter of liquidity requirement is dealt with on Page 5 in Section 13, and it requires that a society shall maintain cash or liquid reserve of not less than five percent of the total of the shares, the deposits and borrowings of a society, not including the unpaid portion of an estate or endowment shares. Each society that permits negotiable orders, a withdrawal or cheques, must in addition to the reserve required under the earlier section maintain a cash or liquid reserve of not less than ten percent of deposits for the first one million dollars of deposits.

Then in 57 (b), no society shall permit its members to use or issue cheques unless the supervisor has examined the affairs of the society and is satisfied that it meets certain requirements, certain qualifications.

Section 58 allows the Board of Directors to receive some remuneration for their services. It's limited to $30.00 in any calendar month. In the past they have served their Credit Unions without any compensation, but when you consider the size of some of these operations it is not hard to imagine that they can be very demanding in terms of time, etc., on the part of people holding responsible positions in these organizations.

60 (a) is pretty well the same. On the bottom of Page 7, 60 (d) spells out in detail the responsibility of the supervisory committee. It really doesn't give it any more authority than it had before, but it clarifies this authority and these responsibilities.

62 (a) says that except where the security held for the loan consists of a charge against the shares and deposits of a member in a society which are sufficient to cover the loan, no loan society other than the Central Credit Union shall make a loan that is to be repayable on demand.

63 (a) is a further supervisory -- provides additional supervision over loans in that it restricts a Credit Union in making commercial or business loans, and restricts it in this sense that no society shall make a commercial or business loan if the aggregate of the principal amounts thereof unpaid exceeds two percent of the paid-up share capital of a society. There is a feeling amongst the Credit Union people themselves and certainly with the Co-operative and Credit Union Branch, that credit unions are not properly equipped to enter into some of these large commercial or business type loans. I might say there's an exception here. It doesn't apply to farming, but farming can be a fairly big business too.

Then we go on, and there are exceptions where the Credit Union, the Board of Directors and the members, meet certain qualifications. They can make business loans and if they engage in this business it requires these loans to be fully secured by lien or charge on property, and it requires the credit union to be represented by a solicitor in certain of these negotiations.

Now 69, or Section 17 of this bill, 69 deals with the requirements for filing returns, and under the old section, or what I should refer to as existing legislation, the rules could only be altered by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and under this legislation the procedures are standardized.

In Section 74, there is only really a change in wording. There is no change in the intent or sense of the legislation from the past. In 21, wherever a Credit Union has wound up its affairs in the past, the Minister got involved and then subsequently the matter is dealt with by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and in order to cut down the amount of paper work and the papers coming and going, we recommend to you that the director can carry through the procedures until we come to the point where the Order-in-Council is required, and then at that time the matter can be reviewed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and I think it will cut down a little on the paper. Probably governments are contributing a great deal to the demand for pulp these days.

(MR. HUTTON cont'd.)

Then you come to the section of the bill which deals with a liquidator -- (Interjection) -- You wish you had his services now? You'd probably point him at me. We've got enough liquid around this spring. This section dealing with a liquidator provides what we believe is a smoother and more dependable way of getting the affairs of local credit unions wound up. Sometimes there may be just a few dollars that are left in the business, and it is very difficult sometimes to get members of the credit union to go to all the trouble that is involved in getting the affairs wound up, so this would provide the procedure and allow for the appointment of a person, say, from the Credit Union League and somebody from the Federation and somebody from the Caisse Populaires to do this work.

Now the next important section deals with the situation where some of the larger credit unions desire to hire their own auditors. We have to maintain a competent personnel and an adequate supervisory service in the department. The average annual cost of this service is something in the neighborhood of $73,000. The credit unions contribute about $37,000 through the fees that are levied. In the case where adequate notice is given, this legislation provides that where adequate notice is given to the director that a credit union is going to carry out an independent audit of its books, we will reduce its fee for that year by 50 percent. We don't give it back 100 percent because we still have to maintain that service, but we do acknowledge that it reduces the work load and some acknowledgment should be given. I think maybe I'd better sit down.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that debate be adjourned.

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

. . . . . continued on next page

MR. HUTTON presented Bill No. 91, an Act to amend The Department of Agriculture and Conservation Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: It doesn't take very long this time. I would advise them to read the explanatory note in the inside...

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, while the explanatory notes may be brief and the Minister's comments may be brief, it does seem to me, however, as I read the section, that more consideration should be given to the amendment, because as I read the bill it takes away the necessity of the department of making special grants to municipalities for tax loss due to acquisition of land for Water Control Works. If this is so, then I think this matter should be considered more seriously, because as I read the section of the Act -- (Interjection) — Pardon? Well, I can't be here and if the Minister had explained it on second reading maybe I wouldn't be up now, but if the Minister will briefly say that the municipalities will not be injured insofar as tax loss is concerned by this, then I'll take his word for it. But I wasn't here, and if I was a healthy, robust young man like the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, then I would have been here and heard the explanation, but being a poor, frail human such as I am, I wasn't here. But as I say, if the Minister will assure me that there is no revenue lost to the municipalities as a result of this and flood control programs, then I'm satisfied.

MR. HUTTON: Yes, I should have mentioned this, asked the members to note that the Act comes into force on a day fixed by proclamation; and that is because we want to deal with two of the municipalities who are affected by these Water Control Works and who were better off under the formula that we originally negotiated with the municipalities than they would have been had we applied the new formula to them. So we're dealing with the two -- we had a good deal under the old formula; we're dealing with them, then rescinding this legislation, and for the rest we'll deal with them under the provision of the Municipal Act.

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

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 92, an Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, this bill is required because of the co-ordination of the Superannuation Fund with the Canada Pension Plan and the whole bill has to do with the amendments in order to make this possible.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I would like to say a word or two in connection with this bill, and I'm sorry it's late in the evening. I could of course have adjourned the motion but I think rather than do that I have a number of questions I would like to ask of the Minister.

The first question which I would direct to my honourable friend is, what consultation, if any, has taken place between the Employees Association and the Government in respect of the changes in pension plans as a result of the New CPP? In effect, is the Canada Pension Plan going to be stacked or integrated into the present Superannuation Plan as we know it today? I do know, Madam Speaker, that in many industries the employer has not had consultations with the employee in respect of the application of the Canada Pension Plan, in respect of pension plans now in force in the industry concerned, and this has resulted in a considerable amount of dissatisfaction with employees where they have not been consulted, and I'm sure, Madam Speaker, that many will agree with me that if, say for instance you have a 5 percent pension plan and then the employee has to add on to his pension plan a 1.8% in respect of the Canada Pension Plan, particularly with a young couple starting out in life, this becomes quite a burden insofar as the young people are concerned. So I would be interested in hearing from the Honourable the Minister what consultations have taken place with the representatives of the employees in respect of this very important matter.

Now, the other day, Madam Speaker -- first of all I note that there is a provision in the bill before us that where an employee retires after the 31st day of December 1965 and before 1969, his annual superannuation allowance shall be calculated in the manner provided by this Act as it was prior to the first day of January 1966, and I would suggest that the reasons behind this is because the employee may receive a better pension under the old scheme, and certainly would not be entitled to the benefits under the new Canada Pension scheme because he wouldn't have got in sufficient time of contributions to the CPP in order to receive a pension.

When we are dealing with the question of superannuation, Madam Speaker, I would like to ask of the Minister whether or not, when the government was considering the question of changes in the Superannuation Act of the province, whether or not consideration was given to

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... those superannuated pensioners now on the roles who rendered valuable service to the government for varying periods of time, whose pensions are less than $100.00 per month. The other day the Minister was kind enough, Madam Speaker, to reply to an Order for Return that I had requested, dealing with the question of superannuated employees of the Government of Manitoba who received less than $100.00 a month by way of pension. His reply, Madam Speaker, was to the effect that there are 255 employees, former employees of the Province of Manitoba, who are receiving $100.00 or less by way of pension. There are, Madam Speaker, 92 superannuated employees of the Province of Manitoba who are receiving less than $40.00 per month, and of these 92 persons who are receiving less than $40.00 per month in pension, there were 32 of them who had served the province for a greater period of time than 10 years. There were 28 who received between $40 and $50 per month of a superannuation, of which 20 served a greater period of time in government service than 10 years. There are 32 who received between $50 and $60 per month by way of superannuation, of which 28, Madam Speaker, served the province for a greater period than 10 years. Of those, between $60 and $70 numbering 27, 24 of them served for a greater period than 10 years, and of those getting between $70 and $80 per month superannuation pension from the province, only one of the 26 had served less than 10 years for the Province of Manitoba.

Now, Madam Speaker, I don't think this is good enough today, and I think that the government when it is changing the Superannuation Act as it is, to integrate or stack - whichever way they're going to do it - the Canada Pension Plan with the present plan, or change the future plan, I suggest to the Honourable Minister and the Government of Manitoba that they should take into consideration the situation in respect of those employees - former employees of the province who rendered good service, and I think that it is a reflection on government to find that of 255 persons who are on superannuation in our province - there are 255 who are receiving less than $100; there are well over 200. As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, there are over 200 superannuated employees of the Province of Manitoba who are receiving less than $80.00 a month by way of superannuation. And I want to make an appeal to the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities and the Provincial Secretary, will he please take this matter under advisement and consideration in order to raise up the superannuation amounts of these employees that I refer to this evening. I don't want to accuse the Honourable the Minister the Provincial Secretary of conducting superannuations so I some time am forced to refer to the Minister of Welfare. So I make an appeal to you, Sir, to take under advisement and consideration the possibility of increasing pensions for superannuated employees that I would particularly refer to this evening.

MR. HILLHOUSE: .....the Honourable Minister closing the debate, Madam Speaker? Well, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the House do now adjourn.

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