

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the honourable members to the gallery where we have 30 students of Grade 11 standing of the Mennonite Brethren Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Harry Wall. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister Without Portfolio.

We also have 25 students, Grade 11 standing of the Steinbach Bible School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kroeker. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be short and quite general, but having also been on this committee I thought I would wish to say a few words at least.

I must agree with some of the other members that the hearings were often quite congenial but with an undertone of a deep concern for the many problems concerning municipal people and especially problems concerning our taxpayers. The people that brought briefs before the committee, many of them showed a deep concern, and so much has been said in this House referring to the different briefs I do not intend at this time going into the various briefs. I think they've been well covered. There were of course very many dedicated briefs. I think the member yesterday mentioned some 20 or 21 spelling out to the members of the committee the different changes that were desired, and perhaps I remembered more of the members speaking of assessment than anything else, but this one seemed to be of quite high concern, our assessment situation and taxation from assessment of course.

Mr. Speaker, I don't really know where to begin with my remarks to do justice to the many problems brought forward to our committee, but I think all the members of the committee would agree of one overall point, and that's what I just mentioned, that the suggestions brought forth on assessment to me came out quite strong and quite vivid as being a problem, especially in the rural areas - and I'm sure I shouldn't say just the rural areas, I'm sure the same applies in the urban areas. I think at best to summarize the 20 or 21 committee meetings that we held, I think at best we could barely scratch or bring forth or solve the many problems or have answers or solutions to the many problems that were brought forth.

But I must admit, Mr. Speaker, and I think every member in this House must admit that some of the solutions will demand some direct action. Perhaps the day has come where municipalities will sit down and have similar meetings as the provinces and the Federal Government do today; perhaps the time has come where the province should sit down with the municipalities on a similar basis. In fact I noted about a year ago they had a meeting of this type in Ontario and I was rather surprised that while they realized that municipalities and provinces were now partners and not creatures any more, I was rather disappointed that the meeting that they had at that time did not really result in anything concrete, and there seemed to be a hesitancy in reply from that government, at least the way the article is described. Perhaps the time has come, and I felt this from reading this article, that quite a bit of confidence has been lost in many of the municipalities and the work they've been doing. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why we find people reluctant to run as reeves or mayors or councilmen today. But I think this is a thought that this government or we in Manitoba should consider, maybe sit down directly with some of the municipalities and maybe some of the problems can be ironed out.

Mr. Speaker, I also think this committee would agree, as I said before, that the assessment was one of the major concerns, and while quite a few suggestions came forward regarding

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) taxation and regarding assessment, I'm sure that all of us feel that much is left to be desired. I think most members in this House would feel though, and come right out and agree, that assessment should be based more on a productivity basis. Of course having said that, a whole can of worms seems to appear right after that statement. You can ask so many questions when you go into that. What kind of productivity? Soil productivity? And you get into the problem of - I believe in the Swan River area the problem of location was brought up quite a few times, and we have to consider our rental value and you might say what about use and alternative uses, the many problems that my colleague and others talked about bordering around the City of Winnipeg, and perhaps Brandon also. --(Interjection) -- Yes, the cost of production, the Honourable Member for Rhineland says, and there's many more questions that would have to be asked, plus the training and experience by assessors. I think this comes into effect even if they try to adhere to the assessment principles that are laid down, but I believe all these determine what weight should be attributed to the various factors which determine value.

I noticed yesterday the Member for St. Matthews made a rather positive statement on assessment, and I think if the honourable member would study the ruling made by the Manitoba Court of Appeal in the Newall-Sulkers-Reimer case I believe it was, I think it states quite clearly, and while I wish the member was correct that a positive statement like he made could be made, I think the ruling refers quite clearly and uses the term specifically that only "shall consider", and then again you get back to the question, it doesn't really settle too much in assessment, although I must say of the member while I'm speaking about him that I think one of the members on this side mentioned that he had not attended very many meetings. I thought I had attended all except two, and I think I seen him at each of those meetings and possibly he was at the other two also.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm speaking as a -- or I should perhaps put it a little different -- I don't wish to go into details of assessment or Bill 102 or Bill 148 since it has been well covered by quite a few members of this House, but I believe the concern of all the members - not just of the committee - of the House must be: where do we go from here? If committees can determine the ultimate goals or destinies of the many assessment-taxpayer-municipal problems, perhaps serious consideration should be given to what can be achieved by continuing these committees.

Mr. Speaker, while this committee or any other committee can only act as a small guideline in regard to what some of the solutions and problems may be, we know that it can only suggest changes, not enforce these changes. But, Mr. Speaker, this government is the responsible party in power, so I suggest to the members opposite that they will have to find some solutions or they will find themselves owning and perhaps administrating some of the municipalities, school boards, park boards, police department, fire department - we could go on and on - and which in anybody's opinion would certainly not be in the best interests of our citizens of Manitoba regardless of what political party is in power. So, Mr. Speaker, the committee may not have done enough but I firmly believe it is a start in the right direction. We can perhaps look back a few years from now and at least say that somewhere a start was made.

Maybe I've spent too much time in expressing the problems of municipal people, but in my book if municipalities, or the province for that matter, the provincial representatives, are not going to fight directly for the taxpayer, who is going to? I know that there are also many individuals, not just rurally, the City of Winnipeg, right across Manitoba who are deeply concerned in our very complex society with very complex problems that we know need some attention. So, Mr. Speaker, while we may not have achieved too much, at least we have made a start in the right direction, but this government across cannot forget that they will have to take the direct responsibility and go further than just accept the proposed changes; we will have to see some action regarding these problems.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Could I have the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand? (Agreed)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this to the Minister of Tourism - and I see he's absent, then to the Acting Minister of Tourism re provincial parks and the dollar fee. I believe there's a letter on the Minister's desk regarding this, and it's the case of leaders, Girl Guide Leaders taking groups into the park on the weekend with some of their garbage -- or some of their stuff and they had to pay the dollar for the mother and the father, they come back for them the next day, and they have to pay another dollar, and really, is this right? I'd like to direct this to whichever one is the acting Minister - the House Leader?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'll ask the -- the Minister of Tourism is now entering the Chamber and perhaps the honourable member could wait until he gets to his seat and then repeat his question.

MR. SPEAKER: I would also suggest to the honourable member that he try and make it a little less lengthy than it was the first time. It was a little complicated. I may have to suggest it should be an Order of the Day if he's going to make it that long. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I direct this to the Minister of Tourism regarding admittance to the provincial parks of a dollar. I think there is a letter on his desk regarding Girl Guide leaders, mother and father, who take the children there on the weekend and have to pay a dollar for both, just to leave whatever equipment they have and go back for them the following day and pay another two dollars - a dollar each - and really is this -- the question is: Is there any adjustment here? Birds Hill Park is the one in the letter that will be if not on your desk.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I would have to have a little more clarification there. If the member is agreeable, I'll take it as notice for now and I'll be glad to reply to the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. With respect to the trip to The Pas to see the CFI Plant on Friday, will there be a financial briefing either before or after or during the day so that members can not only see the physical side of it but also understand the financial side?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, it was the intention to arrange for the General Manager of the forestry complex to give a resume of the operations of the plant, I believe, just before the tour or groups of tours commenced in order to provide adequate information to enable all members to understand the various types of machinery and the various processes that were involved, but this was the extent of the briefing that would be provided.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): A supplementary question. Will this be in printed form?

MR. EVANS: I'm not sure if I heard the question properly. Was it would this be in printed form? I believe it would be an oral presentation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day my question is for the Deputy Premier, Deputy First Minister. I wonder whether he can inform the House whether it will be the government's intention to forward the recommendations of the Human Rights Commission with respect to the census to the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I believe that I am the Deputy Premier designated for such purposes when the Premier is away from the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, then to the House Leader. I wonder whether he can inform the House whether it's the government's intention to forward the recommendations of the Human Rights Commission to those people in charge of the Federal Government -- those people in the Federal Government who are in charge of the census.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question to the Minister of Labour, who I believe is also in charge of the Human Rights Commission or answers in the House for it. Was there a discussion between the government and the Human Rights Commission in connection with the details contained in the census?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I am not responsible for the Human Rights Commission, but I would suggest to my honourable friend that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources took his original question as notice and that follows through for any subsequent question as well.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. The Minister of Labour suggests that his budget does not contain the Human Rights Commission, the Estimates of the Human Rights Commission?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that my honourable friend take a look at the Estimates for the present year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and ask him if the government have now completed plans for the takeover of Western Flyer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I may ask leave of the House to make a brief statement regarding the Japanese Economic Mission to Manitoba. I believe that honourable members across the way asked a question of this, and with leave of the House I'd like to make a brief statement. (Agreed)

STATEMENT

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, on June 5th and 6th the Manitoba Government will host an important economic mission sponsored by the government of Japan. It will be composed of leading members of Japan's industrial and financial community and will be led by Mr. Chujiro Fujino, President of the Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha Ltd. There are 34 Japanese representatives in all on the mission.

Many members will recall that there was a similar mission to Canada in 1964 headed by the President of Nippon Steel Corporation, and I believe that there has been over the last three years a strengthening of both cultural and economic ties between our two countries. Indeed I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that the total value of trade between Canada and Japan now surpasses the 1.4 billion dollar mark. It's particularly impressive, I think, that this particular mission is most intriguing because we believe that this mission and the discussions that will ensue will provide a platform, will provide the groundwork for negotiations between government business and between the representatives of the Japanese nation.

The Government of Manitoba has been in direct touch with the Canadian Embassy in Tokyo to learn if the mission can make direct negotiations during its travel across Canada and we have been told that the Bank of Japan will give automatic approval to any agreements up to a maximum of one million dollars per agreement. Apparently there's no other restriction on the number of such agreements and this figure has been verified through Japanese channels.

Members are aware that there has been a relatively strong investment by Japanese interests in northern Manitoba mining developments. During the two-day visit to Manitoba of the mission we hope to discuss further investment potential in the north and indeed elsewhere in the province. It is our belief that we must ensure that sources of foreign investment in Manitoba are of balance, and if we have to go outside the country for investment capital we hope we don't have to rely upon any one or two particular countries. We note that Japan has accumulated a number of dollars through its strong trade position and we would welcome and

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) encourage the Japanese to invest some of these funds in Manitoba.

In our discussions we will outline areas of investment both in the form of joint ventures where Japanese and Canadian funds are put into a project as well as new enterprises whereby ownership may be fully Japanese. We will be inviting the Japanese to consider Manitoba as a Canadian manufacturing base both for the distribution of products within Canada and for entry from here into the United States market. We will also be discussing with them licensing procedures and the manner in which some of their technical know-how can be utilized in Manitoba to our mutual advantage.

Detailed statements on Manitoba's position and that of the Japanese economic mission will be made respectively by the Honourable the First Minister and by Mr. Fujino on Saturday, June 5th. This will be attended by a number of representatives of the Manitoba business community. It is our plan that detailed discussions and negotiations will be undertaken the following day in the Legislative Building and this too of course will contain broad Manitoba business representation. I hope to be able to report briefly to the House at the conclusion of the visit of this mission and I, like you, Sir, look forward to some concrete results.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce based on the statement he just made, and ask him whether this visit is a follow-up to, and a follow-through on groundwork that was undertaken at the time of the Premier's visit to Japan in October of 1969 or whether this is an entirely new initiative unrelated to that.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the visit of the First Minister while he was Minister of Industry and Commerce to Japan a couple of years ago certainly strengthened our ties between Japan and Canada. However, it is my understanding that this Japanese mission is largely as a result of the fact that Japan does now have a surplus on its balance of payment account; in other words, there are upward pressures on the yen in the international currency market and that as a result -- (Interjection) -- as a result we have Japan -- we have a yen for their yen, yes -- Japan does have surplus funds which they're now prepared to invest in secondary industry as well as primary industry. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, in response to the question that there are various facts of international finance and international investment which have a great bearing on the visit of the Japanese at this time and which lead us to feel very optimistic about the results of this visit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to reply to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce's statement and say how very happy we are on this side that this opportunity is being presented to Manitoba . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: On a point of order, I believe that through inadvertence or otherwise, the statement was made, there were no responses to it and then a question period followed. Now, ordinarily the statement should be made in response to a statement which was made, and I assume that that's what my honourable friend now wishes to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Member from Fort Garry asked a question prior to my statement and I assume that by the rules it was permissible; if it isn't, I would then ask leave to be able to reply. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, it's hard to contain oneself when we have the Minister of Labour chirping away: The Minister of Labour unfortunately is in front of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and I wish he was behind him and then it would give me an opportunity to address my remarks to him.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there is an opportunity for Manitoba, and I would hope that the discussions that will take place will result in something concrete along the lines that the Minister has indicated, either in some new investment capital being brought to Manitoba, some joint ventures being conducted or some kind of manufacturing licensing program in which our manufacturers will be able to benefit from the technology and expertise that Japan has been able to marshal together in their home country and which is reflected in the variety and sophisticated manner of the products they have presented to the world. I believe, and I would recommend to the Minister of Industry and Commerce that the Minister of Transportation be present at those meetings, because it's very obvious that he at least has some concept of

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) the necessity of trying to negotiate and sell as well as being a person who simply receives delegations and hopes that something will come of it.

Mr. Speaker, it's rather amusing that the Minister of Industry and Commerce can stand up and give us a dissertation on the Japanese economy, the problems with Japan's export situation and the fact that there will be a delegation here which may or may not be in a position to do some business, when he's not prepared to travel more than 70 miles to the United States . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable gentleman is debating this statement. He is allowed by our rules to make a reply but not a debate. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I say it's rather amusing that the Minister of Industry and Commerce who is welcoming the Japanese delegation is not prepared as Minister of Industry and Commerce to travel to any community in the United States to try and seek investment capital, joint ventures, manufacturing or licensing in Manitoba. And there is a bit of hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, in the manner in which the Minister of Industry and Commerce makes this presentation today, because the fact of the matter is that there is a delegation that is coming to Canada in which I am sure there has been the co-operation and assistance and help of government officials from the Federal Government in Ottawa who are located in Japan who have been responsible for this. It is a fact that we in this province would welcome the opportunity to visit and to further whatever negotiations may be carried on; but, Mr. Speaker, industrial activity does not take place by delegations coming to Manitoba, industrial activity will take place if the Minister of Industry and Commerce will get off his hands and start to do his job.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, relative to the Minister's announcement, one question directed to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Does this mean, Mr. Minister, or through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister, that the Minister of Transportation will not be going to Japan?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I do want to caution members that these kinds of irrelevancies are not necessary. I do think we want to conduct our business and get it completed, and I know one thing, that the honourable gentleman has a habit of doing this. Now in the future I'm just not going to recognize him on that point after a statement of this kind because this is what he's done a couple of times, and I would suggest to him that he not, that he cease and desist. The Honourable Member for Morris.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (Cont'd.)

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the First Minister and ask him if it is the government's plan to take over Western Flyer.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the application I believe for some financing with respect to Western Flyer Coach is before the Board of the Manitoba Development Corporation. There's been no recommendation or final course of action agreed to as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines. Could he inform the House as to whether or not Manitoba Hydro has a permanent licence to alter the level of Lake Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it was announced in December of 19 -- excuse me, I may be wrong about the month, but it was announced publicly, and I can't recall the month, that Manitoba Hydro had been given an interim licence to regulate Lake Winnipeg between the levels of 711 and 715 feet.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. Is the First Minister going to keep the promise he made to hold public hearings before a permanent licence is granted to change the level of Lake Winnipeg?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if I understood the honourable member's question correctly, it was whether or not arrangements would be made for public meetings, and the answer is that arrangements will be made for public meetings.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question of the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Should there be wide disagreement at the public hearings, will there be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. That's debatable. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Can he indicate whether or not the Manitoba Water Commission is currently investigating the regulations that'll have to be arrived at with respect to regulation for Lake Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in answer to my honourable friend, about a week ago I indicated that the Manitoba Water Commission will have an input insofar as the pattern, the ultimate pattern of regulation is concerned, that they will be looking at the pattern.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Honourable House Leader indicate whether or not the Manitoba Water Commission has sat on this specific problem in the last month?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I know that the Manitoba Water Commission has had its duties and its own terms of reference with regard to Lake Winnipeg regulation, has had it under constant consideration.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I repeat the last question. Can the Minister indicate whether or not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, repetition is not necessary. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Thank you. I address my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Would the Minister of Industry and Commerce have any views on the impact on Manitoba should Great Britain join the European market?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do have some views on the matter, but with deference to my colleagues in this House, to all of you, I would suggest that you don't prevail upon me to give you those views at this time. I'd be delighted to talk to you about them over a cup of coffee.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder whether he can indicate whether the government has in their possession any figures that would indicate the resource loss as the result of the raising of Lake Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, we have statistical data on a good many things. Unless the honourable member can be more precise, I fail to see how it's possible to answer that question.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder whether the First Minister can indicate whether there is to be any resource loss if Lake Winnipeg is to be raised.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my impression is that there would not be, and even if there were it would pale in comparison to the resource loss that would be encountered if alternative projects were followed.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister could indicate whether he has any specific study that would support his position.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, a good deal of information that my honourable friend is aware of.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. Could he undertake to provide the House with information on the tenders for the first excavation on the Lake Winnipeg diversion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I do believe that belongs to another realm and not to the House. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

STATEMENT

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement in regards to minimum wage rates in Manitoba. The report of the Minimum Wage Board was received on May 3rd of this year by the government. The report was in three parts. First, the unanimous report of the board which stated consideration should be given to applying an increase to the minimum wage rate when the cost of living increased by two percent. Second, the majority report of the board, which comprised the employer representatives, which stated the present minimum

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) wage of \$1.50 per hour should be considered as the base and future increases should only be made on the basis of the unanimous report. Third, the minority report filed by the employee members of the board which recommended that the minimum wage should be increased in stages to reach \$1.75 per hour by July, 1972, and to \$2.00 per hour in 1973.

Representations were made to the government by employers in the garment industry and the hotel and restaurant businesses asking that their respective positions be considered before changes were made in the minimum wage rate. They were particularly concerned that they be not given sufficient lead time to adjust any wage increase.

The government, after considering the report of the Minimum Wage Board and the representatives of affected industries, have concluded that there should be a fairly early adjustment increase in the minimum wage. The government is mindful that the federal minimum wage will increase on July 1st of this year to \$1.75 per hour. Ontario has a wage rate of \$1.65 per hour. It should be noted in both these jurisdictions certain exemptions are permitted for the application of minimum wage rates. Other provinces have rates ranging from \$1.15 to \$1.55 for males and from 95 cents to \$1.55 for females.

It is the considered opinion of the government that Manitoba should increase its minimum wage to \$1.65 per hour effective the 1st of November, 1971. And also, Mr. Speaker, may I say that there will be a differential for those under 18, and beginners, as are in practice at the present time. Following that date of November 1st, 1971, it is considered that further review be undertaken to ascertain what, if any, further adjustment should be made at a later date.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (Cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may direct my question to the Minister of Labour under his shawl as Minister of Railways. Will the Minister inform the House on the proposed closing of the stations Kenville, Durban and Benito? Does this mean rail abandonment of the rail line in that area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Not as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker. There is two different propositions, one dealing with withdrawal of station agents, with which I've had discussions; and I've also stated in the House, Mr. Speaker, that I will oppose any further rail line abandonment in my capacity as Railway Commissioner in Manitoba.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if the Minister could inform the House as to whether or not he has discussed this matter with the C.N.R., and if he has, who did he discuss it with?

MR. PAULLEY: The answer to the first question is yes. I have discussed it with the C.N.R. and have discussed it, in answer to the second part of my honourable friend's question, with the Vice-President of the Prairie Region of the Canadian National Railways, Mr. John Gardner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I may direct a question to the First Minister, and it has to do with my question of yesterday. I wonder if he has a reply to my comments at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well Mr. Speaker, I remain abject but unfortunately I haven't got a definite answer as to how it happened, why it happened. I'd rather -- excuse me. Mr. Speaker, the whispered advice that I received is simply added reason to make further enquiries. I am told the decision on a matter such as that has to do with federal practice, but that doesn't quite explain all of it either, so I shall make further enquiries.

MR. BILTON: If it should turn out that it is the prerogative of the Federal House to determine this, I wonder if the First Minister would protest that attitude in lack of the Commonwealth Association.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can assure my honourable friend that I am, like he is, a supporter of our constitutional system and all that that involved with respect to the Crown.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In his absence I asked

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.)the question of the House Leader. I'll direct it to him now. I wonder whether he can inform the House whether it's an intention to forward the statements of the Human Rights Commission with respect to the census to the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I understand that my colleague the Minister of Mines, the House Leader has taken this as notice, and even though we are in this front bench accustomed to working quickly, imparting information quickly, not that quickly, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour and it relates to his statement from the Minimum Wage Board. Is this a new practice of government to act on minority reports of boards?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I'd like to direct two questions, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour. First of all, seeing that the report was submitted to the government on May 3rd, would it not have been much more appropriate to bring . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is debating the question. Would he place his question.

MR. GIRARD: I wonder if the Minister of Labour could advise us as to why the report was not brought in during his Estimates. Secondly, I would like to know from the Minister if he is aware of whether or not the increase to \$1.65 in November will create some unemployment, or more unemployment would be resulting in loss of jobs, and, if so, how many?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend should be aware that I did make a statement to the House on receipt of the report from the Minimum Wage Board. I'm sure my honourable friend, if he would take the time out to peruse Hansard, would find the date and also my statement. That's in regard to his first part of the question. In regard to the second part, it's hypothetical and we have no precise information either in Manitoba or anywhere on the North American continent as to the effects of increases in minimum wages.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, might I direct a question to the Minister of Railways. He undertook the question as notice back some time ago to advise whether the C.N.R. had made formal application to the Canadian Transportation Commission regarding their railway station closing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and if my honourable friend would also refer to Hansard he will find that I replied the day following that to the effect that I understand that no formal application has been made. There was made as of that date, I'm not sure of the day, by the C.N.R. to the Board of Railroad Transport Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise a point of order. I question the Honourable Minister of Labour bringing in a minority report from a body as the one he's just mentioned.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I did not bring in a minority report at all. I have brought in a report of what this government intends to do in respect of minimum wage, and I want to assure my honourable friend from Rhineland it is a majority report of the Government of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. Can he indicate whether or not the government or Manitoba Hydro is helping financially to undertake the studies that are currently under way at the University of Manitoba with respect to shoreline erosion and beach erosion, that study group that's studying that matter at the university?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland. -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a supplementary.

MR. ENNS: The Honourable the First Minister said yes. I appreciate the fine definitive line, but is it the Manitoba Hydro or the government in terms of bookkeeping who is helping the financing of this study?

MR. SCHREYER: It's public funds, Mr. Speaker. I'll have to check further to see

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) whether it's to the account of the department or the account of Hydro.

MR. ENNS: I wonder if the First Minister in so doing, in checking this matter could also ascertain the actual amount being involved with respect to this study.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. In view of the Winnipeg School Board's opposition to an NDP oriented school such as is sponsored tentatively by interested parents . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is making a statement and assertion which may be an assumption. Order, please. Would the honourable member rephrase his question.

MR. FROESE: My question, Mr. Speaker, is simply - is the Minister still going to further the interests of this group?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth & Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, for the fourth time I'm pleased to answer this question. Any project will have to come under the aegis of, and within the ambit of the public school system and will have to be approved by the School Board.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister then. Does he not consider this a deliberate effort . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is debating the question. Will he state his question.

MR. FROESE: Well I'll rephrase it then. Is this not a deliberate effort to scuttle or . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also for the Minister of Youth and Education. Is the Minister of Youth and Education now in a position to inform the House how many of the thousands of university students who are presently unemployed have obtained employment through the Student Placement Bureau?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: I can't confirm how many thousands of students, if any, are unemployed, but I can inform the member that as of two and a half weeks ago 453 secured employment with the Province of Manitoba.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Honourable Member for Brandon West. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if that particular bill can be held and that we move to Bill No. 37.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk) presented Bill No. 37, an Act to amend the Municipal Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of amendments proposed here. They are in the main, amendments which are made necessary as a result of the practical consequences and results of the passage of the New Municipal Act in the last session, a number of items which have come to our attention during the past year.

First, there is an amendment which makes it possible that any member of council may do business with one of its members, if the council gives notice of its intention to do so and in cases where the amount involved is not substantial. We've recently had some judicial cases in the province where there in fact has been disqualification of members of council because they have been involved in business dealings involving the municipal entity which they represent contrary to the provisions of the Municipal Act, and this is an effort to make more liberal some of those provisions subject to the ratepayers and citizens in that jurisdiction having appropriate notice.

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.)

The second amendment is one which provides and removes any ambiguity or confusion that members of municipal office will immediately take office fourteen days after the fourth Wednesday in October whether or not they've been elected or whether their election was by way of acclamation. Their automatic assumption of office takes place fourteen days after. The provisions of the Bill which we passed last session left this unclear.

Another area which we passed last year in the session was one in which there was a division of the ward boundaries in the rural municipalities based on a 25 percent quotient by way of population. Now I would like to say at this point I have included in this bill a number of amendments in regard to that. During the last several months I have heard a number of representations from municipal people, councillors, reeves and others in regard to this provision. In the main, they have been unhappy with the changes that were passed last session in respect to the bill, and if I recall correctly last session, this was pretty well an all party bill or motion that made this change in regard to the boundaries.

In some municipalities in particular it creates a problem because of -- for example if I could use a municipality - I believe in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell - Ellice, where you would have a non-incorporated village of considerable size included and a sparsely settled area, farming area surrounding it. Then you have a ward much smaller than the majority of the wards within the municipality and you have councillors that are representing large chunks of land - area. On the face of it and in theory, certainly we want to constantly have representation by way of population. There's no other way that true and proper democratic process can effectively take place and this is the principle which we have attempted to adopt at the federal and the provincial levels.

I think possibly we should acknowledge however that on the municipal level there is some reason for us to be prepared to examine some of the practical problems that municipal people have encountered. They point out for instance that their main work and municipal function is drainage or roads and that it would be very very difficult to obtain people to run for office if for example they should represent half the municipality, looking after all the roads and drainage within that half of the municipality, because it represents the farm portion as compared to a very small ward which represents only the unincorporated area.

So I want to say this, that I am sympathetic to changes in regard to these sections in the Act. I must acknowledge that all these changes aren't spelled out at the present time in the bill before you and it's my intention to bring amendments at the committee stage to detail more some changes that can bring about just a little bit of balance between the theoretical or the general principle that we wish to all adopt I'm sure, and the principle of attempting to ensure that municipal people in rural areas can still effectively carry on their work. In fact I've arranged a meeting to meet with the Union of Manitoba Municipalities within the next day to discuss this matter in more detail and I will be bringing further changes in regard to that part of the bill before the committee stage.

Last session we passed a provision that a person could run for municipal office if he or she was in fact receiving welfare assistance. By oversight, the drafting of the bill failed to also lead from that point to leave without a doubt that a member of council who, while a member of council, applies and receives municipal assistance can still retain his seat. So there is a provision in order to make that possible and it's only consistent with the provisions of the municipal bill which we passed during the last session of the Legislature.

At the request of the City of St. Boniface we have extended the provisions of the Municipal Act to pertain to the City of St. Boniface in regard to council indemnity and tax cancellations, and this change is being brought about at the request of the City of St. Boniface itself.

We are removing the mandatory or compulsory provision that existed in the old Act that every municipality must have within its office a copy of the Municipal Gazette -- the Manitoba Gazette. This provision is being removed from the bill.

At the request of municipal organizations the bill is providing additional authority for municipal councils to deal with the abandonment of underground containers.

We're also including in the bill provision permitting municipal councils to enter into agreement with regional development corporations for various terms, but none of which shall exceed three years.

Provisions will make it possible for rural municipalities to levy in part of the municipality the cost of covering the cost of operation of community centres as well as the retirement

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.) of debt in that regard.

There will be provisions also permitting the municipal councils to collect fees, licences, in regard to mobile homes and placing increased onus upon the owner of the lands upon which the mobile home is located to collect these fees so that the municipality will not be left carrying the burden of unpaid arrears in respect to licence fees involving mobile homes. This again has been a repeated request by municipal organizations passed by resolution at their conventions.

Provision for the providing of some form of remuneration to members on an advisory committee elected to serve as advisers to administrators in local government districts.

There's also included in the bill provisions making it possible for a municipality to initiate a local improvement, paying for same out of the current funds of the municipality and providing for the recovery of such expenditures as local improvement levies without submitting the matter to a vote, or to approval of the Municipal Board as is the case in the present provisions of the Act.

Also, municipalities are to be given authority to pass by-laws requiring that provision be made for health, food, water, sanitation facilities, parking, traffic security, fire protection and like facilities as a condition for obtaining a permit in order to carry on major entertainment or recreational functions that are likely to attract large crowds - and we could refer here to the rock festivals for instance held last year - that the municipality will have more opportunity to be responsible for some of the very basic safeguards that should be available in such undertakings as these in the future.

You will find in the bill before you a number of amendments clarifying tax sale and tax title procedure and other changes which are purely of a procedural or housekeeping type. We're presently also working on some other amendment changes to the Municipal Act so that we may have some other amendments that we may wish to present to you before the session is over. These are the main items that we have at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: I wonder if I could ask the Honourable Minister a question. He was mentioning at the start that allowance was made that a member of council could be earning some money or making a sale to the municipality, and I believe that amount in the bill is mentioned at \$100.00. Now there's also a clause after that. If it is advertised otherwise, can that amount exceed \$100.00 then?

MR. PAWLEY: I don't believe, but I would prefer to answer that in more detail in my concluding remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I . . . be replying formally to the details on the bill before us, but there was one matter that I wanted to bring up to the Minister while we're in the process of making changes to the Municipal Act. It's one regarding the charges on improvements to properties in areas where a street is upgraded and services are put in - concrete, sewer and water and so on - in an area where there are existing homes. One of the recurring problems that has existed in the past is that these are advertised usually on an area basis that may include more than the street, more than one street, or even if it just includes one street, and usually a petition is taken if there are a number of the people against such improvements and nearly always you have a percentage, a significant percentage that have the improvements cast on them even though they don't want them - and usually again the reason is that they can't afford the improvements at that particular time. So the municipalities offer to carry the costs at an interest rate that is current, but the individual may pay off the entire amount within a set period, usually it's 30 days, and nearly always people can't raise that amount of money in 30 days and for a 60 or 65 foot lot this may run up to \$2,000 or \$2,500 which is an awful lot of money.

Now what they find is that a little later on they have to move, get transferred or sell their house and they have difficulty selling it because their taxes are so high, so they go down to the municipality to pay off their taxes and they find that they can't actually pay that off. It's beyond the 30 days of course and they can't pay off their improvements. The municipality has an arrangement where they can pay it off only if they pay all the interest over the amortization period which is ten years, and by this time that bill amounts to over \$4,000 if it happens to be -- it's almost double the amount over the ten-year amortization period. Now there's quite a significant number of cases get reported on this where people in improvement areas such as

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) new suburbs, which the area I represent is, where there are new improvements always going in and it's a chronic problem.

Now the reason given by the department, as far as I know, is that once the debentures are let this somehow has an effect and they can't be disturbed, but there must be some sort of an arrangement whereby a person could adequately pay off this without that severe penalty of paying ten years of interest. It would certainly solve a very very real and very significant problem for many people who are caught in the financial pinch where they cannot pay these improvements. I wonder if the Minister has mentioned in going along that there may be more amendments brought in - if an amendment is necessary to that effect, I wonder if he would take this into consideration and see if some more adequate means might not be contrived where these people caught in this predicament can pay off these debts that are cast on them against their will.

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

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Youth and Education, 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 Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

. Continued on next page

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Capital Supply, Schedule A. Item - General Purposes, \$21, 252, 000 -- the Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, may I ask what's involved in general purposes? What particular expense is entailed in all this large expenditure?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, may I first premise my response by correcting a statement that I made the last time we dealt with this. I was not seeing well when I was looking up and I misread a signal. I stated that Canadian Pension Plan debentures are repayable over 40 years; I was incorrect. They are repayable in 20 years from date of issue, subject to repayment prior to maturity on six months' notice from the Minister of Finance of Canada who would be acting on the advice of the Chief Actuary of the Canada Pension Plan. That's one correction.

Secondly, may I say that I'm rather hoping that we could complete the Capital Supply and Interim Supply today so that necessary work can be undertaken. Having said that, then I would reply to the Member for Souris-Lansdowne to say that the last time we dealt with I did give a general summary of the projects that are hoped for. As last year, the government is presenting to this committee a proposal which will give it the authority to proceed along various lines of development of much needed facilities. We don't say that we can get them all done nor indeed do we say that we could really get them going in this year, but we want to be able to work within our capacity and therefore to be able to do certain things, have the authority to do certain things. And secondly, if the unemployment situation develops seriously, then again we would like to have the opportunity for speed-up.

So what we have here is what is sometimes termed a "menu" of work, all of which is considered important but which, as I say, we would like to proceed with with due care and all we're asking for at this stage is the authority with which to be able to proceed. Now I can give a recap but I'm just wondering at what stage we stand now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I may just interrupt the Minister. I was just wondering if I could remind the members that the Minister had itemized the expenditures of the \$21, 252, 000. It can be found in the Hansard for the evening of the 20th.

MR. CHERNIACK: I think that we had sort of agreed to take them department by department and I think that we had -- my impression is that we have dealt with Attorney-General, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Co-operative Development, and we were starting to discuss Health and Social Development proposals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is my recollection also, the Department of Social Services.

MR. CHERNIACK: So that I would now be in a position to -- we agreed I think in committee it would be more orderly, rather than hopping around, to deal with each department. I think the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is anxious to be heard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have before me the Hansard of May 20th and have some questions which I would like to ask in clarification of some of these sums. Now on May 20th the Minister of Finance indicated the government's intention to spend \$1.2 million on Headingley Correctional Institute and \$1.5 million on the Brandon Correctional Institute. On looking back over the past year, the Loan Act (2) for 1970 set aside - this is authorizing capital sums - had set aside \$3, 539, 000 - and some dollars for an item indicated as court facilities and correctional facilities.

Then also we had at the last session Bill 47 dated April 30th in the Hansard. In that bill there were additional funds authorized for capital construction and in that instance almost two and a half million was set aside for correctional facilities. Now this is all a little confusing. I would like to know were any of the monies mentioned in the Loan Act or in Bill 47 applied to or subsequently included in the amounts mentioned on May 20th by the Minister in respect of the Headingley and Brandon Correctional Institutions? Could I have an answer to that question?

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . member could give me elaboration on Bill 47.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, Bill 47, 1970 was an Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of same, and then in the Hansard . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: That's the Loan Act that you also referred to?

MRS. TRUEMAN: I'm sorry . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: I don't have it before me. Is that also Loan Act (2) or whatever it was called?

MRS. TRUEMAN: The Loan Act (2) is dated April 20th, ten days earlier, also in 1970.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm just wondering whether the member isn't actually doubling up on the same bill. Loan Act (2) was Bill No. 47.

MRS. TRUEMAN: I see. Well, the sum that's mentioned appears to be different.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, may I say in general that the General Purposes Authority is one which provides for some flexibility so that if the government is able to proceed with some project and not with another then there is authority to make the switch, and actually in the case referred to, Brandon Hospital Administration Building, there was some authority that had to be moved to an area which was able to proceed more rapidly and that was done, and that would be the reason for the apparent contradiction referred to by the honourable member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Chairman, these sums which were enabled to be spent last year, were these sums actually spent?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: The General Purpose Authority was a lump sum and the projects that were stated then were what was expected to be done, but as I say, they weren't authorized to be spent for that purpose alone or only, and therefore there have been changes made to accommodate to our ability to proceed in the last year. Now the amount required now for, I think the reference was to Brandon, the Administration Building, there was some \$575,000 which was reallocated for another purpose and that's why it appears now before us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: What other purpose was it reallocated for then? I'm trying to sort all of this out and nowhere . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Well Mr. Chairman, it wasn't specifically for a specific other purpose, but in the realignment there was this money, together with other money, made available for other projects that were able to proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I assume then that it was spent for other capital projects. Then on the matter of the mental hospitals, again we have the same confusion of figures. On May 20th the Minister announced an appropriation of 600,000 for the Brandon Hospital for Mental Diseases and 400,000 for the Selkirk Hospital. Now the same Loan Act in 1970 had set aside almost \$4 million. Was that \$4 million spent and on what projects was it spent?

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . that bill that the honourable member's reading from, that \$4 million figure, I don't see it in the bill.

MR. TRUEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I should have had a copy made of this. It's the Capital Authority required for General Purposes, Loan Act No. 70, anticipated allocations. Now there the sum is \$3,735,700. Was it divided between the two?

MR. CHERNIACK: I now understand the honourable member. She's not reading from the bill itself, she's reading from an anticipated estimated statement of estimates, and to answer her, the allocations for 1970 in the - now which area was she asking, the Brandon Mental? The Brandon Mental was 925,000 set aside for the Administration Building, Renovations and Minor Projects were close to half a million; Selkirk Mental was some 1.63 million, but one and a half million was for the Administration Building.

MRS. TRUEMAN: I assume that we have a duplication again here in Bill 47 which puts forward the sum of 10 million or a little better. Now in the News Service, a leaflet which was put out on October 30th, the special capital fund to aid work programs - this is the \$32 million fund which was authorized earlier this year, or last year - it set aside \$600,000 for Brandon and Selkirk Mental Hospitals. Now is this related to the 600,000 and the 400,000 which is being proposed at the present time? Is this a duplication or is it an addition?

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . referring to a News Service Bulletin of some kind of which I am not aware. May I suggest that that would come up better under the department's estimates.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, there's one further clarification I would like

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd) to get if possible, the School for Retardates at Portage la Prairie. On May 20th the Minister said that the sum of \$960,000 would be directed towards that. Now, the special capital funds, rehabilitation cottages and the Manitoba School for Retardates headquarters, there was a sum of 536,000. Are these two figures in addition to each other or is that 536,000 part of the now proposed 960,000? Should we add them or are they a duplication?

MR. CHERNIACK: They are not a duplication as between last year's authority in the School for Retardates and the present proposal.

MRS. TRUEMAN: I think what I really would want to know is whether the special capital fund of \$32 million, are the items listed under that entirely separate from the present capital estimates.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm having difficulty understanding what special capital fund of \$32 million she's referring to. That may be my problem.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Chairman, this was authorized by the Legislature in case of severe unemployment. The government was enabled to use up the \$32 million for capital projects to help solve unemployment.

MR. CHERNIACK: Your 30,500,000 - now is that the one she's referring to, because that's what confused me. If it's the 30,500,000 which was the authority given last year, I want to make a correction. It was not issued for the purpose of authorizing special projects to deal with unemployment; it was requested on the basis that this is part of a program which we want to be able to undertake, to have authority to proceed with, it being representing matters of importance for the government. The pressure on us was to be able to respond more rapidly if we felt it necessary and we were able to do so, to deal with special situations, but that bill was a regular capital bill and the bill we're now dealing with is a regular capital bill. But there is no doubt that then I said, and now I say in connection with this bill before us, that these are for needed projects, not all of which I can guarantee will be proceeded with in this year but for which we are requesting authority so that we will be able to respond to it. And responding is a complicated matter. It's not only a question of being able to borrow the money, it's also a question of getting the planning process completed - and that can take quite a bit of time, as we found out, that it can take more time than we had hoped it would take within the department itself in defining the needs and the nature of the development; then after that is done, working drawings have to be developed and approved and checked, and there Management Committee plays a role that try to keep the cost in line; and after that then tenders are called for and all this takes time. So the authority is what we're requesting, and again I can only speak of the fact that there is money being requested now and these are the kinds of projects we have in mind.

Now there was reference to the School for Retardates for a program which, too, \$450,000 worth was reallocated and to that extent it is a repetition.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think that this is all extremely confusing and I think that the numbers of documents with which we are provided and which we have difficulty in relating to each other are a good reason to get into the PPBS system of planning so that we can have before us not just a one-year but a two, three, four and five-year projection of capital costs, because for me all these things -- I know that for instance there was money authorized for an extended bed treatment in Brandon - as far as I know that authority has not been cancelled - there's no sign of the hospital being started; Brandon Correctional Institute which I think was to cost \$1 1/2 million - there's no sign of it being started - apparently it's not even in the planning stage; and yet these sums were authorized last year.

How we would go about it I don't know, but I do feel quite -- (Interjection) -- frustrated exactly, and as if I don't really know very much more exactly of what's going on than I did before I asked my questions, and obviously even the government has some trouble keeping track of all of these things. Perhaps now would be a good time then to serve notice of an intention to secure this year, during the estimates on Health and Social Development, information as to what monies have been spent, what has been allocated and is still sitting to be used, and what the future suggestions are so that from now on we will . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: I can only say that I agree with the honourable member and we are attempting to get the PPBS system in operation just for the very purpose that she said. Those efforts were commenced some time ago and there is a definite working team on that very project and it is a necessary and advisable one and one which I agree will be most helpful to us in

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) reviewing the entire program for coming years. That has been the desire all along, and as I said earlier on another occasion, I think it was last night, that when we came into government we found that the PPBS was still a theory in the administration, and I am not saying that in any criticism whatsoever, because the fact is that having taken some time to recognize the need and the problems we have started to do that very sort of process and I cannot say that we have succeeded as yet in having that clearly available to us. So I can only say that I agree with the honourable member and that when you come to the estimates of the department, no doubt you'll get better response that you can from a Minister of Finance who's supposed to be handling the money rather than dealing with the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're getting into a repetition of debate which took place on May 20th, and specifically on this particular point I would refer honourable members to Page 1136 of Hansard which pertains to the difficulty of relating unused capital authorization and current Capital Supply. The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the Member for Fort Rouge that she's not the only one that might be frustrated with some of these figures. The Honourable Minister was mentioning the figure of 30.5 million and saying that this was not specifically an amount to be used for an unemployment situation. Could he perhaps inform the House if such matters as earlier tendering for construction and the like are included in that amount?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I'm sorry, I'd have to rule that question out of order. I think it would be better addressed to the Minister's estimates, because the matter under consideration at this particular time is a specific item, \$21,252,000. It had been agreed by committee that we proceed to the item by item account of this which the Minister had put before the committee and it can be found on Page 1141 of Hansard for May 20th. The Member for Fort Rouge has taken us down to the item of the Manitoba School for Retardates of Portage la Prairie for the sum \$960,000, and some of these points I think would be better addressed to the Minister during his Estimates. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, this may appear to be repetitious but I think it bears repeating. The statements made by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, I think is a generous way of treating this with respect to the government's responsibility to furnish the members of this side and the people of Manitoba with information. The request was made at the last meeting of the committee that information be supplied as to what programs authorized for the 30 and a point million last year for Public Works had in fact been commenced; what stage they were at the end of the fiscal year, what unused capital authority was to be spent this year; so that we have a way in which to judge the request for another \$20 million, which would be a total of \$50 million of Public Works programs in the two fiscal years, the last fiscal year and this fiscal year. It seems pretty obvious, Mr. Chairman, because the statements have not been questioned, the part of the Capital Supply authorized last year had in fact not really commenced, notwithstanding the fact that the Minister may have some basic work order number or something which would indicate that it is started in process in reality; in terms of bricks and mortar, it doesn't appear to have taken place in some situations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this becomes important - first, because of the posture of the government, that this in fact was to be part of a winter works program - and we have some news releases of the provincial government to indicate that - plus the speeches that were made in the House; and no one is quarrelling with that. What we are suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is that we have a right to know, and it would be important for us to know and I do not think that we have to wait until the Estimates of the various departments come up. I think before we are asked to authorize an additional \$20 million for basic general purpose for Public Works programs that we have a right to know specifically the authorization that was made last year; how much of it was actually spent last year; how much of it was really started; how much of it will be used this year, if necessary to prime the economic pump in Manitoba as a result of anticipated economic conditions. This goes to the heart of the manner in which the government has used its resources, and properly, as a means to stimulate the economy.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the questions that have been put by the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge should be put in this committee and that there was sufficient time - and we do not need any complicated accounting system to be able to tell us very simply of the \$30 million that was authorized last year, how much of it was spent in the fiscal year, how much of it has actually been started, how much of that authority is expected to be used in this fiscal year, and what of the \$20 million that we are being asked to approve will in fact be

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) started this year and likely to be disbursed this year. And these questions I think should be answered by the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed, I appreciate the honourable member's suggestion. What he thinks bears repeating and what should not be repeated is the prerogative of the Chair. Now the Chair is here as an instrument of the House and one of the rules is against repetition, and in my view this particular debate has taken place before, at which time the Minister gave an undertaking that that information which was necessary to review unused capital would be forthcoming and it seemed to me that it was generally accepted at that time. Now this specific item that is under consideration by the committee, whether someone will support it or argue against it, is what members should do; they should direct their attention to these specific questions. Now the Minister in my view has been ready to answer any question relative to these items as they have been forthcoming and you keep — some members insist upon dragging back something which in my mind has been resolved by this committee. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, there were certain questions asked by the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge that have not been answered and they relate specifically to the general category of the \$10 million, I guess that was allocated in the Health and Welfare portion, Health and Social Development portion of the Capital Supply requirements. For that reason, I see no reason why we can't deal with it to try and get the added information. I frankly find it strange that the government is not prepared to release this information to us. I really do. And I find it very strange, Mr. Chairman, and I say this to you, that the government should take the position that we should try and elicit this individually from each Estimate. You know, what are we asking for? We're simply asking how the \$30 million was authorized -- was used, or has been used. Now I can't reason -- well, I can maybe guess, but I can't believe that there is a valid reason for it to be withheld, and if it's being withheld, there has to be some justification for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, we're on the merry-go-round again. I think that I've already given information as to the allocation of the 30 1/2 million dollars by government, and I agreed or undertook, whichever way you want to put it, that in dealing with my Estimates I would try to bring in an up-to-date report as much as possible of information of actual commitments under that 30 1/2 million dollars, which is last year's bill, and I intend to do so to the best of my ability. Now we are dealing with the current request for Capital Supply and I am prepared, and have been prepared all along, to give information as to what is proposed. I only must repeat again for the record, because next year it will be looked at again, that this is not a commitment that this work will be done this year. It is a request for authority for general purposes for some \$21 million and this amount has been arrived at by estimates for various projects. I don't undertake that they will be done this year. I don't even undertake that there won't be another reallocation as may prove necessary for the reasons that I spelled out only about ten or fifteen minutes ago dealing with the possibility. It's all very well to have the authority; one also must be able to respond to the priorities and to the abilities of various departments, which means architectural firms, engineers and others, planners, to reassess the situation from time to time. Certainly that is the important way and therefore I still feel we can proceed. And when I stated that we had set aside in this present Capital Bill some 10 1/2 million dollars in the Department of Health and Social Development it does not mean that we're committing ourselves either to spend it all nor indeed to spend it all in that area. We are giving the information that we have now as to what appears to us to be the likely method in which this money will be spent once authority is given, but that doesn't mean that as we go along with our work that there won't be changes. So what we're requesting now is General Purpose Authority for 21 1/4 million dollars and I am still prepared to continue to give the information as to how we now see it. During my Estimates I expect to have a fuller report on the expenditures and the commitments made in regard to last year's bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think really for my own purposes then I can only sum up this procedure of bringing in capital estimates as being a rather meaningless procedure because we're asked, for instance, to authorize this particular sum but we don't have any idea what other allocations are still outstanding from last year or the year before and we, as a result of this, really have no knowledge as to what capital spending the government will do

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd) this year. It could possibly do a certain amount but we don't know what that amount is depending on what happened in previous years. I'm not arguing, I'm just suggesting that perhaps we could work out a better system that would give us more information.

MR. CHERNIACK: I've already agreed with the honourable member that we should work up a better system, I can assure her. We're trying, because we're just as interested in having a better system of reporting than we inherited or that we have at this time. Might I say that so far the discussion on this Capital Supply is more meaningful than any in which I've ever participated, and indeed to that extent I congratulate members such as the Member for Fort Rouge for making it possible. In the past, I would say that Capital Supply was passed so quickly that one barely noticed that it was going, but not only that, there were projects that appeared year after year in departmental estimates that were not dealt with. And I remember sitting in a seat not far from where the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge now sits, and pointing out year after year the same project was being repeated. And that is because it is hoped that it will be proceeded with and for various reasons it hasn't been. So I fully understand the position she's in. I've been in that position before but much worse, I assure her. Although it's not meaningful to her today, I assure her it has been much more meaningful this year than I recall it in the past and I would hope that, as we proceed, it will be more helpful to her in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think a better thing to do for a member is go back to Hansard of last Thursday evening, because here we have it listed in Hansard what the various amounts are comprised of, and there we have the statement as to last year's authorizations and also this year's allocation for General Purposes, the \$21,252,000. And then among those is an item of 10.5 million for Health and Social Development. Later on, on Page 1141, we have a further breakdown of this 10 1/2 million and I find that we have an allocation here of \$960,000 for a school for retardates at Portage la Prairie. I would like to make a few comments on this very matter.

I feel that we're supporting certain areas and assisting them in providing facilities in certain localities, but yet in other areas we find that this is not the case. On repeated occasions in this House, I have asked for assistance for the workshops such as have been set up in my riding, both in Altona and in Winkler, and the people have been taking these responsibilities on themselves and they've provided large sums of money to build these workshops and to provide an opportunity for the adult retardates to find employment even though the compensation is very small, yet they're able to do this and bring this about. And they're becoming useful citizens in this way. These projects are supported by the municipalities concerned by giving grants to these workshops on the basis of the students attending, and in this way this operation is being made possible. Naturally this has to be supplemented by voluntary gifts and so on, but they have been able to make a go of it. But I feel that this government should support such workshops, especially the matter of capital that is needed to bring about the workshops. This is the big difficulty. The matter of maintenance, I think, can be looked after more easily but the capital that is needed to construct these workshops and bring them about is the big hardship. And when I see that we are providing large sums of money for certain areas in this province and nothing to other areas, I cannot agree with this and I feel that we are discriminating in this respect to certain areas that are trying to do work actually on behalf of the government, and I feel that we should give them and lend them more support. And when I see that we again have an allocation for these other areas that need it so badly. Especially now with the economy in rural Manitoba being what it is, it is doubly hard, and when I see such large amounts allocated to such areas as Portage and others mentioned, I feel that we're not doing justice to some of the other areas in this province. Not that I would like to have this diminished or not have these people taken care of, but I feel that we should be treating the people in this province more equally.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed, I would direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery on my left where we have 41 students from Carberry Collegiate of Grade 7 standing. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Porter and Mrs. Mitchell. The

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. On behalf of all honourable members, I wish to welcome you to your Legislature.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (CONT'D)

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I feel the Honourable Member for Rhineland should have a response. It won't be a good one because this is a much more specific matter he's dealing with. I don't think that if one goes to Manitoba School for Retardates one can say that there's very posh surroundings around there for looking after the people, but that doesn't mean of course that there aren't areas that are making a real effort and a real sincere and worthwhile effort to deal with a problem which is probably the largest problem facing people in the provinces, who I believe don't get federal support for this kind of a project, and it's a question of proportion, I suppose, and how one can deal with it. But here again, I think that this properly belongs more within the Estimates of the Minister of Health and Social Development than it does in Capital Supply, so I'm responding merely to indicate that I've listened to the honourable member and I can understand what he's saying and I'm not brushing aside what he said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item—passed. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: When the Chairman says, "Item--passed," are we referring to the whole item or are we going down to the next item which is Industry and Commerce?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm at the . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, we're not passing these item by item, but I think we agreed that we would discuss them in the order in which I read them so that we could do it, but I don't think you said pass, I think I heard it from behind me. Or if you said "pass" then I assume what you meant is that we are now ready to proceed to the next department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I had said passed. I was thinking of the \$10.5 million relative to the Health and Social Development.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . clear is that we're not passing them department by department; we're just dealing with them in that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well then, I assume that we're now in the Industry and Commerce item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the -- this obviously is a new program of government that has not been announced before, and I wonder whether the government is prepared now to give us the information on this.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I believe it was discussed and was referred to. I don't want to use the word "announced." I'm not sure of that. But, as I understand it, this is monies to be set aside for the purposes of helping the development mainly in the North by way of loan capital to northern areas for work that they may be able to undertake. I think it involves the fund proposed for the special Indian and Metis projects in the form of loan capital, and generally -- well, I forget if it's called the Native Development Fund and that -- (Interjection) -- pardon? It is, in any event, for development monies to be made available in those areas which need that kind of support.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, we've already discussed the revolving fund for loans to Indian and Metis co-operatives, so that's something separate and apart; that's something separate and apart. Now, what you're referring to is Community and Economic Development Fund of \$1 million which I believe may have been referred to in the Speech from the Throne but I don't think any additional information has been furnished to the House, and I wonder . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: That may well be and I'm not the one who is in a position to give additional information. I think that again is something that would come up through the Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of Industry and Commerce. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Surely in terms of procedure, I know the Minister of Industry and Commerce is not here, but surely we should have some explanation of what this program is about before we're asked to approve it. You know, it's very simple. This is obviously a new

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) program, Mr. Chairman, and probably a worthwhile program, and it's not being covered in general in a -- it's not being covered as an estimate expense. Is this money eventually to be paid back? Is this money to be loaned or to be given for community development, in which case is this a capital cost to be absorbed by government?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not like to take away from the Minister of Industry and Commerce the opportunity to expand on this and, knowing him as we all do, we can expect that he will do that, so that I can only say that it is my recollection and understanding that this is not money to be given but rather money to be loaned, and I believe the plan is to do it through the Development Corporation but I'm not sure of that. I believe that that is the plan, for the establishment of a loan amount to be available through a corporation made up of residents of Northern Manitoba and remote areas to be able to carry on a self-development program. Now it's speculative as to whether they'll make enough money quickly to repay the debt or not, and the honourable member says, well now, is that current or is it capital. As far as I'm concerned it's capital because it will be loan monies.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder if it would be possible to go on to the other items and to have the Minister of Industry and Commerce here. Again, you're asking us to approve a million dollars on a program that has really not been announced in detail which we're not familiar with and surely we're entitled to this information. Surely this isn't a question of waiting until the Estimates come. Certainly I'd be happy to go on to the other items and possibly have the Minister of Industry and Commerce come into the House and give us an explanation. I'd like to know, as an example, whether it's intended to have a special Act for this particular Fund. I'd like to know whether in fact there will be a revised Manitoba Development Corporation Act coming in which will incorporate this Fund, and I think we're entitled to have that information before we're asked to approve the million dollars.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, what we have before us is a General Purpose bill, and we have indicated the manner in which we expect that it will be used, and we are expecting that we will be required to set aside \$1 million for the purpose I have outlined. Now, when the entire program is fully developed and can be discussed, it will be discussed but I am not undertaking to inform this committee just what the present status of it is. All that we're asking for at this time is the authority to borrow money for that purpose. Now the authority for that purpose alone will be something that has to be found within legislation, of course.

. . . Continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, dealing with this particular item I just wonder how the government arrived at the figure \$1 million for this particular area. Are we going to leave all the other development corporations in the province out in the cold? Will they not be getting anything? And we're just going to cater to one particular area and give them a million dollars to develop their part of the province? I think we should be fair in what we are doing, and if we are going to provide a million dollars for capital purposes to one area in the province we should do likewise to the other development corporations, of which we have five or six in the province, and I certainly would want to stand up for the corporation in my riding, that they certainly could use a million dollars very easily and very handily, and certainly bring about a lot of development in that area. A million dollars would go quite a ways because if this -- (Interjection) -- A million is quite a bit in my area, I can tell you. It's not like C. D. Howe says - what was a million? But I feel very strongly on this that we are again just catering to certain areas in this province and not doing likewise for other areas. I know that my area is certainly short of money, that they could set up more industry if funds were available, and on the strength of this, if this money was made available, certainly they would be able to secure more funds in addition to this on the strength of this equity that would be there, and I feel that we are not doing justice in providing money to one area only. Maybe the Minister of Mines can tell us whether his new mineral construction, or mineral exploration company, will be involved in this. Are they going to get part of this one million dollars or how much will they be needing? And will we have to supplement this item later on or will there be a change made later on?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wish the Honourable Member for Rhineland would start looking at horizons beyond his own. I wish the Honourable Member for Rhineland would start thinking about Manitoba and the needs of the underdeveloped areas of Manitoba, and I don't know if he's prepared to say that the constituency he represents is in as dire need of help and development and progress as the other areas of Manitoba, especially in the north. I wish he'd sometimes look, as I say, beyond his horizons even within the seat in which he sits. If he would only turn around and look at the person sitting behind him and the area he represents, and start thinking about the needs in the north of Manitoba, in Churchill, in other constituencies of the north, and of other areas in southern Manitoba, I think he would be glad to recognize that something is now being done or attempted to be done in connection with areas that are much less able to be self-sufficient than is the area he represents. There's a good deal of money has been spent and advanced and loaned by this province over the years for development all over this province, but for special development purposes one has to recognize the needs of the isolated areas and the impoverished areas, mainly in the north but in other places as well. I want to indicate that the -- he asked why a million dollars. One reason it's a million and not more, is that we felt that we weren't prepared to commit more than a million. The requests and demands that we have been receiving is substantially in excess of that, but this money is being set aside and one of the reasons that I can't go into this in any great detail, aside from the fact that I'm not that familiar with it, is that there are negotiations taking place with the Federal Government. It is expected and hoped that there will be a contribution from the Federal Government to this kind of fund and that is part of the developing program. As I say, at this stage we want the authority to borrow for this purpose generally, and specifically we hope that this will be one of the programs that will come within that and hopefully we'll be able to proceed, but the authority for spending the money is a different matter for this Legislature - that is, the authority to borrow the money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, far be it from me to have to stand up and defend the Honourable Member from Rhineland but, you know, the Minister of Finance should understand that when he asks the Member from Rhineland to raise his vision, he must realize that he's not super-man like the Minister of Finance and he can't see beyond a certain distance through certain walls. The truth of the matter is this: that the government has information that we do not have, and we're being asked to approve \$100 million, what have you - \$20 million here, \$1 million there, on programs that have not yet fully been announced, and surely the honourable member who represents his constituency is entitled to stand up and to recite what he believes is representative of his people's position with respect to the manner in which investment is taking place in this province, and I think that I've spent as much time as many of the other members here in the Honourable Member from Rhineland's constituency, and I would think

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) that he probably reflects pretty accurately the feeling of the people whom he represents.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, let us now deal with this item. I don't know, and I'd be very interested and there may be someone up high who will be in a position to send that message down to the Minister of Finance, I'd like to know where there's another situation where capital requirements have been asked to be approved before the program has been officially announced and declared in the House, and I think that's important. Obviously this is a new program and it would appear that there's going to be an Act, legislation required. We have no objection to this but, you know, there are provisions under Part 2 of the Manitoba Development Fund to be able to use the Manitoba Development Corporation Authority to be able to work whatever arrangements have to be worked out and there is capital authority provided there. So I again have no objection, Mr. Chairman, to the \$1 million being proposed. The only thing is that I'd like to know what it's all about before I'm asked to pay for it or to approve it, and I think that this is what the Honourable Member from Rhineland has suggested as well. I don't think that he or anyone else should have to be in a position of putting themselves and having to declare a position of acceptance or rejection against, you know, basic principles that I think there is general agreement on.

There is no difficulty on any member on this side in trying to carry out programs that are going to help the disadvantaged areas in this province, and hopefully this is a program that will be meaningful. Hopefully we will accomplish another objective which is to get money from the Federal Government, and I want the Honourable Minister of Finance to know, and certainly for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that my remarks and questions are not for the purpose of defeating the government but rather to see, rather to see whether in fact this is the proper way in which the authority of the province, its borrowing capacity, is to be used. You know, we have, Mr. Chairman, a Manitoba Development Corporation, an Agricultural Credit Corporation, two major organizations who in fact are in the loaning business and who have realized sums of money from borrowing on the credit of the province, and one can question why the necessity of some other concept being developed. One can be concerned about the necessity of some additional bureaucracy being set up. You know, we have to start thinking in terms of the efficiency of government and, without knowing all of this, recognizing that there is a provision in Part 2 of the Development Fund which would have allowed something like this to have been created because there is nothing so far that indicates that it couldn't have been developed on that and the borrowing power of the Corporation could have been used, I think it's important that we have some meaningful information.

Now, the Minister of Finance does not understand it. I accept that. Surely we can have the Minister of Industry and Commerce come into the Chamber and surely we can deal with the other matters, or is it the government's position that they want to use the appropriate time to make the declaration of the policy, have us approve it, and then be able to announce it afterwards? If it has to do with negotiations, then I suggest that -- you know, the cat's out of the bag anyway, so at least let's have the detail and understand what is to happen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statesmanlike statement made by the Leader of the Opposition. He asked whether it's ever happened before. He himself referred last week to the fact that he assumes that there is authorized unused authority from years back. As a matter of fact, there have been occasions when there has been unauthorized authority sitting around for 20 years. He knows it and I know that this has happened in the past. This million dollars, as I say, is being requested as part of the package of the General Purposes of \$21 million, and it is monies which are planned for assisting in the development of areas which are in need of it. Now, it is in the process of negotiation; it is being discussed; therefore the form of it cannot be stated with any certainty. Now I'm quite willing to state my impression of the proposal as it last stood when it was discussed, and that was that there would be moneys set aside to be used and operated by a corporation which would be representative of government-appointed people and of the people who would actually be involved in the development. It is not proposed that this would be a government operation as much as a loan and I think through the Development Corporation, although that's not essential that it be that way, but it would be a loan to corporations made up of the people involved and they may -- well, they are northern people, many of whom are of course of native ancestry, who will act in partnership with other people on the board of directors appointed by government in order to

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) plan projects for the development of their area.

Now, the exact details I know have not been worked out to such an extent that they can be laid before you, and frankly I don't think they should be until they are defined, because in the negotiations with the Federal Government we have to make it clear that we may not proceed with the project unless we do have federal participation, especially if one thinks in terms of development within and involving reservations. Therefore, all I can say is that the authority that is being requested is to borrow for that general purpose, and that's I think a pretty concrete proposal, but as to the method other than the way I've stated in general terms, we're not in a position to say and will be accountable for whatever is done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, my question of course was not answered. My question was whether this House has been asked to approve authority for borrowing for programs that have not been announced in the House or for legislation that has not yet been introduced. I just wonder whether this has in fact happened before. The Minister of Finance answered -- and I'll sit down if he can answer that and indicate that there is a precedent for this.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the answer is: of course there have been plans made and commitments made that have been not detailed in any specifics. There was a commitment made in regard to the development of the forestry complex in The Pas which was not discussed in this Legislature at all until after it became known, and it became known some time later. The whole Development Fund, the monies set aside for the Manitoba Development Corporation in the past have always been in lump sums that come within the orbit of the former Manitoba Development Fund Act and, as I've indicated, this is quite similar. The monies that are being used by the Manitoba Development Corporation for the assistance of small business, for example, which is somewhat of a departure or at least an expansion of previous efforts, is one that is combined and the total amount voted, and I think we've already approved of some \$25 million, if my memory serves me correctly, in that general way. Now there has been much less said about the purpose of the use of that money of the Development Corporation -- and the amount is \$25 million as I stated -- than there has been said now about this much more specific project of \$1 million, and I think that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has been answered to a greater extent in this regard than either I or previous Ministers of Finance have dealt with larger sums that have been allocated to the development corporations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to hear from the Minister of Finance that \$25 million of the Manitoba Development Corporation is going to be used for small business. I . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: If I may interrupt. You know I didn't say that.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, the inference, of course, is that the \$25 million, there's been a change in the program of the Manitoba Development Corporation for small business. -- (Interjection) -- Some of the \$25 million?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, that's right, and in the past as well.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I think that I would be prepared and the occasion may arise where I would be very interested in knowing what change really occurred in the Manitoba Development operation with respect to small business. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I think that it would be an appropriate time to argue that.

You know, Mr. Chairman, there are two ways in which we can operate. One is to say, "The government needs \$100 million, \$20 million. Give authority to it; they're going to spend it because they know . . ." -- (Interjection) -- No, no. They represent the people of Manitoba; they have the majority, and therefore they're in control and they can spend it. The other is to try and get information which is really our function. Now first, I don't think anyone on this side objects to the kind of program that's being proposed, but I don't think anyone on this side really understands it. I'm sure that the Minister of Industry and Commerce understands it and I'm sure as well the Minister of Finance understands it. I recognize that obviously for some reason -- and he's indicated the reason, the negotiation with the Federal Government -- it's impossible to deal with it in any specifics. However, there are a number of things that I would like to know.

First, is there going to be a specific bill introduced into this House? -- (Interjection) -- Well, so we don't know whether there's going to be a specific bill. If it's not going to be a specific bill, then will it be spent or the authority itself used by the government and the money

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) distributed through the Minister of Finance or through the Department of Industry and Commerce? I have specifics, I think, and let me just go through it -- (Interjection) -- Well, there's a pencil -- (Interjection) -- Which Sidney? Yes, today is a day of charity for some reason or other. I think there is one very basic thing. Is the money to be used for what would be called normal services to a community as opposed to the conventional kinds of -- well, the Minister of Finance is ready to jump -- as opposed to programs that would not be considered community service programs, that is services to the community rather than the creation of jobs, specific jobs. And if that's the case, then it's in the Industry and Commerce level rather than the level of community service, and that then presents an interesting, certainly an interesting development, which is something I think we on this side would like to know, and I think we're just entitled to some more information.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, in the first place the first question was: will there be special legislation? I don't know whether any partnership agreement will require special legislation but certainly I would say that the Manitoba Development Fund Act as it was presented originally -- well no, with Part 2 in it -- by the previous government, probably gives ample authority, but in the event that it is insufficient then I would think that authority will have to be sought either in present legislation or through new legislation. The question as to whether it'll be done under the aegis of the Minister of Finance or Industry and Commerce, I think is much less important, because it's the government as such that will be responsible for carrying out a program. Now I'm happy to say that the Minister of Finance normally does not involve himself in a program of a line department, by taking over the functions of the line department, and I would do my best to avoid that responsibility that is sort of suggested by the Leader of the Opposition.

The question as to whether it's to be used for basic services, I imagine he must be referring to the term we've learned to use in an all encompassing way as infrastructure and the answer is no. The proposal is that it shall be used for the economic development, not just to find jobs and spend money on jobs, but loan money for projects which will be undertaken in order to become viable operations which will return profits to the corporation; that is the hope and the expectation; and, of course, it is an area which will need a great deal of attention and concern. I don't think anyone can guarantee success in the profit-making feature but certainly it should be a worthwhile project in which this government and all the people in Manitoba, and I include the members of the Opposition in that group, as being interested in promoting. I think those are the questions that were asked.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder then if the Minister can indicate, will this be under Part 2 of the Manitoba Development Corporation?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I thought I had made it clear that I think that there is a great deal of authority within Part 2 of the Manitoba Development Corporation Act to make it possible to do this, but I also stated that there may be some need for some other kind of legislative authority possibly relating to the partnership or possibly relating to the actual establishment of the other corporation; so I can't give a definite answer other than to say I think there's enough authority there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, in listening to the Minister of Finance responding to my former statement that we get the appearance that if you're asking for something for the people of the province as a whole, that's statesmenslike, but when you do ask for something for your own constituents, that's almost less than honourable or even crummy. Well I certainly don't subscribe to that, because I find too often that people in my area have been getting the short end of the stick and I am here representing that area to see to it that we will get like treatment and that we should not be taking a hind position.

I'm rather interested in one thing, that the Development Corporation in certain respects -- the municipalities comprising the area of the Development Corporation are matching funds in order to get funds from the province. Is this in any way associated in that way or is this outright loans that will be made?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, it is hoped that the monies that would be provided in this project from the Federal Government will also be loan monies. In regard to the member's own area constituency, I don't know whether it's of interest to this House to start searching through the records of the Provincial Secretary to find out how many loans have been made to companies within his area by the Manitoba Development Corporation or the Agricultural Credit Corporation

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) or any other of the programs, but I would think that his constituency, represented as it is by a person who is anxious to make sure that he gets a full share of the benefits that are available, is being treated fairly under existing programs; but if it isn't of course he is the first one to bring it to our attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . -passed. Mines and Natural Resources is \$1.8 million. The Leader of the Opposition,

MR. SPIVAK: Well I wonder if we can have a breakdown of the 1.8 million as to how much is fishery redundancies, airstrip and dock construction.

MR. CHERNIACK: I just repeat again that this is part of the whole picture and is what we at this stage have felt would be the breakdown if we were able to go ahead with all of these immediately. There's half a million dollars expected to be needed for the Moose Lake Logging Corporation as a revolving fund - an operating fund. There is one million and some dollars expected to be required to be available for the purchase of assets of the fisheries' processors; there is \$350,000 expected authority requested for airstrip and dock construction.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder whether the Minister can indicate whether the one million dollars for fisheries' redundancy takes into consideration the contribution from the Federal Government or whether this is one million dollars of authority from Manitoba to be matched by the Federal Government?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on Friday morning, the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources made a statement in the House in reply to some questions that had been put to him earlier, where he stated the number of monies that would be expended and the grants that would be made, and among them was one, and I quote here: (1) Early retirement, 248,000; compensation for fishermen who were too old to be involved in any type of work, 65 and over. I'm just wondering, are any of those items included in this at all, or is that completely separate from the item that we're discussing?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, none of the items referred to by the Member for Rhineland come in here. The question asked by the Leader of the Opposition dealing with the purchase of the assets of fish processors, it is to be expected, hoped, that the assets being purchased at their market value can be resold at their market value and the ideal would be that we neither make money nor lose money on the turnover once the assets are purchased. But the Minister expects that there will be some losses and I'm informed that to the extent that there are losses they'll be shared equally with the Federal Government.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I realize the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is next but I'd like to understand something. The actual outlay then of the money to be given to the fish processors, assuming there is agreement, will be made by the Province of Manitoba with the losses to be absorbed equally by the Federal and Provincial Governments, which would mean the million dollars is the outright authority anticipated for, you know, as a maximum for the purchase initially of the fish processors' assets?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: If the Minister's going to reply, I think I would like to put in another question at the same time. Dealing with these redundancies, when assessments are made, are they made as of the present, as of today, not at the time that they probably went out of business because of the government takeover; and are there not considerable losses that these people will have to bear because of the lapse and the interval between the time that they went out of business and that they will actually be compensated?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, may I only repeat that this money is expected to be used for the purchase of assets of the fishery processors and that this is the amount that is expected to be required for that. Once the assets are acquired then they will be available for either use by government I presume or sold, and in the event that there is a loss, then it will be borne equally with the Federal Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next item, Public Works, total of 4.7 million--passed. Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs - The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under Public Works, just what do we understand? There's nothing of such items as schools, it's separate, . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: These are straight public works, Mr. Chairman. It involves in large terms parking facilities in various areas where there are government buildings, public washrooms, public works projects carryover, there's some \$430,000 from last year, and the main item there is - well, there are two main items: Convention Centre, Winnipeg, there is

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) the sum of one and a half million dollars set aside as being the first phase of the need; and highways garages both in Dauphin and Winnipeg East of close to \$1.2 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs, a quarter of a million dollars. A well for the Youth and Education - Hansard reports Youth and Education well. . . \$37,000.00.

MR. CHERNIACK: Small item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Youth and Education, well. . .

MR. CHERNIACK: That's \$37,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a total of \$21,252,000--passed. Schedule A--passed; Resolution--passed.

Interim Supply: Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$152,102,490, being 30 percent of the amount of several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972. (passed)

MR. CHERNIACK: Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pardon?

MR. CHERNIACK: I say committee rise. I believe you've completed that resolution.

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management, that the resolution reported from the Committee of Supply be read a second time and concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CLERK: Capital Supply. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$115,080,000 for Capital Expenditure. Schedule A: Requirements of, the Manitoba Telephone System, \$16 million; Manitoba Water Supply Board, \$260,000; Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, 15 million; Manitoba Development Corporation, 25 million; Manitoba School Capital Financing Authority, 20 million; Community Colleges and Frontier School Divisions, \$4,088,000; Universities, 7,535,000; The Pas Special Area Agreement, 2,085,000; Brandon Special Agreement, 700,000; Churchill Complex Development, 760,000; Leaf Rapids Contract Development, 2,400,000; General Purposes, 21,252,000.00.

Interim Supply. Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$152,102,490 being 30 percent of the amount of the several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, placed before the House at the present session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, just one question. Why are we asking for 30 percent? Isn't it the normal practice just to ask for 10 percent or so?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it is now well towards the end of May and that means that we are much further advanced in the fiscal year than we were in the normal course in preceding occasions. I'm not even sure that the honourable member is right in saying 10 percent. It seems to me that it has been 20 percent in its time, and I believe on one occasion it was 40 percent. So that it is really what is sensible and what is needed that we're asking for, not to follow any tradition.

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to point out that the Chair allowed this digression but there was a motion before the House and in essence it was not a question period or a debate. The question that the Honourable Member for Rhineland asked should have been asked in committee or as part of a debate when there's a motion to debate. -- (Interjection) -- Order, please. I am trying to state the situation as it was. I had already called the question and that was before the House to pass the Supply. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: If I may just speak to the ruling or to the point of order on a point of order, I'm a little concerned that if my understanding of the rules is not correct then I certainly accept your direction, but we are at third reading of the Capital Supply Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: No.

MR. ENNS: Or the resolution . . . I still believe that we have a debatable motion before us at that stage and the question asked by the Member for Rhineland was in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we should be in dispute over something which everybody agrees with. I think that you indicated that it was not a question period and I think that the Member for Lakeside indicates that the Honourable Member for Rhineland's getting up to his feet was to participate in a debate on a substantive motion before the House, that the Minister of Finance rising was rising to close debate on a substantive motion; therefore I think we all understood what took place and that there should be no misunderstanding as between the Speaker and the Member.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank both honourable gentlemen for the understanding we have arrived at now.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister Without Portfolio, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Capital Supply and Interim 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 into Committee of Ways and Means with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee of Ways and Means. Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for various capital purposes, the sum of \$115,080,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. (Agreed)

Resolved that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, the sum of \$152,102,490, being 30 percent of the amount of the several items voted for departments as set forth in the main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1972, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. Passed? (Agreed)

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to prolong the debate but I just wanted to register my objection to the large-scale borrowings that are being made by the Province of Manitoba. Last year we passed authorizations, I think in the amount of \$294 - \$295 million. This year we will be authorizing some \$303 million, and where are we going at this rate? In another ten years at this rate we'll be \$3 billion in debt, and does the government really believe that we can borrow ourselves into prosperity? Certainly I cannot subscribe to that kind of philosophy. In fact, we in Social Credit pride ourselves with a pay-as-you-go policy, and that both the Social Credit provinces are debt free.

B. C., when Social Credit came into power, they had a large debt of \$190-odd million. By 1959, they had that debt cleared off. In Alberta, they had \$167 million worth of debt in 1935. People always say, "Oh yeah, Alberta struck oil. All rich." Well, long before they ever struck oil, they had set in a system whereby repayments were made and they had the amount of debt reduced very substantially before they ever struck oil, and naturally, once they did receive monies from the development of their natural resources, this would speed it up, and they are debt free - not only debt free, they have millions in reserves, and surely this is

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) to their credit. They may show that there is some 25, 26 million dollars owing by the province, but these are bonds that are uncalled; the people won't cash them in; and as a result these figures are shown. But they are really in a much better and a much sounder position than any other province in this whole Dominion of Canada, and certainly this is something that I certainly pride myself, that Social Credit administrations have been able to bring this about, and I feel that this government should take heed and not go head over heels into debt at the rate we're doing, because sooner or later this is going to catch up with us and we will have great difficulty with just making the installment payments, let alone pay off our debt completely.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, that the Resolution reported from the Committee of Ways and Means be read a second time and concurred in.

MR. CLERK: Capital Supply. Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for various capital purposes, the sum of \$115,080,000 be granted out of Consolidated Fund.

Interim Supply. Resolved that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, the sum of \$152,102,490, being 30 percent of the amount of the several items voted for departments as set forth in the main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature, be granted out of Consolidated Fund.

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

MR. CHERNIACK introduced Bill No. 20, An Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for Capital purposes and authorize the borrowing of the same (2).

MR. CHERNIACK introduced Bill No. 17, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the bills are now being distributed. They are in the form in the usual way that they are distributed and I will move slowly, Mr. Speaker, so they can be distributed.

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 20, An Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for Capital purposes and authorize the borrowing of the same (2), for second reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 17, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1972, for second reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider the following bills: No. 17, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1972; No. 20, An Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for Capital purposes and authorize the borrowing of the same (2).

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 20, An Act to authorize the expenditure of money for Capital purposes and authorize the borrowing of the same (2). 1—passed; 2—passed; 3(1)—passed; The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under 3, I haven't had a chance to really look at the bill as such, but under Section 3 we find various initials. I take it that these stand for the various

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) corporations so that . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes you're right. Do you want them?

MR. FROESE: No, that's all right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bill No. 20, sections 1 to 16 were read and passed.) The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before we pass the bill in total, I take it, Mr. Chairman, that we will not be precluded from discussing some of these items under Estimates even though the bill is passed in such a hurry. I feel there might be things later on that we might want to comment on and certainly I would want to have this understanding that we would be able to discuss some of these items later on in Estimates.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the only understanding I have is that the rules provide many opportunities within which one can debate various items, and I would think that as we proceed with the Estimates that are still in committee that the honourable member will have the astuteness to find the opportunities to discuss what he wants to discuss.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 20 was read section by section and passed, Bill No. 17 was read section by section and passed.)

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Logan, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, BILLS No. 20 and 17 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . we call it 5:30?

MR. GREEN: Well, we would require the leave of the House to go into a Committee of Supply where we could proceed with the Estimates of the Minister of Urban Affairs, if leave is granted.

MR. CHERNIACK: I beg to move, seconded by . . .

MR. GREEN: Just a minute.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On the point of order, I think by allowing these bills to pass in this fashion as we did, I think they should be agreeable to call it 5:30.

MR. GREEN: The member has the right to call it 5:30 all by himself if he wishes to, so it's up to you. The honourable member doesn't agree to give leave, so I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, 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 Thursday afternoon.