

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Wednesday, May 22, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day I don't think I'll have any trouble directing the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have a group of ladies, from the Alphonsus Church of East Kildonan. This group is under the direction of Mrs. James Mills and they are from homes in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is it permissible for any firm which a member of this Legislature has an interest in, to obtain funds from the Manitoba Development Fund?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, that's a legal question.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like a subsequent question of the Minister. Is there any firm in which a member of this House is connected with, have they borrowed money from the Manitoba Development Fund?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not seized of that information.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): I wish to table a return to an Order No. 36 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Burrows. I don't seem to have the date of the motion, but I know it's quite recent. Another return to an Order of the House No. 40 agreed to on May 6, 1968 on the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it we move to . . .

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House a return to an Order of the House No. 26 dated the 28th of March on the motion of the Honourable Member from Elmwood.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in terms of business tonight, I would suggest that we turn to page 4 of the Order Paper and proceed with the second readings of the government bills that are still listed there and hopefully after having concluded and passed most, if not all of those items, that we would then move over to the second readings of public bills on page 10 and then to page 12 to the adjourned debate on second readings of the private bills that appear on page 12. Just so that there will be no misunderstanding, later on in the evening it would be our hope that we could conclude this work tonight, before adjournment, without specifying any particular hour, although we would certainly hope to be through in the approximate area of 11 o'clock, thereabouts.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the understanding was that the House sittings would be to 10 and subject to discussion we might sit later. I think we should start off on that basis, see what progress we make. I'm not being absolutely adamant on the ten but I think we should set that as a goal and when we reach, a little before ten, maybe we can have further consultation.

MR. LYON: As long as we agree that the goal is to get the second readings done, we'll worry about the hour after that.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Per understanding, 10 o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYON: Until we finish.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you want to bet. I was just saying do you want to bet?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day -- are you offering to make a bet with me? I'm not quite sure of the legality of it so I think we should avoid that. I wonder if I could address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) asking him whether there is any likelihood that I will be receiving a return for the Order that was approved of on April 1st, No. 27, dealing with the breakdown of the interest and investment fees shown in the statement of the Manitoba Development Fund, within the near future - like tomorrow?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is soon.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question may I request the Minister if he would care to indicate whether this information which he has just given us is based on recent information that he has received from the accountants of the Development Fund or just that he shares with me in his hopes.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker I have had numerous discussions with the Manitoba Development Fund and I share the hope with the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Bill No. 73. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I didn't have too much time to go through the Bill but this is one that interests me very much and one that is a concern to the farmers of this province. In going through the various matters I find that this bill in my opinion is far too strong and too severe, and I might refer to the matter of the powers of the Inspector. They are shown on Page 4 and I feel that they are too severe or if he exercised them it could be very severe and certainly could cause real hardship to many a farmer, because under (c) it says "To seize and refrain from threshing any grain, seed or other crop that in the opinion of the inspector might result in the spread of noxious weeds".

Mr. Speaker, almost any kind of crop contains some weeds and certainly the weeds can spread and if you take a look at the Act, other sections, there is a matter of interpretation - what interpretation the inspector will place on a certain crop and the type of weeds and the amount of weeds. Certainly any farmer knows that wild oats is a weed that can come any year. You might think you have eradicated it, probably have summer fallowed your land the previous year, and you might have the biggest crop of wild oats ever. We have sprays now that you could spray your field.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if as many private conversations are necessary. I can hear the honourable gentleman but I'm sure there must be some that can't.

MR. FROESE: You can spray wild oats today with a pre-emergence spray and also a post-emergence, but certainly a farmer unless he has very firm views that he will have trouble with wild oats, he will not use the pre-emergence spray and therefore wait until the crop has sprouted and come up, to see whether wild oats are coming, and if so, then he can spray for wild oats. But this is a costly thing, too, and if you have a lot to spray it can become a real burden to the farmer.

Then too you have other crop such as leafy spurge. This is another weed that will grow and is very hard to eradicate. You can summer fallow one year and you will still find that the weed comes up the following year; and while this is not a weed like sow thistle, that sours your land, you can grow a good crop of grain. I have seen fields that go - barley go 60 bushels an acre, rye go 50 and wheat go 30 or 40, and yet you had a real infested field as far as leafy spurge is concerned. But it's not a weed that really hurts your crop to that extent and yet both these weeds are mentioned as noxious weeds in the list and if an inspector went out he could condemn fields which could grow real good crops and have good stands. I think the powers that we are giving to the inspector under this Act are too wide and certainly there should be some limitation and probably also provide for appeals. I think the council should certainly act as an appeal board for an inspector, so that when a farmer finds that he is being treated wrongfully and that too strong action is taken, that the council will be able to adjudicate.

Then we also have the matter of appointment. The bill says that an inspector cannot be appointed for less than 12 months. It says, "he shall be appointed for 12 months". Why is this stipulated in the Act? Certainly a municipality could engage an inspector for six months of the year and in this way save money. It could also be a person who would probably be available during the summer months and not during the winter months and why have to pay this extra salary? Why not let the Council decide this? Why have it read that it "shall" be a 12-month engagement. I think this should be definitely changed so that it could be a shorter term where Council so desires and where a person might only want to serve for several months in a year.

There is also matters in connection with the neglect of the municipality to act and also in

(MR. FROESE cont'd) connection with the inspector if he doesn't act; there are certain penalties provided. I feel that the Act is too strict in too many cases. It also provides that a crop can be cut down where they are infested and this too is left open to interpretation. I do not know whether the inspectors receive any instruction from the department as to what constitutes an infested field and what not. If the Minister has anything to offer in that way I would be glad to hear from him, because I think so much depends on interpretation here and I think we should have a better knowledge of what interpretation is being placed on these various sections where we delegate these large powers.

Right of entry is another matter. I'm sure that there should be no trouble for an inspector entering a field because who knows when he's coming and so on, so that people generally are not aware when he enters the premises, at least not on open fields unless they are close to home.

Some of the other matters have already been raised by the previous speakers and I do not want to take time unnecessarily to discuss matters in detail but certainly I'll come back with some of the sections when we deal with the bill in committee. But I feel that the legislation is too strong; it is too severe and that certainly there should be more provision for appeals because of the large delegation of power.

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

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to dwell a little further on the point that was raised by the Honourable Member for Rhineland with respect to provisions for appeals. I just want to give notice to the House that my colleague from Brokenhead has asked the Legislative Counsel to prepare an amendment which he'll be submitting in Law Amendments -- make provisions for an appeal board, whereby in cases where the weed inspector might have come to a decision the farmer might not quite agree with, there would be provisions for an appeal and deal with these matters in that stage. Other than that I have no further objections to having the bill go to Law Amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, the word Ethelbert Plains slipped my mind at the moment. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture & Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, if I may just in closing the debate on second reading of this bill, briefly deal with some of the points raised by the honourable members opposite. Firstly, let's remember that noxious weeds do cause millions of dollars of loss to our farmers in Manitoba and if we are talking about doing something in terms of reducing that loss and saving that money to our farmers, this is why we require that legislation.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks is not in his chair but he asked a question with respect to Metropolitan Winnipeg. Yes, Metropolitan Winnipeg is to a large extent a weed control district, with the exception of parts of Charleswood, I'm informed.

The Honourable Member from LaVerendrye requested some further information why Section 8 of the old Act was being dropped - the Section 8 that referred to the railways. We have been informed and have known for some time that it was a question as to whether or not this part of the old Act was not ultra vires, that is dealing with railway property. Railways is a matter of federal jurisdiction and it's debatable as to whether or not this House, this Legislature, can pass legislation having to do with restrictions on railway property. We have by and large, managed to attain a fair measure of co-operation with the railways in agreeing to the measures that we seek.

The one point that was brought up in the debate in second readings, particularly by the Member from Brokenhead, the suggestion that there perhaps isn't adequate appeal areas set up within this bill is something that I'm not prepared at this point to indicate a yes or no to how we will react to an amendment that may be forthcoming from the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. I haven't had an occasion to discuss this with my staff. I think it in all likelihood is a reasonable one. I would have to point out to the honourable members though, as I'm sure I don't have to, that noxious weeds are what you might call a perishable item. There is of course the situation where if you have a field of blowing sowthistles then it's time to control them, there's a specific time to do this. It's not as though you can lay something over for a six months period and then can do it, because the reason for the action would be gone. So with these reservations I think, which they're aware of, I could well consider the idea of an appeal situation here, which I think would go a long way to relieve some of the Honourable Member for Rhineland's fears with this regard.

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that first of all this is voluntary permissive legislation. It takes twelve counties, townships or municipalities to come in to form a weed control district voluntarily. There's no pressure on the part of government to force them into these districts. They do so on their own accord and can withdraw on their own accord.

Secondly, the Act is being administered by what I'd like to think is sound reasonable farmers by and large. I may have some hesitation about giving this kind of authority or power into the hands of lawyers, but as long as it's going to be operated by our good rural people with the close co-operation of local councils, who have full authority control, I don't share the fears that have been expressed by the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): I don't share your views either.

MR. ENNS: One final point on the matter of the twelve month period of the job. Firstly, I should point out to the Honourable Member for Rhineland that of course the Department of Agriculture pays a substantial portion of the Weed supervisor's salary. This is an ongoing program; there's perhaps just as much educational work to be done within the weed control districts and this kind of work is done through the winter months while the weeds aren't actually flourishing, and for this reason, I think if you took the time to check on the activities of these weed supervisors you would find that they are employed very fully for the period that has been contracted for.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 96. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, this is Bill 96, the Manitoba Agricultural Credit and Development Act. We are changing the Agricultural Credit Corporation Act to the one I just mentioned and it's altogether different legislation that we're proposing here. In my opinion we're changing the principle that was laid down with the passing of the previous Act, and this is altogether different. Under the former Bill we were trying to assist young farmers, give them help and subsidize the interest rates on the money that they borrowed, up to a certain age of anyone who made application. Now we find that the Bill is one that will guarantee to the lending institution a certain amount of losses that they might experience. All this is not spelled out; we don't know the percentage or the amount of the total loans that will be insured. This is not spelled out, and I feel that matters of this type definitely should be spelled out.

We have abandoned the principles of the former Act and I'm not too sure whether I like it at all. There is one thing though that I have recommended in previous years and that is that we get away from the actual approving of loans and getting into guarantees. This, I do support and I have supported in past years, because I think there is a certain amount of merit to this. This will more or less work like the Farm Improvement Loans that have been made by the banks under federal legislation for many years. However, if you take a look at the Bill - we don't know - does this contemplate long-term loans at all? Presently, banks do not make long-term loans for agricultural purposes, especially purchasing land on a long-term basis, and I'm just wondering whether the matter of supplying capital - a guaranteeing capital for long-terms loans to buy properties to buy farm lands is being excluded from the legislation. It certainly reads that way or makes you think that this is the case.

Also, I would like to know from the Minister, will there be any further subsidization as far as loans are concerned, that the interest will be subsidized in any way? This certainly has been a big help to the young farmers who have been getting established through the latter eight or nine years now since the previous Act was brought in, and certainly has been a big help to many a young person going into farming.

I am at a loss to know once the present loans that are outstanding under the Credit Corporation are paid up, where will the new corporation get its revenue from? Will the banks charge an extra amount which will be paid into the Consolidated Fund to cover the operations of this new corporation, or how is this new corporation to get its funds to pay for administration and the various items listed in the Bill? This is certainly not spelled out, and if there are to be any extra charges over and above what the bank charges in interest rates, what are these charges going to be, and how much above the actual bank rate, so that we will have some idea as to what revenue we can expect this corporation to receive.

The Minister made a great deal about the developments at the university and the matter of building complexes and mentioning such programs as the Soil Testing Program, and it seems to me that they were now going to make all the soil testing programs - I think this is a

(MR. FROESE cont'd) self-sustaining program - and that more programs of this type were to be introduced. I'm just wondering, are we to understand here that the grants to the university for agricultural purposes will be decreased in future years and that the services and the research and so on will have to come from this corporation, or what is the plan? Certainly if there are such big plans ahead for the corporation in this matter, we should hear more about them and just what the specific plans are.

I notice that farm machinery will be an item that can be purchased under the loans from this corporation. I'm just wondering, have consultations already been had with the banks and the lending institutions concerned? Have there been any consultations and any agreements reached? Because we still have the federal legislation on the books whereby farmers can get Farm Improvement Loans at a much lower rate of interest if the banks make loans, and occasionally they do, and that loans are still being made but probably not in large quantity and in large total amount. Does this mean that by instituting this corporation and this type of a lending agency that the farm improvement loans will be discontinued? Has the Minister got any knowledge of this, that the federal legislation might not be amended and that they might discontinue farm improvement loans as they presently exist? I think these are matters that we as members should have knowledge of, if the Minister can advise us.

I already mentioned that the principle of the legislation from the former Bill has been changed completely, in my opinion, and if there was a need for this type of legislation, why were we as members not advised earlier of this? Why does it have to come out all of a sudden?

Earlier in the session this year we asked for one particular matter and that was that certain properties should be able to be released under an existing mortgage arrangement when certain moneys had already been paid off, that if a farmer needed additional capital from another source that he could probably get a release from some of the property that was tied up under the Agricultural Credit Corporation and in this way was able to use some of that as collateral against another loan that he might make elsewhere. We had difficulty, and farmers had difficulty in getting this. I think it just wasn't done, and now we find in this Bill that this will be possible. I certainly approve what is in the new Bill, but why were we not told earlier in the session of these things so that we wouldn't have had to question you people unnecessarily on some of the points.

I also note that there's a section here whereby arrangements can be made with the Federal Government - and I take it that this has to do with the FRED Agreement - whereby the Interlake area will get special assistance from the Federal Government. To what extent will this agreement play in the operations of the new corporation? Will the Federal Government have any power or jurisdiction so that they might give direction as to what is to be done in the Interlake area, that these people will get special treatment as a result? I think in this area, too, we need further explanation of how the people in this area are supposed to get special treatment, and certainly the report that was distributed earlier in the session on this agreement indicated that to us.

Then another matter that I wish to draw to the attention is that I do hope that through this legislation that the lending agencies such as banks and the other agencies - I don't know just who they will be - I imagine, or at least I hope credit unions will come under this interpretation of lending agencies, and that the government does not make it too complicated for these agencies to approve loans and to do this without too much delay. I think the operations of the farm improvement loans that were made under the bank were operated very successfully and very smoothly, and certainly if we can handle it in that way there should not be any unnecessary delays.

I once more wish to reiterate, to find out the total amount and/or the percentage of loans that will be guaranteed to the lending institutions. Is it a percentage of the total amount of loans that will be made or is it just a percentage like the Federal Government is guaranteeing under the Farm Improvement Loans legislation? I think there it is 15 percent of the total loans that is insured, and we know that we've never had that many losses. I think the amount of loss that the Federal Government through that legislation has sustained is very very small. I can only recall of the two incidents in my area where they had to collect on such a loan, so that certainly this should not be a costly proposition at all.

Mr. Speaker, these were some of the points that I wanted to raise. I notice that from henceforth there will be no more direct loans made to farmers from the Agricultural Credit Corporation except those that applied prior to March 31st. I imagine these will be made in the

(MR. FROESE cont'd) normal course of business as they've been done heretofor, so that during the current year we no doubt will have a dual operation under this Act; but after that, I take it, it will just be a matter of guaranteeing loans.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do hope I will get some replies to the questions I've put, and I'm sure that these would be helpful to us so that we might bring in some changes when we deal with the matter in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I think it is not at all astonishing that the honourable members who have spoken on this Bill up to date have had to ask so many questions. My honourable friend and colleague from La Verendrye and now the Honourable Member for Rhineland, have both asked what seemed to me to be very pertinent questions. And why, Mr. Speaker? Well the reason is that my honourable friend the Minister, when he moved second reading of this Bill, gave a very full report, so full that I think that most of us marvelled at it, with regard to what would be possible under one section of the Bill. But the other 23 sections of the Bill seemed to almost completely escape his attention. And this is a most interesting phenomenon, Mr. Speaker, that the sponsor of the Bill would take all the time that he did to wax eloquent about what can and will be done under Section 14 - I believe it is - the building program, the investigations that will be carried on, the conferences that will be held, the studies that will be made, the research that will be instituted under Section 14, one section, and then all the rest of this Bill, which is a very important Bill, and as my honourable friends have said, a complete change of policy, very little said at all. And my honourable friend's reluctance to enlighten us on these major questions of just what is going to be done under this Bill, what is the new program with regard to agricultural credit; how much is going to be guaranteed at what rates of interest; and these questions were, unless I missed them, not answered at all.

Mr. Speaker, the impression that my honourable friend's performance gave me was that he doesn't like to admit that the government shouldn't have been in this business during the last 10 years and that they're now backing out of it as gracefully as is possible under the circumstances, and that it's up to him as a good trouper to make it sound as feasible as possible. And being the good sport that my honourable friend is, he decided that the best tactics under that set of circumstances was to appear very confident and discourse at length on this one section of the Bill and try and convince the House by his enthusiasm, as well as his eloquence, that there really was a major program in the making here and then -- (Interjection) -- yes, that's what my honourable friend tried to convey - he seems to be convinced of it.

I must say that I have never before seen one section of a Bill get the attention that this one has to the exclusion of the really important parts of the Bill, but being the good tactician that my honourable friend is, he decided that under these circumstances the thing to do was talk confidently - and this he certainly did - and present as good a case as possible under the circumstances and then to attempt that well-known method of defence, to attack, and so he feeling himself to be on the spot he thought he'd better attack. And what was his form of attack, Mr. Speaker? He even had the temerity to suggest - and here he was expecting some doubting Thomases like myself to come along and raise some questions - and so anticipating that situation, he even said right in moving the second reading of the Bill, now this program that we've had has really done a fine job; it's done a fine job, and it not only did a great job in its own right, but it even spurred the Federal Corporation into action.

MR. ENNS: And private.

MR. CAMPBELL: And private lending as well. Well, my honourable friend really has the faculty for wishful thinking, Mr. Speaker. He's excellent at convincing himself. I will not attempt to enter into the discussion regarding the private lending, but as far as the Federal Corporation is concerned, Mr. Speaker, at the very moment that this legislation was being put on the statute books of Manitoba 10 years ago, at that very moment, this government had notice of the fact that the Federal Government then was liberalizing - and that's a good word - was liberalizing its Farm Loans Act. The famous and unlamented Diefenbaker government was in office at that time and they were making great claims about what they were doing for the farmers. The Honourable Colonel Harkness was Minister of Agriculture at that time and he had already proclaimed, he had given notice at the time that this Act was put on the statute books that they were greatly expanding the Federal Loans Act.

And to such good use was that federal Act put that during the time that this Act has been

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) on the statute books here, that Act has been consistently loaning more money here than has the Manitoba Act, and under a better set of circumstances and with lower administration costs; exactly what some of us prophesied would happen because we knew that the other organization had the experience; they had the personnel; they were a going concern; and it has been proven in the fact that their administration costs were lower, and although there were some areas in which the provincial Act was even more generous than the federal one, yet they continued to put out more money than the Manitoba Act did.

In the last five years, as an example - and I just took those figures down from the latest reports that I have - in the last five years the federal corporation has loaned in the Province of Manitoba well over twice as much money as the provincial organization has loaned. Because why, Mr. Speaker? Because of the fact that the federal Act was made more generous - again I use the term "liberalized" - in 1958, just exactly at the time that this Act was being put on the statute books here, and about three times since, under the Diefenbaker government and under the successor government, to the extent where it has been loaning ever so much more money and it has at the present time much more money loaned in the Province of Manitoba than this corporation has. And this is duplication; this was duplication; it is duplication. I'm glad, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer has won the argument against my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and his cohorts, and that reason and logic have prevailed and that my honourable friends, no matter how embarrassed they may feel about it, are now retracing the steps of 10 years ago and deciding to get out of this field that they should never have been in.

And I'm not going to say, Mr. Speaker, that no good was accomplished. When an Act of this is put on the statute books, even though it is duplication - by the way the new one will have a measure of duplication too, no question about that because they'll be duplicating some federal programs as well, and I don't approve of that principle - but I do, I do say that certainly some assistance was given to agriculture, and quite a bit of it at the expense of the taxpayer, because year after year after year in this, the committee of estimates, we have passed the deficit that they have had without considering the bonus that they have given to the young farmers, and on some occasions, even bonuses to the others as well.

I made a rough computation of my own, Mr. Speaker, that I would think that perhaps something very close to the amount of \$3 million in total has been given as a direct bonus to the farmers who have participated in this scheme. Well, I'm not saying that that is necessarily wrong either, Mr. Speaker. You know many years ago, before I came to this House, the government of the day had put on the statute books of the province a so-called Farm Loans Act and a lot of money was loaned under that Act. If you'll go back to the Public Accounts of the province you will find that the Public Accounts charged that Farm Loans scheme as having cost the Province of Manitoba several millions of dollars - several millions. I don't claim that it was a net loss to the Province of Manitoba because I have always taken the position - and I recognize that the factor is here too - that nobody can say to what extent the presence of those competing bodies, public bodies in those cases, have held down the interest rates that otherwise might have prevailed. So I do not say that all of it is loss. I do say, however, that it was duplication, and I raise the point again to an extent that this one also is duplication.

However, to come to the Bill itself, I'm not sorry to see the old program go. Like my honourable friend from Rhineland, I have certainly some questions about its successor. I won't comment on the Section 14 to which my honourable friend the Minister devoted so much attention. If it does all the things that he says it will do, if it fulfills all of his hopes, then it will be a service to agriculture no doubt. But that's not quite the kind of agricultural credit programs that we have been discussing. It's a different field and I'll leave that for later discussion.

But some of the questions here I think should be answered immediately, and others of course, the detailed ones, can be left until we get to the committee stage. And I repeat the questions that have already been asked. To what extent are the losses going to be guaranteed? As I read this Bill, they could be guaranteed in total. Is that the intention, Mr. Speaker? If it is, it should be in the Bill. If we're guaranteeing the losses in total, then we should state it in the Bill. If it's 10 percent or 15 percent, as some of the federal policies have been, then that should be stated in the Bill. Instead of that we have it left to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, or, in the other case, to the Board of Directors approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and, Mr. Speaker, if supposing that the directors get the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, they can guarantee the whole loan of these lending institutions. Now I

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) don't think that's the intention, but this Bill, as drawn, would allow for it, and I suggest that we should write right into the Bill what the amount should be. That's a major principle and one that I think should have been stated at the time that second reading of the Bill was moved. Certainly it should be stated now.

Then there is another principle that I think should have attention paid to it, Mr. Speaker. It appears on Page 15 of the Bill and on that page we have the principle of subrogation referred to here. I don't object to that. If they have to take over some losses of one of the authorized lending institutions, then their position should be subrogated to this corporation.

I have some doubts about the wording of the paragraph dealing with the form of the receipt, but supposing that the receipt is in order, then we come to the registration of a lien - and I won't take the time to read this whole paragraph into the record, Mr. Speaker, but I will read the last part of it - "after this lien has been registered, and it can be registered in the Land Titles Office of any Land Titles District or in the office of any County Court District or in both, and from the time of the registration the certificate shall bind and form a lien and charge in favour of the corporation for the amount so certified on all lands of the borrower situated in the Land Titles District and on all chattels of the borrower situated in the County Court District." Now surely, Mr. Speaker, does this mean other lands and other chattels in addition to those that are covered by the loan? Because as I read this particular provision, it would mean that all of the land in that Land Titles District and all of the chattels in the County Court District could be covered by that lien, and the matter of registration of the lien without an Affidavit of Execution, I think, is altogether too wide.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the time of the House to deal with any more of the principles that I think should be discussed at this time, but I re-emphasize a very main one, that we should know in this House the maximum amount that is going to be guaranteed, that is the maximum loan that will be guaranteed. We should know also the maximum proportion or percentage of that loan that will be guaranteed as to law; we should know the interest rate that is going to be charged and these, in my opinion, should be written right into the Act. These I think are main principles that must be considered, if not here, then certainly in Committee. And I would suggest to my honourable friend, the sponsor of the Bill, that I would think it must be an oversight that they have not written in both the maximum amount, maximum percentages that will be guaranteed, and the appropriate detail all along that line.

Mr. Speaker, of course I'm prepared to support the Bill. I have no great enthusiasm for it as it stands at the present time, but I think we can make some amendments in it that are very worthwhile, and I certainly will pay my honourable friend the compliment of saying that by the time we get through with strengthening his legislation, I am sure that it and the policy under it will at least not be as bad as the program that it replaces.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to go in length in discussing this Bill. However, I'd like to ask one question of the Minister when he's making his final remarks, and that is what percentage of the loans, where application is accepted by the Manitoba Credit Corporation, were to young farmers under the age of 35 on the subsidized rate? It would seem to me in looking over this Bill that Section 22, where it indicates "and no direct loans to borrowers will be made under the new legislation", is somewhat a contradiction of the original intent of the Bill this will be replacing and that of course, I haven't read the speeches made at that time, but it was my impression that the intent was to facilitate transfer of family farms from the father to the son and in order to induce the young farmers to stay on the land they were given a subsidized rate. I think that today the situation in agriculture is no different than it was ten years ago, as a matter of fact, the situation is a lot worse. We have a lot of our young people leaving the farms, about 40 percent of the farmers today are over the age of 55 and it would certainly indicate a need for having loans available to young farmers at a subsidized rate. Unless the Minister is prepared to accept a few amendments in Law Amendments which would continue to make loans available to young farmers at subsidized rates, we will oppose second reading of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying "a funny thing happened on the way to work this morning" and a funny thing happened on my way back to the building at noon today. I called in at the branch of the Bank of Montreal, across the way here in the Great West Life Building, and I paid a visit on the Manager of the Canadian Imperial

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) Bank of Commerce, right on the corner, to enquire and to ask them for the information that they were distributing in respect to the new farm loan programs. Neither of the Managers knew what I was talking about. They hadn't heard at all that the government had made changes or that it was the intention of the government to get out of the farm loaning field. Now I judge that the Royal Bank of Canada is the only bank as of this date that has announced any plans in regard to the new farm loan program. I'm not right, eh?

MR. ENNS: If the honourable member would permit a question. If he speaks of some knowledge that I don't have, certainly I would not be aware of the Royal Bank having any particular knowledge with respect to a proposed new program.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well then this just points up what I have been saying, Mr. Speaker. It's evident that the program announced by my honourable friend last Friday has not been discussed with the banks, with the lending institutions. I don't know, I still am as much in the dark I guess as are most members on this side of the House as to what the lending institutions are going to be. Perhaps it is the intention of my honourable friend to refer all applications that are presently on hand and to be dealt with by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada, and if the banks do not intend to co-operate with the program that is envisaged by the new Act, well then I don't know what the lending institutions are going to be. I question very much whether the banks can be encouraged or enticed into the quantity of credit that the farmers need in this day and age.

I'm looking now, Mr. Speaker, at the last annual report of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. On page 4 of the annual report, the last one that's available, it points up here that - and I shall read this. It says "the increasing use of machinery and other modern equipment, the trend towards specialization, the rising cost of land, and larger commercial farms necessitate more long range capital expenditures now than in previous years and therefore more credit." And it goes on to say that "young farmers in particular are finding it increasingly difficult to establish economic family farm units under a maximum long-term credit ceiling of \$30,000." This is what the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation have learned in their 8 or 9 years of experience in the field. That it is absolutely necessary in this day and age if we are going to establish an economic farm unit to have credit on tap to the tune of \$30,000. Now my experience in dealing with the banks in the past is that they are fairly conservative in their lending habits, and I know that the bill that is before us at the present time is only permissive legislation, that is, we are passing legislation here that will enable the banks to loan money to farmers under certain conditions. But it does not instruct or compel the banks to loan money to a farmer or if it does I would like to know from my honourable friend.

As I understand the old Farm Improvement Loan Act, it was legislation that was set up by the Federal Government to provide a certain guarantee of repayment of loans. As a matter of fact, the loans under the Federal Farm Improvement Loans Act have declined in recent years - and in particular in recent months as my honourable friend well knows. And why are they declining? Because the interest ceiling under the old Act is five percent and the banks are just not interested in making loans, that's all. So I took it upon myself to write to the Federal Minister of Finance, Mr. Mitchell Sharpe, in February, asking him if we could expect amendments to that Act which would liberalize it and make it more acceptable to the farmers and he wrote back saying that it was their intention to make amendments that would provide for flexibility in interest rates. Just a month ago, just about a month ago on the propaganda sheet that came out on April 11, 1968 headed "Farm Credit Body Ups Interest Rates" - my honourable friend knows all about that - in which it was announced that the interest rates for young farmers under the Act would be increased to 6 1/4 for the first 5 years and 7 3/4 for the remaining period of a 31 year repayment contract and 7 3/4 percent for the older farmers. Well what was the purpose of making this announcement if it was the intention of the government to get out of the loaning field? Was it only intended for applications that are presently on hand and not dealt with? My honourable friend is nodding in the affirmative so I guess that that was the whole purpose.

Well then if that is the purpose. to increase the interest rates to a point that it will completely discourage farmers from making application to the Farm Credit Corporation, does he not feel that a further propaganda sheet should go out immediately advising the farmers who have applications laying on the desks over there, that you are out of business, why do you not make an application immediately to the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada, where you can

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) obtain a loan at 5 percent. You would be doing a real service to these farmers by encouraging them to take that step now before they get involved in a 31-year repayment contract at 7 1/4 or 7 3/4 percent interest. Now I don't need to tell my honourable friend what even the difference in 1 percent interest would mean on a 30,000 loan over a 30 year period. It would be a staggering amount, and I cannot see the banks, even with a guarantee, loaning money to farmers to the extent of \$30,000 for 31 years at 5 percent interest. I just can't envisage a bank doing that in this day and age.

My honourable friend the Member for Lakeside has asked a question in respect to that guarantee and I will look forward to the Minister's reply in respect to the guarantee. As I understand the Federal Farm Improvement Loan Act, they only undertake to guarantee the banks I think up to 10 percent of the loans, that is they appreciate the fact that the record is good, that at no time would the Federal government be called on to pay more than 7, 8 or 9 percent of the loans. In fact, I don't know whether they've ever been called on to pay any of them back. But these are the things that we would like to hear from my honourable friend the Minister.

In consideration of the fact that the Minister has decided that the government should get out of the loaning business, I say once again, Mr. Speaker, that I think that he should encourage farmers that need long-term credit to immediately make application to the Farm Credit Corporation. I know in my own particular area at Neepawa, the farmers who are interested in making application for a loan, get much better service, and always have done, from the Farm Credit Corporation than they ever did from the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. Why? Simply because we have got (a) an office right on the main street in Neepawa, that is the Federal . . .

MR. ENNS: How long have you had it?

MR. SHOEMAKER: How long have we had it? We've had it there for a number of years.

MR. ENNS: '58, '59?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well it hasn't been there since '59, but the same man that was administering the Veterans Land Act took over, took over, and he has been there since '59 I'm certain. Mr. Robert Turner has been there. He is an excellent appraiser with his background. He is a diplomatic and a tactful kind of a fellow and he can process and appraise an application in no time flat, simply because he knows the area.

One of the quarrels that I had with the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation was that it took them so long to process a loan that quite frequently a farmer who had made application for a loan to purchase additional land to provide himself with an economic unit, it took them so long to process the loan that someone else bought the land in the meantime. Long before my honourable friend the Minister was a member of the House, I moved a resolution that the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation process loans in the dead of winter. And I still say it can be done and I still say that the banks or other lending institutions will do it. They will loan money at Christmas, Easter or New Years and it's quite possible for them to do it; no problem at all; no problem at all. The provincial assessors now have assessed all of the land in the Province of Manitoba. There is a relationship between the assessed value and the actual cash value or the productivity value of the land; there's that relationship there. You can certainly tell a man at Christmas time the amount that you are prepared to loan him.

However, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly look forward with interest to further answers to many of these pertinent questions that have been put to my honourable friend the Minister. I would particularly like to know what consultations he or his department have had with all of the banks in respect to this program and what reception he received from the various banks and the extent to which they will co-operate in making loans in the amounts of \$30,000 -- because this is what my honourable friend says is the minimum that's now required -- the interest rates that they will charge, that is the lending institutions, and whether or not, because of the guarantee that is made by the government, whether or not we can still look forward to a select rate of interest for the young farmer. Because after all the young farmer is the one person that requires the large amounts of capital at a low rate of interest.

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

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a few remarks on this bill. I don't intend to go into the Bill because I think the Minister of Agriculture can handle that quite well himself but I want to just fill in a few things. To begin with, for the Member of Lakeside who has conveniently chose to use the last 5 years of the operation of the Federal

(MR. WATT cont'd) Corporation as compared with the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation in which he I believe said that the Federal Corporation had been loaning somewhat in excess of twice as much money.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, when I came into the Legislature first - my first session was in 1960 - and at that time off the top of my head I would say the debate took place in the Estimates of the Minister of Agriculture and at that time the Honourable Member for Lakeside was criticizing the government and the Minister of Agriculture, George Hutton at that time, for bringing in the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation set-up on the grounds that it was duplication. It is true that the Federal Government did have a policy at that time, in 1960 I believe it was brought in sometime, or announced probably as the Member for Lakeside has said, about the time that this government was instituting a credit corporation, long-term credit for farmers. But in the year ending 1960, March 31st, the amount of money loaned by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation was almost three times as much as the Federal Credit Corporation was loaning to farmers at that time. In the year 1961 the Government of Manitoba loaned to young farmers 5, 9 million dollars as compared with the Federal Government of 3. 5; and in the year of 1962, the Manitoba Government loaned 4 1/2 million compared with 5 million of the Federal Government. Now, this is a three-year period, Mr. Speaker, that we're covering.

The Member for Lakeside showed to you the five-year period since that time and it is true that the Federal Government loans did increase, until 1967 the Federal Government was loaning three times as much as the province, and rightly so - they should. But in 1960, the year ending March 31, 1960, the Manitoba Government were loaning, to young farmers particularly, almost three times as much money as the Federal Government, and at that time there was no indication from the Federal Government that they would be expanding, that they would be offering money on the market for young farmers particularly in this area. I think that the government at that time were absolutely justified in establishing this corporation to make money available, particularly for young farmers.

And I want to say to the Member for Gladstone, when he says that at no time was the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation equal to that of the Federal as far as benefits to the young farmers were concerned, the interest rates in 1959-60, Manitoba Credit Corporation - 4 percent; Federal - 5 percent. At that time in 1959-60, the maximum loans for the Manitoba Credit Corporation were \$30,000 - Part I, Part II - \$10,000; Federal Government - \$20,000, Part II - \$27,500.00. Now, I say in no sense of the word was this duplication. This was offering a better service, it was offering a strengthening of the agricultural society or industry in this province that was not offered by the Federal Government at that time.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to members of this Legislature that it was good legislation; that it has served its purpose well in the Province of Manitoba; that we now have federal legislation that is adequate now to support agriculture in Western Canada and that we no longer need to stay in the field of long-term credit. But I do say that I am quite satisfied that provincial legislation at that time did spur the Federal Government on to better legislation in respect of credit to agriculture in Western Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on second reading of Bill 96, firstly, I don't apologize for one moment for waxing eloquent on Section 14 - is it? - of the Bill. Certainly when a Minister is in a position as I am, that the government that he is a member of and the caucus that he is a member of provides him with the kind of a program that we are about to provide for the farmers of Manitoba, I'll wax eloquent here, on the hustings and anywhere else, because it is a very worthwhile program as the farmers of Manitoba will find out.

On the question of -- the major question. If I deal with all these enquiries that have been put to me, really I think in substance the Honourable Member for Lakeside, for Gladstone, for Brokenhead, will agree that the issue that they have brought forward in the questioning is the lack of details with respect to the guarantees, the interest rates, limits, size and types of loans, Mr. Speaker, we want to avoid precisely what has locked in and made ineffective the federal legislation in this respect, that is by writing it into legislation and into statute, because after all this is the only thing that happened to the Federal Farm Improvement Loans Act by writing it into legislation that banks must loan at five percent, and when that figure no longer became a realistic figure, it took no action on any part, nobody decided to kill farm improvement loans, there was no decrees issued by government or indeed by the private sector; it was just plain common everyday banker's sense that told the banker that he had other areas to lend his money

(MR. ENNS cont'd) that was more profitable to him than loaning a farmer at five percent.

So, Mr. Speaker, very briefly, this is what we wish to avoid in this legislation; namely, to name or to write into the legislation the precise or the specific percentage point, the interest rates, interest terms that can or should apply, because we want this to be effective. We have in our contacts with the banking communities - and the Honourable Member for Gladstone was interested in this - we have of course in a general way felt out the private community, banking community, with respect to some of our plans. I'm not at liberty to name precisely the persons all who were contacted, but I can assure you that we did send out sufficient feelers in this regard. At the same time again of course, unless we have some definitive legislation passed here in the House, there's very little that I can approach a banker with in terms of saying, "Now, what can we do?"

In other words, I'm asking the House to pass, what I admit to be rather broad and generalized legislation here, so that we can get on with the job of sitting down with the bankers of private lending institutions and working out with them the very best deal possible. I envisage a situation arising that we will -- it's a matter after all of a certain amount of negotiation, the degree of the guarantee that the government is prepared to underwrite should, we hope -- will be reflected with the interest rates that we may be able to get from the private sector in this regard. It may be that we're talking 10, 12, 15 percent or 8 percent, this is a matter that can only come out after some pretty hard-nose negotiations with the private lending institutions.

Also, it gives us an opportunity, and we certainly wish to exercise this opportunity, to be directional in this regard. Whether it is into the young farmer area, whether it is directional in the sense of specific farm enterprises, do we choose to direct, as part of government policy with the means of these guarantees, additional inputs by the private lending sector into specific farm areas. One of the big things of course that we hope to do is to do what the Honourable Member for Gladstone described, to make those conservative bankers more liberal with the backing of the government in this respect.

Also, I'm aware that, as has been pointed out, we're very likely - in fact it wouldn't surprise me if it happened before June 25th - that there would be some change with respect to the federal Farm Improvement Loans. I see this again as complementary to our scheme; it would free us up to be still more directional. It may well be that it's a matter of government policy that we choose to direct more of our guarantees into specific livestock growing areas, into specific diversified farming areas which we may wish to lay greater stress on here in Manitoba.

The other day I had the pleasure of informing the House that Manitoba was the only province in the past year that recorded a net increase in farm income. The only reason why that is - it's no mystery - is the fact that our agriculture is more diversified than those of our sister provinces, particularly Saskatchewan which is much more dependent on their wheat economy, and when one is so entirely dependent on one commodity, any setback in that commodity of course affects more vitally the overall agricultural situation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not apologize for the general form of the Bill that's before you. It is purposefully written in that manner so that we can, not only with the people that we hope to be doing business with but also with the farm organizations, whom I will be inviting in very shortly after the passage of this Bill to get their advice and get their thinking on assisting us into what particular areas they believe are areas of need, and can steer us away from areas of duplication and maximize the input that we are prepared to bring in this way.

In closing, I think also further to the Honourable Member for Lakeside's reference to the total amount, is it all or what, I think he recognizes as I do that our treasury reserves are not comparable to the federal reserves in this respect. We would envisage - and I have indicated this in second reading - that the turnover, that is the money that is coming back in the initial stages, 1 1/2 to 2 million dollars, would be the first base of establishing this guarantee. In other words, we're talking about guaranteeing the amount of money, that 2 million or 1 1/2 millions of dollars, we'll guarantee at a rate of interest that I'm not in a position at this moment to inform the House will be. If it is 10 percent, \$2 million would guarantee \$20 million of production credit for the farmers of Manitoba; if it is less, the percentage guarantee is less, then of course the same amount would have the same effect on a greater amount of money, or conversely the other way. I think that as we walk into this program rather than leap into it, we can expand this. I think the experience that we can expect to have in this program will be good, as was the federal experience, and that it may well expand to a far greater program than we,

(MR. ENNS cont'd) even at this point, envisage.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend the Bill to the members opposite. I'm happy to note that the honourable members of the Liberal Party, at least, appear to be supporting the legislation in its general form. They may have some further comments on it of course at committee stage. I trust that we'll have a - you know - the speedy passage of this Bill in order that the department can proceed with the negotiations, the very important negotiations that have to be followed up upon passing of this Bill in the House.

MR. KAWCHUK: I'm just wondering if the Honourable Minister of Agriculture would mind replying to the second question I proposed to him with respect to whether or not he would accept an amendment in Law Amendments Committee to make available loans to farmers under the 35 age group at a reduced interest rate, or an interest rate below the prevailing interest rate?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, we would have to judge carefully any amendments put forward at that time. I'm not prepared at this time, certainly on the part of the government or myself, to make any commitments for accepting or rejecting any amendments.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and nays please, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture in respect of Bill 96.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Weir and Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Cherniack, Fox, Green, Hamschak, Harris, Kawchuk, Paulley and Petursson.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 40; Nays, 8.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Bill No. 102, An Act to amend the Manitoba Medical Services Insurances Act. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, we've had considerable debate already on the subject of medicare in this House, but I find that every time the debate comes up my friends to my left make a very determined attempt to confuse the situation, Mr. Chairman, and to proceed and try and pretend that they don't understand the position that we're in in this Party. And I can only suspect, Mr. Chairman, that what is really bothering them, what is really disturbing them is that my Party got a resolution on the Order Paper early in the session, before they ever did, taking a clear-cut position. None could be clearer than the statement of resolution saying that we believe that this House should request the Manitoba Government to join the national plan effective July 1, 1968.

Now what a positively clear, concise, precise statement, Mr. Speaker, and that's obviously what's bothering my friends because they would have loved to have come into this House, Mr. Speaker, and to have been the people who were supporting medicare, and hopefully having everyone else opposed to medicare, and having found that that hasn't worked out, they sit there moaning, carping and trying to confuse the issue. Mr. Speaker, there is no confusion. The position of my Party is crystal clear in this regard. We stated in the debates here, and I repeat, we believe that the Manitoba Government should proceed with medicare on the 1st of July, 1968, at the very first date at which medicare is available. Not six months later, not a year later, but as soon as it's available from the Federal Government, and every time, Mr. Speaker, that a new event occurs in this regard, in my opinion it strengthens that very position. I recommend to the Government of Manitoba, if they will be prepared to look at the events of the past few weeks themselves, whether they shouldn't reverse the stand they have taken, which I think they took in error, the stand that they announced some time in early February, because everything that has happened points out to the case for Manitoba moving at the earliest possible date, Mr. Chairman.

Let's look over the events of the past few months. First of all the government, instead of starting to negotiate as it should have, having decided last winter during the course of the session, having set up their negotiation structure through the committee headed by Dr. Tanner, having decided that on the 1st of July, 1968, they would proceed, negotiations should have

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) started immediately with the medical profession, but for some reason or other, Mr. Speaker, the government held back and held back and held back, and this may be accounted for by the fact that it seemed really last year that the government had no real desire to go into this program, that they were moving into it with the greatest reluctance, that the Minister wasn't really sold on it, and then instead of acting on the decision that they recommended to the House, they failed to produce.

Meanwhile, what happened, Mr. Speaker, is that medical costs went up. Last year there was an increase of some 12 1/2 percent in the premium, and during the course of the year the medical profession, through the MMA, proceeded to work out a new fee schedule which was announced just recently. The government not being in a position to negotiate, not being apparently willing to negotiate, we now find that the MMA and the MMS, over which we have no direct control I admit, that that group have now proceeded to raise the fees. Now the government can say well, we would have no direct control over that; we can't force them. That's true, Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting that they should, but I do say that the government had a responsibility to be actively negotiating with the medical profession so that there was in fact some indication to the medical profession that the government was involved and interested, but the government didn't seem to be interested.

Well, meanwhile the government, having decided that it wasn't going to proceed with medicare, had indicated in some earlier statements that they would be doing something for the low income group. So far there's been no indication of any action on the part of the government to deal with the low income groups; no indication of any specific plan, just a wait and see attitude. Mr. Speaker, it's that wait and see attitude on the part of this government that puts the people of Manitoba in the position now where they are going to have to pay very substantial higher costs for their medical services. And so the government is prepared at this stage to leave - as the Minister himself has stated last year - he said then that it would mean leaving \$17 million on the table at Ottawa. Well, Mr. Speaker, that figure has now gone up to something like \$20 million. This government has been content to leave \$20 million dollars sit on the table at Ottawa whilst repeating steadily in this House that Ottawa isn't doing enough for Manitoba, but the government is prepared to leave that \$20 million sit there and meanwhile see the costs of medical services to the people of Manitoba virtually skyrocket.

Mr. Speaker, there is no alternative, in my opinion, for this government but to move on the 1st of July. That's what they should do. That would be the right thing to do. But now the government has said no, we won't do that; we're not prepared to move on the 1st of July. Well, if that is the case, then we have to look at the situation on the basis of the Bill that's now presented to us by this government, and this is where I take a different position from that of my friends to the left who simply say, well if the government's not prepared to proceed on the 1st of July, we won't have a thing to do with any other type of program.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the government should move on the 1st of July. We have a resolution on the Order Paper asking for that, but if the government won't move on the 1st of July, then I want to see to it that they do whatever they can to assist those people who need help in the Province of Manitoba, and there are a large number who do. There are a large number of people who at this moment are not covered by any program of medical insurance, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a good number of those are not covered because they simply can't afford to pay the premiums, because they don't have the income required to pay those premiums, and I want to see the government, if it is not going to go into the full plan, do something to protect these people, and these people need all the more protection, Mr. Speaker, when you consider the increase in premiums that just went into effect recently.

It is for this reason that I am prepared to support the amendment to the Bill, because I think the amendment to the Bill can put the government in the position where they can move if they want to do so. My honourable friends to my left say they could do it through the Social Allowances plan. Ah, but there is a difference, Mr. Speaker. Let us assume that we did proceed simply through the Social Allowances plan. There would be no control in two areas, two areas which I consider vital, two areas we recommended to the government last year when they proposed their initial Bill and where we moved amendments.

The first one is that the schedule of fees should become part and parcel of the Act. That is what we moved last year. The reason for doing that, Mr. Speaker, is so the public will know what the fees are, and I think that the public have a right to know what the fees are, whereas if we move on the proposal of my honourable friends then the government would simply

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) be paying whatever the fees are and this House will have no knowledge of what those fees are. If we proceed to pass this present amendment, my colleague the Member for St. Boniface has served notice that we are going to move an amendment as we did last year on the original Bill to see to it that the fees are included in the Bill.

The second item, Mr. Speaker, which would not be covered by any plan operating through Social Allowances and which in my opinion should be included in the Bill if the government is going to pass this Bill I want to see that in that Bill, and that is that there will be no extra billings by the doctors, because I think, Mr. Speaker, the extra billing procedure is wrong in principle and I think it destroys the plan, and I think it puts an undue burden on many people who cannot afford to pay. I have no objection to doctors practising outside of a plan. If they don't want to belong to the plan that is certainly their privilege, but if they belong to the plan, I think that then they must accept that the advantages of the plan, the advantages that they get from payments and coverage, means that they must forego the extra billing outside.

So these are the two items, Mr. Speaker, that I want to see included in this Bill. The only way that we can make sure that this is done is by proposing amendments to the Bill, and I would hope that the Minister will be prepared to accept these amendments, because last year on the original Bill he was certainly prepared to accept the extra billing feature, and insofar as the schedule of fees, he had indicated that while he couldn't put it in the Bill at that time because it had to be negotiated, that he would be prepared to consider it at a subsequent date. Now the only way we could get that is by in fact passing this Bill now with the necessary amendments.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason that we are supporting the Bill now before us. We want the government to move on the 1st of July. We will do everything we can to get them to change their minds in that regard. We want them to recognize the Federal Government is going to proceed and that they should proceed as well, and if they don't, they are doing harm to the people of Manitoba. But if they are not going to proceed, Mr. Speaker, then I want to see them have the necessary legislation so as to be able to protect those people on low income who desperately need protection in this province. I think the way that that can be done, and best be done, is by passing this Bill and not simply by saying put it over to Social Allowances. I think it should be part and parcel of this Bill.

The last point I want to cover, Mr. Speaker, is the overall question of my honourable friends and their negotiations with the medical profession. I have high regard for the medical profession, Mr. Speaker; I believe that they are a body of devoted and honest men, but, Mr. Speaker, this government has a responsibility when it is dealing with any group of protecting the general interests of the public, and I am concerned when I see what I believe are the type of negotiations that have been going on between this government and the medical profession. I don't think that this government took action when it should have. I think if it had sat down with the medical profession and explained to them what they wanted to do in Manitoba, what the government wanted to do, how it proposed to go about it, and appealed to the medical profession for their understanding, that we would have had the understanding of the medical profession. But with my honourable friends staying back, apparently in a totally undecided position, the medical profession proceeded on its own, and in this regard you can't blame them.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are heading here to some serious troubles in the future. When I get figures which apparently indicate that the average gross income - I have to admit, not net income, but the average gross income - of the medical profession in the year 1965 based on the then schedule of fees was something in the order of 32 or 33 thousand dollars; when you consider that on the basis of the 1967 fee schedule on which the doctors are now asking for 75 percent through MMS that this will likely bring up their average gross income to something in the order of \$41,000; when you consider if the full 1967 fee schedule was put into effect the incomes would probably rise to something in the order of \$51,000 - and this is average, Mr. Speaker, admittedly gross income, but nevertheless average gross income; I am saying to the government that unless negotiations are started with the medical profession there will be a great deal of resentment by the people in this province who will not be prepared to accept that sort of a situation.

And it will come back to the disadvantage of the doctors and the medical profession themselves, because we have a large number of people in this province on such low incomes, Mr. Speaker, that they can not see how they can afford to pay out of their meagre income the type of premiums required to produce that type of income. This is why it is essential for the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) government to be negotiating with the medical profession, to be sitting down with them and putting these figures on the table, and every day that this government has failed to proceed in this direction they have harmed the medical profession and harmed the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, in this regard I think we should hear from the Premier of this province. I think we should have an outline from the Premier of this province as to exactly what his intentions are because it was his decision apparently back in February, Mr. Speaker, not his Minister of Health, because from everything we've been able to find out the Minister of Health hasn't been involved in this medicare thing. He apparently is not involved in negotiations, does not meet with the medical profession, does not meet with MMS. I don't know why he's Minister of Health because he doesn't deal with the health factor, but the First Minister does, the First Minister who conducted negotiations, and I think it's time we heard from the First Minister what exactly does he have in mind for medical coverage for Manitoba. If he sits there and tells us that he will turn down the federal plan, that he's going to leave that \$20 million on the table in Ottawa - not for me, we don't need the 20 million, we'll have an increase in premiums of some 25 percent in Manitoba but we'll leave the 20 million sit in Ottawa - then what are your alternatives for the people of Manitoba, and that, Mr. Speaker, we haven't heard?

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to be more than a couple of minutes, but I want to ask whether or not we can expect to receive the Order for Return that is on the front page of the Orders of the Day - in fact it has been on the front page of the Orders of the Day for about a week now - because I think it would be most helpful to the members of the opposition, all members of the opposition, if we could have this Order for Return tabled before this Bill goes before Committee of the Whole. There have been so many charges levelled by members of the Opposition at the government and vice versa and we are kept in the dark on. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm just wondering in my own mind as to whether or not this can be discussed at this particular time in view of the fact that it is standing in the honourable member's name for debate at the next Private Members Day. As I say, the question goes through my mind as to whether or not it should be proceeded with at this particular time when it is already set for debate on the proper day.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, of course the whole subject matter that we're discussing now, that is this Bill 102 and the Order for Return are one and the same thing. I'm not going to debate the Order for Return, I'm simply saying this, that it would be very helpful to the committee if we had that Order tabled before the Bill goes to Committee of the Whole, and I'm asking whether there's any hope at all of having that Order tabled in the next two or three days.

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

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker. It's too important.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Cherniack, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Harris, Kawchuk, Paulley & Petursson.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 41; Nays, 8.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Bill No. 92. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, those of us who listened to the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party were made aware of the fact, by what he had to say, that he too had had the benefit of a discussion with the student representatives that came to visit the various caucuses of the parties, and I hope that the members of the Conservative caucus also met with the students and heard their point of view and shared with them the benefits of the discussions which must have transpired, which did in our caucus and which obviously resulted in the suggestion made by the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party, with which we agree. So I

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) don't intend really to repeat what he said except, as I say, to endorse what he had to say in relation to what was suggested by the students group who made a very strong point, and as I say he expressed it very well.

We were informed by the Honourable the Minister that this proposed Bill was prepared really by the university people - that's the expression he used, the university people - and then he let us in on the fact that the government finally got around to looking at it in the last few days and has made certain changes which don't appear to amount to much, like a change from 9 to 12, but as pointed out by the former speaker, that little change of just a few numbers changes the control of the Board of Governors into the hands of those persons who are appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, whereas under the original plan they would have a minority of representation of 9/22nds rather than 12/23rds.

I don't think it's too important whether numbers count very much either way because certainly there is no guarantee that all people appointed by the Board would vote as a bloc, nor is there a guarantee that all persons on the Board of Governors not appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council would vote as a bloc, but there is something wrong with the approach made.

The Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party was talking about the fact that in Manitoba if we accepted the suggestion that there be a change in the Board - and he's speaking specifically about representation by a student of the student body - that this would be breaking new ground, and he's right speaking currently, but he's also wrong speaking historically, because the old traditional institution of higher learning was one where a group of students gathered at the feet of a learned man and studied with him and learned with him and, in fact, they were the ones that were running that little institution of higher learning that operated at the feet of the teacher, of the person who had something to say. And indeed they were of an age and of a calibre and of an interest who knew what there was to learn, who knew the need to learn, who were dedicated in that purpose, who had a stake in the learning and also had a stake and a deep interest in the manner in which their learning facilities were made available to them. And to that extent, although I agree it means breaking new ground now, it is really a recognition of the people for whom the institution is really designed, because you can set up all the structure you like, if you don't have a group of students that are anxious to learn and that want to play a role in the learning facility and who want to participate in that which is being offered to them, they you won't have that feeling of co-operation, of working together, which is so desirable and which was expounded very well, and I won't repeat it, by the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party.

Therefore, I would really think that in spite of the fact that the government has just made a decision reversing what was the proposal of the university people, that they would still have an open mind to consider just how important is it for this government to control the Board of Governors, because I cannot conceive of any other reason for the proposed amendment than the word "control", otherwise I can't visualize just why bring it in. What control is needed by this government over an institution of higher learning, the institution, the largest in this province?

It seems to me that the government ought to have another look at this problem, another look at the constitution of the Board of Governors, another look at the purpose of this institution, and another look at the feeling of responsibility involved. I don't say turn it over to the students. As a matter of fact, I endorse the thought that one student out of 23 would be a worthwhile addition to this Board. One student out of the 23 would make a tremendous contribution, not necessarily in what he would have to say to the Board but rather in what he would have to interpret for the student body of the decisions that the Board is making, for what he would have to be able to interpret to the other members of the Board of the thinking of the student body, because as was mentioned, a university is nothing if it is not an expression of the desires of the students and of their willingness to learn. This paternalistic attitude, or this controlled attitude or this distrust attitude - and certainly that's not a word that the Minister used - but I'm putting it to him that the only reason for the change involved from 9/22nds to 12/23rds must be a distrust for the other grouping. It can't be anything else that I can visualize. Possibly the Minister will try to deal with that, but how he's going to deal with it I can't imagine, because I can't see any other concept.

The question asked by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party was what danger can there be in this? And I suppose the only answer that they can give would be the fear of student

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) power, one student in amongst them could possibly do so much harm that there would be danger, because I must agree with him I cannot see danger in any way.

The constitution of the Board is spelled out in some detail and we now know of certain changes that are proposed. We know that the membership appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is determined under the Act, under the Bill. Incidentally, and I'm glad the Provincial Secretary is here, I would point out to him that if he looks at the Bill that the term of the members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is defined right in the Bill, which is somewhat contrary to the practice that he espoused only yesterday in dealing with the membership of the appointees of the Centennial Corporation. He may think one way and his neighbour on his left may think the other way, but at least they ought to be able to agree on what is the accepted practice of the way things are being done, because yesterday he stated it one way and today the Honourable the Minister of Education brought in a Bill the other way which determined the exact term of office, which makes a good deal more sense than that statement of policy which was enunciated by the Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

Incidentally, another amendment apparently will involve a maximum of three terms, and I think that's a good idea because I don't think a Board of Governors, a part-time appointment should be one where a person acquires so much depth of knowledge and experience where it becomes a vested interest of his, where he feels that this is something personal to him, an institution that he owns. I think it's vital that there should be movement in and out, there should be experience of course, but it should not be frozen so that people will stay there for a long time, and too long a time, but rather there should be changes in points of view.

The powers of the Board concern me to some extent. The Board is the governing body of course, but the Leader of the Liberal Party mentioned, and he was right, that the real control is financial control and that does not rely on the Board of Governors in any event. There is another council altogether with the powers to control finance. We discussed last year the extent to which they had power and which some of us thought were too extensive, but even then there are certain powers of the Board in this Bill which I feel ought to be examined carefully.

Now the powers are, in general, proper. One of them is to exercise disciplinary jurisdiction over students, with power to fine, suspend or expel. I'm not sure just what is intended in terms of fine. I don't know whether there would be a financial fine imposed on students by the Board, and I recognize that the Board should have the ultimate power, but I would like to see spelled out in the Bill, in the Act, certain requisites before the Board would exercise its powers to fine, suspend or expel.

Mr. Speaker, we have gone a long way past the concept of capital punishment, and let me suggest to the Honourable the Minister of Education that the word "expel" is akin to chop his head off, because a student in university who is expelled may have great difficulty in moving to any other university, and expulsion to that student may be a final decision, a final step in his career which would affect him for life, and one which cannot be taken lightly. I'm not suggesting the Board would deal lightly with it, but I feel that we are entitled to know that a decision by the Board of such magnitude as an expulsion would only be done after proper precautions and care have been taken. I would like to see written into this Bill, when it comes to the question of expulsion, a sort of a little bill of Civil Rights which would guarantee to any student who is affected by that the right of representation and the right of an open hearing and the right of investigation and the right to be present whilst all evidence is brought in, and it is certainly not in the Bill.

I would like to see a guarantee that no student will be arbitrarily dealt with or will be dealt with only on the recommendation of, let us say, the senate or a faculty or some other administrative officer, because I have sat on boards where the temptation is too great, when you meet infrequently and you have a great deal of business, to rubber stamp things that come through. I'm not suggesting for a moment that there would be rubber stamping on the part of this Board, I would hope that they were much too intelligent and well-intentioned people to lend themselves to it, and yet I for one would feel much more secure if it were in the Bill, that there would be some sort of guarantee just like in any other trial that takes place, that there would be proper representation, that a person would be presumed to be innocent until proven guilty of whatever conduct there was that involved disciplinary action.

Moving on, there's a section dealing with dismissal of an member of the academic staff,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) and I don't see in this - and I haven't studied all the implications of the wording - but I don't see here a real security of tenure. I don't quite see a real protection to the academic who is in danger of being dismissed. Sure, it's in accordance with bylaws, rules, etc., but nevertheless it seems to me there should be some understanding that a person who is in the academic field, in the highest institution of learning, should have a great deal of freedom of movement, a great deal of mobility in the approach he takes to society, without having the fear of any form of dismissal or other form of discipline that might be imposed on him. And I speak now, knowingly of the fact that people in the institutions of higher learning have independent ideas, are entitled to freedom of expression, have the right and must have the right to speak their minds on many issues which may be contrary to that of the board of governors or of the Establishment generally. And I would like to have seen - and I know that this Bill was written, according to the Minister, by university people - a guarantee of a fair and proper review of all circumstances before dismissal takes place.

Now I'd like to see it in the Bill, and I haven't seen it, Mr. Speaker, I'm not saying it's not there because the Bill is rather extensive. I think I've read it carefully. I've tried to lend my time to it but we all know that we have been rushed and I am excusing myself in advance if I've overlooked it, but I have not seen it, and I would like to see it; I would like to see it pointed out to me; and if it does not exist, I would like to appeal to the Minister to see that it goes in, because this is something I think that is very important. It's vital that the institution, the largest institution of higher learning in this province, does give to the people who are involved in his day to day work, a feeling of security that their job is to teach, and that any discipline or discharge is something which is subject to substantial review, to appeal, to reconsideration in the finest principles and methods that we know in all our courts that deal with disciplinary measures.

Now, moving on to a similar principle but one which does not deal with academics and is therefore obviously much less important, and that's the section dealing with removal of members of the board. It gives to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the right to remove appointed members, for cause, ahead of the term. Now, the term is - it's a terminable term; it's a three-year term. What possible need would there be for the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to remove one of these people? What could one of these people do - that is the appointed people, not the elected people - that would cause them to be removed? I hate to conjecture what it could be because I might be very unkind to whoever drew the Act, or to the government itself, which has reserved to itself this right to remove them, so I won't conjecture. But I will ask the question: where is it spelled out in this Bill just what cause is sufficient or adequate cause, or indeed where is it spelled out in this Bill that the cause has to be described in any way or has to be measured by anybody but the persons who impose the sentence? In this case, the persons who say "You shall be removed," presumably will say, "The decision is made for cause." And this to me is not clear and certainly ought to be more fully clarified.

Now, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the senate, the Honourable the Minister has given us the benefit of the information that the senate will consist of about 80 people. I'm glad he did, because it's hard to know how many there would be if one did not know exactly how many faculties there are and how many of the various institutions mentioned in the membership list. But there were 80 - I believe that's correct, that he said that there will be 80 in the senate. I think by coincidence maybe, there will also be approximately 80 in the Council, but I'm quoting him on the senate. Out of those 80, six will be students - he has corrected me by saying seven and he may be right. I read six persons elected from amongst the students but possibly - oh, yes, in addition the President of the Students Union; seven out of 80 will be elected in one way or another by the students, and surely the Minister says, "Well, in that way, and as members of the senate, there is a possibility", - I don't know if he will use stronger words than that - "that a student will be on the Board of Governors," and I say: nonsense! If seven out of 80 are representative of the students, what likelihood is there that one of them will form part of the six elected from the 80? Seven-eighths of six is 42/80ths, so we may have a half a person there on the "rep by pop" basis representing the students. I think it's very unlikely, and if it is possible then the possibility is too remote, so I come back to the original point, that I think that the students, who represent by far the largest population of people, the largest number of people involved in the institution, that they should be guaranteed representation on the board. And the guarantee should not be based on the nebulous and

MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) the possible but I think not probable basis that one of them will be elected by the Senate to the membership of the Board of Governors. And, as I've indicated, I think it's important they should. Whether it's to keep the other members honest or whether just to make sure that there's sufficient exposure, there is good reason for it.

One other point, which may not be too vital but it is probably to some, and I wonder about the validity of it, is that the senate may only elect to the Board of Governors from amongst its members, a person who is a full-time member of the faculty. Even to the senate itself you cannot apparently be a member of the -- that's right; you cannot be a member of the senate unless you are a full-time member of the faculty, and certainly there must be quite a number of people who are dedicated in the interest of education on this level and in their faculties, who are only part-time, who may be giving of their time freely and at great expense from their other occupations to be part-time lecturers, but who are denied admission on the senate, and I would like the Minister to think about the importance -- his own profession has a number of people who are sacrificing a great deal of economic return -- and I'm not worried about that -- but the fact is they are, in order to participate in the field of education in the Faculty of Medicine, and they will be denied membership on the senate because of the provision in the Bill which says that only a full-time member of a faculty may be a member of the senate.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in order to move on, I want to refer to the University and Community Council. The idea sounds good. How it will work out is something that remains to be seen. I can't be too enthusiastic about its possibilities. I see that it will consist of some 80 people, of whom 30 approximately are appointed because of the positions they hold in the University itself or by and through the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and 50 who are appointed by those 30 -- which is probably all right because once they have to appoint 50 they would probably look for people in the Province of Manitoba who would be interested in working on this. The powers that they have are adequate for the purpose set out as to its duty. How they operate is very important and that's a question of just what funds are made available to them, how often they meet, how dedicated will the people be who sponsor this group to see to it that they do meet, because in my opinion, one of the drawbacks, one of the criticisms that I have of our University of Manitoba, is that it has only recently started to play a role in the community of Manitoba. For too long a time, I think, it has been an institution removed from the community and not a part of the community. For too long a time, I think, have the members of the faculty, the senate, been too much involved in the academic life and not enough involved in the communal life, and I think we have a right to expect that from the University community will be the greatest stimulus for our cultural advancement in this province, for our inquiring minds of the people, who are not necessarily and maybe never were students. And I would hope that with this concept of the Council, the University will play a much larger role in the community as a vital part of the community than it has played up to now. So that I endorse this creation of the Community Council for the University, and I hope that it will be provided with sufficient funds to do a job and I don't expect there'll be payment made to them, but that there should be sufficient funds and sufficient interest of the University people to keep it going and make the members of that council feel that they are playing a real role in relating the University to the community of which it forms part.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you didn't see the Minister when he rose.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . and patiently listening. I think the big thing in bringing forward this Bill if the -- some of the points that have been made -- the idea of the University and Community Council consisting of wide representation of the University community and hopefully a wide representative group from the community appointed by -- as you note in the Bill -- really the University people themselves involving our community. I think, though, that in defence of our University, I can't quite concur with the remarks from the Member from St. John's saying the University has for too long been completely removed from the community. I think in fairness to the University, the function of the Board until this last couple of years has been most difficult for the President. The senate was composed of representatives of the now University of Winnipeg and Brandon, St. John's, St. Pauls, the University proper. The only communication between the board and the academic body has been the President, and I think he's carried an exceedingly heavy load, and I think a tremendous step forward in aid of secondary education has occurred in this past year, with the formation of two new universities, the creation of their own senate, the rationalization of our senate at our major University, and

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) now the reform of this entire structure to make it work more efficiently. And in the field of agriculture, the former member from Lakeside well knows of the impact of the School of Agriculture in this province, and the School of Medicine in this province; they haven't been removed from the people; they have done a noble job. But there are certain -- I'm sure it depends on the individuals; it depends on other factors at the best of times. But in defence of the University, I thought I should make those few comments.

I think the problem facing the committee, who spent two years looking at the composition of the board with respect to student representation, was that in giving academic representation, to give students direct representation involved them in some problems; namely, the Deans Council might wish a special representative; the several colleges on campus might want special representatives; and by giving certain -- I did want to avoid the possibility of . . . know how to put the word - power blocs within Senate or groups within Senate being appointed on the basis of membership to a particular element or body on the university campus, and they came down on the side of this recommendation to us.

With respect to some of the finer points raised by the Member from St. John's, I think with respect to removal without cause the amendment that I'm proposing talks about the just cause being absenteeism from board meetings. I think this is going to be written in in the amendment to the Act. I know of no other cause for removing a member of the Board from the staff unless it were -- it's never happened in my time and I can't think of anything this evening, or on my feet, but certainly it's a point I could try and check up on further. The security of tenure. I'm not sure if all this is included in the bylaws of the senate, which are extensive. I would like to check those bylaws and report to the members possibly in committee, where we'll have some representations.

Part-time people on the senate. Now whether this is in the bylaws I'm not sure, but I think that it might be useful to point out at this time that really every faculty at the University, curriculum committees and so on, is made up of students and staff, and really these faculty councils with wide student representation report to Senate. Senate receives the committee, the minutes of all, the recommendations of the several faculty committees. This is really what Senate deals with. So students have massive representation in that area - curriculum, academic, what have you - the Senate deals with these. And so, I would think that part-time people must be involved at this level but I would like to get further details.

I don't think there's anything more I can say at this time in closing debate on second reading. No doubt we'll have some representations, and some of the questions asked I will attempt to get further information for the honourable members.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 114. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for the Honourable Member from Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have very few remarks to make about this Bill but not something that I can dismiss.

The part that I wished to discuss, Mr. Speaker, was the legal aid program, and it certainly is something that this party, and I think all members of the House, are going to favour but it's one of the occasions when I feel that I have to somehow suggest my own position in voting for it.

Now Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, approximately a week ago, that if there was a scheme whereby the people of this province undertook to be responsible for the defence of an individual in the same way as they are for his prosecution, that I as a lawyer would be prepared to work under it. That, of course, Mr. Speaker, would be a concept which I think is not something which can be at this particular time introduced successfully in our society, and even though I agree with the principle of it, it's not something that I would make an issue of at this time. The government has seen fit to present a scheme whereby legal aid will be provided to people who can't afford it so that they could properly protect themselves in the case that they are charged with a crime. I look on this type of scheme as being a move in the direction of social responsibility for the defence of people accused with crime, and on that basis I certainly am going to support it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that in the long run, however, we have to recognize a principle in practice that we are continually mouthing as a matter of principle, and that is that everybody charged with an offence is innocent - innocent, that is, until proven guilty. I'm convinced

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) that although lawyers say it and although most of the citizens of our society say it, that they really don't believe it. They really have the attitude of the juror who said to his fellow juror, when the principle was expounded to him that the man in the docket is innocent until proven guilty, "Well, if that's so, what's he doing in the docket? This is a difficulty, Mr. Speaker, which I don't think we're ever going to -- that's a long time. I think that we will eventually overcome it; I think that gradually we take a more proper attitude towards people who are charged with criminal offences; we don't regard them as criminals before they are convicted.

I would like to recall to the Attorney-General in particular, because I'm sure that probably he went through the same courses I did, the work of Samuel Butler, entitled "Erewhon", and in Erewhon Butler attempts to demonstrate some of the fallacies of our thinking with regard to matters such as crime and health and he compares the two, and in Erewhon a person who was diseased or who fell victim to a cold or any other condition which required medical care, was punished. He was actually either incarcerated or even had corporal punishment administered to him because the people of Erewhon believed that the condition of one's health is something that everybody has the power to deal with; that nobody should catch cold; that nobody should let himself be infected by diseases such as would be caused by cigarettes or other things which we know are going to cause us trouble and yet we continue to do it. And therefore, having the power to avoid these things, if we fell victim to it we should be punished, and the logic of the position, although it didn't carry through to diseases over which people had no control, did not get through to the people of Erewhon who continued to punish people regardless of whether they had control over their actions or didn't have control over their actions, as long as they were what we call "sick". On the other hand, these same citizens, when a person was found to have interfered with somebody else's property or done any of the things that we in this society regard as a crime, he was treated by a physician and pitied and dealt with very sympathetically, and everything that could be done to comfort such a person was done. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that Butler intended that this should be the way in which we should look upon either health or crime, but I think he intended to demonstrate that the way we do look upon these conditions is wrong and for that reason he attempted to show exactly what the reverse situation was so that it would more clearly demonstrate our own fallacious attitude.

I don't intend to dwell on this a great deal more. I do indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we see no difficulty at the present time in spending a great deal of money administering the law which prosecutes people. I know it's a radical thought to suggest that we would also pay money to defend them. This is a move in that direction. There is still a long way to go but we're still relatively young even in this area of sociology. I congratulate the Minister for what he's done but in voting for the Bill I would like to register at least my opinion that there is indeed a long way to go.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 109. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have not completed this Bill, not checked all the sections, but I am prepared to let it go to committee and bring in any remarks at the time that we consider it in committee.

There are various matters dealt with in this particular Bill. Actually it deals with, I think, some 37 different bills or Acts that we're amending, and I think a bill of this type should come into the House much earlier than always having it done on the last or second last day of a session. I know last year there were important amendments made on the Bill when it came into the House which in my opinion were not minor matters at all. The parts that I have scrutinized this year I think are not as important. However, I notice that we are correcting or condoning and also endorsing a number of amendments which are made retroactive for a number of years - there are some going back to 1964 - and I think some of these should have been caught much earlier than here we are in 1968, four years later, so I feel these things are not very good, certainly aren't good in my opinion, and should have been caught much earlier.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Now we go to Page 10?

MR. LYON: Page 10, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings - Public Bills. No. 58. The Honourable Member for

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, by leave, I withdraw this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed) No. 84. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill) presented Bill No. 84, an Act to amend an Act respecting the Incorporation of the Town of Thompson, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: I have a question to ask of the mover, in any case.

MR. BEARD: I thought it was getting late, Mr. Speaker, but -- in any case, Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to get up and talk about northern Manitoba.

I might point out, first of all, that the Town of Thompson is in northern Manitoba, in the heart of northern Manitoba. The point, I believe, the real point that we would like to consider in this Bill would be the section which states that the boundaries of the town and the school district may be altered or amended from time to time by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council with consent of the company. The reasoning behind this Bill, Mr. Speaker, was that they found that the town itself and the accommodation has exceeded the area that was set aside on one part of the river, and it was either to go across and develop the other side of the river or continue on in respect to taking over other properties that were within the Local Government District of Mystery Lake and were controlled by the International Nickel Company.

The International Nickel Company in making a proposition "to the Local Government District of Mystery Lake and to the Town of Thompson" suggested that they would give up certain properties adjoining the Town of Thompson and within the Local Government District of Mystery Lake so that that property which would be immediately adjacent to the town could be joined on to the community and developed. This area would accommodate approximately 7,000 people and would be done on an immediate basis. In fact, I understand they are getting along with the development now. The purpose of this, of course, was to allow an orderly development of the community and to carry it out as quickly as possible. Thompson has continued to expand and it is quite evident that the expansion itself has been accelerated to a degree that is far quicker than the International Nickel Company expected or the government or the Town of Thompson. And if they were to consider the expansion on the other side of the river at this time, then it would have increased the cost, for one thing, because of the development of the necessary services such as water and sewer on the other side of the river, the building of two new bridges, and a cost which would be well over and above what it would cost to continue on in this orderly type of development.

When I first looked at the Bill, I checked back with the original incorporation of the town and there is not a great deal of difference. I would ask, if possible, if the Clerk could send up the bill of Thompson. The legislation is referred -- it's 87 -- well, it was Chapter 87. In referring back to it, we did find that in the original incorporation as a town it stated that -- pardon me for just a moment, please. In Section 3, Chapter 3, No. 2, it says, "The boundaries of the town and the school district shall not be altered or amended without the consent of the Government and the company -- I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, it's important to the Town of Thompson.

I did feel that in reviewing this, and I am suggesting that during the committee that I would like to bring an amendment in to this so that in Section 2 it would read: "the boundaries of the town and the school district may be altered or amended from time to time by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council with consent of the Company and the Council of the Town of Thompson and the Local Government District of Mystery Lake." I felt that these amendments would be in order to assure that all peoples involved were being consulted before boundaries of the Town of Thompson were changed at any future date, because while we agree that this is good for the Town of Thompson at this time, then certainly we must think about the future, and especially where there can be deletions or they can be altered or amended in future dates.

I don't know whether there are any other parts of the Bill that should be considered. I felt that this was the important part of it and I would commend it to the Legislature, because this would allow for the orderly development of Thompson and adding on approximately accommodation for 7,000 persons on an immediate basis.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his explanation, but frankly after listening to it, I still cannot see why we should be proceeding with a Bill of this sort. I cannot

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) understand the purpose, in having set up Thompson as a town by an Act of this Legislature in 1966, and now to be proposing an amendment which says that the town will have no control over its own boundaries; it would be up to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and the company. The previous amendment, or the previous section which I had before me - the member now has it - has the council responsible for any boundary changes. It also stated that they had to have the consent of the government and the consent of the company, and while this was somewhat unusual I suppose in a town charter, there are some reasons there. Because of the origins of the town, because of its financial arrangements with the company, because of the fact that all of the land surrounding Thompson in any case is Crown land, I think there is some logic for saying before the Council can proceed -- in fact from a purely practical standpoint, they couldn't extend without the consent of the government because the government owns the land, so this is the long and the short of it.

But to come along now and amend this and to say, but now the Council has nothing to do with this, the government is going to make all the decisions in consultation with the company, the council neither initiates nor has any control over it nor will they be consulted, appears to me to be a very bad practice, Mr. Speaker. I just can not see why we should proceed in this way. Why can it not be done the same way as it was in the past? Let the council initiate it, let them have the agreement with the company and the government, but let the council be its own master.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the explanation from the other side and I was kind of befuddled by the way it was brought on. Here this thing is being perpetuated again. It was done in '66, and it was voiced from this side that they didn't like it. That thing is brought back right now in the same manner. I say we talk about the north, we talk about doing things for the north. I like to hear that coming from the other side there. They talk about doing things and then they stifle. Here's a baby in swaddling clothes - awhile back - now it becomes a young lad and he wants to stand on his own two feet, but grandparents and parents say no, you can't do that son, we'll look after you - or foster parents or whatever you might call them - we'll look after you; you don't know enough to look after yourself. There is no chance for that young lad to go along and do something for himself. Now I say to come in with something like this, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council with the consent of the company -- well my gosh; I don't know.

I lived in an area where the county council was in command and they were the ones that said everything there. There was big mining companies in there, had hundreds of men working for them, but the county council itself -- and the county council was as powerful as this Chamber here. But each town was a municipal in itself and I say we can do the same with northern Manitoba, but it seems that we don't want to give them any freedom or leeway whatsoever. So I say that I'll let this Bill go along into committee and I know that our people -- (Interjections) -- All right, let them go along because we are going to argue about it. But anyway, we are voicing our opinion here and we are against this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Just in case there are any misunderstandings, my honourable colleague from Logan I am sure was misunderstood, that we are opposing the Bill based on the fact that there is a principle contained within this Bill that establishes the equality, insofar as legislation, with a private corporation with that of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. We feel, as my colleague so adequately pointed out, that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and this Legislative Assembly should be the body that decides on extension of municipal boundaries, such as we are having to do with the Town of Souris and others, without the consent of any private corporation. That's what my colleague from Logan established adequately well, and we're opposed to this principle. The government can buy the suggestion of the Member for Churchill if they like, but we want this Assembly and/or the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to make its decision based on the democratic process and not by acquiescence of any private corporation, which should not be done, and my colleague pointed that out very adequately.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if I might just direct a question to the government side, I see there is at least one former Minister of Municipal Affairs here. Unfortunately, the Minister herself is not in. I would like to know whether the government can make us aware, or indeed the Honourable Member for Churchill who brought this motion, this Bill, if there are other Acts on our statutes that empowers this type of expansion of municipal boundaries other than by spelling it out in a statute as we have in the bills mentioned by my honourable leader.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) Just for my own information I would like to know whether there is anything in the statute books, ranging all the way back to whenever they want, that has a similar type of provision which will change the boundaries of a municipality other than by statute.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 80. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 80, An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956 (2), for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, there are two matters in this Bill. One would permit the city to provide commercial rental space in any parking structure it might build to preserve the character or to complement the use of the surrounding area or in order to assist in defraying the operating costs of the building, with the city to have this commercial space on the ground floor at street level or on floors below street level. The area is not to exceed one-third of the total area of the entire building and the city would be able to construct such a parking building with this limited commercial space without the approval of the ratepayers, as is now the case in respect of a parking building with no commercial space.

The other point in the Bill is that it reduces the time after which the city is entitled to demolish a building that has been placarded as unsanitary from 12 months to 6 months after the building has been placarded. The reason for this of course is that if you have an unsanitary building that's been let go to rack and ruin, it brings down the value of the properties in the neighbourhood; it becomes a fire hazard; kids get into it and it becomes a regular nuisance to the neighbourhood; and the city would like to have these unsanitary buildings demolished in the lesser time if the owner is not going to repair them and put them back into proper shape. Although this Bill reduces the time from 12 months to 6 months in effect, because of the time that the engineering department takes to give another notice and tear down the building, it really reduces the time from about 16 months to about 10 months, so that the owner certainly has ample opportunity to put the building in shape or to tear it down himself before it is torn down by the city.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): I have several reservations on this Bill 80, but because I wish to hear the explanation from the city officials I will support it at second reading, but only for that reason.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): . . . reservations on Bill No. 80 I will allow it to go to second reading and we will hear representations, but with the definite understanding that we have reservations on Bill No. 80.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 107. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 107, an Act to amend The Municipal Act (3), for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in recent years there have been various methods of holding title and acquiring equity in property devised. One of those was the condominium that we have just recently discussed; another one is the concept of co-operative housing which has been discussed in the last number of years.

The co-op housing concept consists of a co-operative owning a parcel of land with any number of housing units on it, and for a person to acquire an equity interest in the housing co-op the person becomes a member and pays into the co-op an amount equivalent to the equity required for that portion of the development which is his, that is the housing unit which he occupies, and he thus acquires an equity through membership equivalent to the down payment on that housing unit, and of course the balance of the cost of that particular unit of housing is paid by mortgage on which he makes payments. In effect, this person is the owner of a portion of a housing development consisting of the unit which he occupies, and is acquiring an equity

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) first by his down payment; and secondly, by his monthly payments which are applied on account of, of course, the upkeep, the running expense, and on account of principal and interest and taxes - principal and interest on the mortgage and municipal taxes.

Now this Legislature recognized two years ago the fact that this concept was not covered by the existing law, and I forget which Minister it was that brought the motion, but a Bill was brought in two years ago which recognized the concept of equity ownership by a member of a co-op who was resident therein, in that school tax rebate was made available to that person and to the co-op based on the individual members rather than accepting the concept of a maximum of \$50 which you will recall was in the Act.

It was learned that the present law as it stands did not cover the right of these people to vote on money by-laws as ratepayers. Even though they had an equity interest in land and were thus paying taxes and acquiring a greater equity, they did not qualify as ratepayers, and the purpose of this Bill is only to qualify resident members of co-operatives to be classified as ratepayers for voting on money by-laws. There are some who I think know that I don't believe in the concept of voting on money by-laws generally, but once we have that concept then surely these people are equally entitled to vote as ratepayers as if the actual certificate of title were issued in their name. Who knows but that when this condominium legislation goes through they could transfer their form of title into a condominium form and that way would be qualified. So that I would suggest that this is a proper case for this and I would commend it to the House for passing into committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, the right to vote on money by-laws, as you know, has been granted to persons who are British subjects, who are 21 years of age, who have been a resident in the municipality for a period of 6 months, who own a freehold estate and land in a municipality having a value of at least \$400 and is rated as such in the latest revised assessment roll of the municipality, and a person who is a spouse of a person so entitled when the freehold estate in land that is assessed to that person is assessed at a value of at least \$800.

Now the right to vote on a municipal money by-law therefore is a personal right granted to the owners of property. Corporations, as such, do not have the right to vote on municipal money by-laws. The amendment which is being proposed in this Bill could deem each shareholder in a co-operative housing corporation to be a person entitled to vote on money-by-laws by reason of his ownership of stock in the corporation. This amendment, to me, would be discriminatory in that it deems the shareholder of a co-operative housing corporation to be a ratepayer but does not similarly extend ratepayer rights to shareholders of other corporations. A member of a housing co-operative is a shareholder of a corporation and the corporation is the property owner; the shareholder is not.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have some reservations on this Bill. I am not proposing that it does not go to Law Amendments so that we might hear representations on it, but I do say to you that I do have reservations on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I close debate on this. I certainly will try my best not to say anything to antagonize the Minister who has indicated that she is prepared to permit this to go into Law Amendments. May I only plead with her to look back into her own vote when she dealt with the question of the school tax rebate and the reasoning which she must have had in support of it, or that of the Honourable the First Minister who I believe was the one that approved of it at that time, to accept the concept and to recognize that a co-operative is not a corporation in the sense that she was speaking. And just to look back into the entire question of just how one qualifies to become a member - she uses the word shareholder, I don't know where she made up that word because there is no such thing in my recollection as a shareholder of a co-operative, and as such, I am afraid -- (Interjection) -- Well, I mean in this sense, that a member resident, a resident member of a co-operative is a person who qualifies in a different way than does a person who buys shares in a corporation of a public or private nature.

So I'm happy that she's prepared to take this into committee so that we could discuss it further. Certainly if it needs any clarification, that's fine too. But to set up a concept of shareholding in corporations to be the same comparable situation as that of member residents of a co-operative housing unit is, I think, not a recognition of the true nature of the holding of

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) this person.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 108. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre,

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 108, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (3), for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, there are two matters in this Bill. One removes the limitation of \$8,000 on the aggregate of the amount the Winnipeg School Division may grant to teachers to enable them to take special courses.

The other would allow the Boards of Trustees to employ teachers' aides who have the right to impose discipline. In employing teachers' aides, I think they have in mind employing teachers' aides who would help to maintain discipline and control the children before school opens in the morning and during the lunch hour periods.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, one question I'd like to pose here, and kind of puzzles me, is why this Bill was introduced by a government backbencher? I just can't see the reason for an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (3) it's an important Act - and so on and it was introduced by Mr. Cowan, it says here, and that's what I wonder.

As far as the two principles in the Bill are concerned, the increase in the aggregate grant for special courses as to teachers, I know that this applies only to the Winnipeg School Division - no others, I understand. I understand that the teachers have asked for that.

And the next one, teachers' aides - call them aides or call them policemen, whatever you wish - I know that the teachers were complaining that at some periods when they have their own breaks for lunch and so on and before they come that they should have some aide there, but I'm just wondering what effect it would have on the pupils when you have other people than teachers policing the students. Will these teachers' aides be teachers in fact who understand the children and understand the discipline and psychology going along with that, or simply any person who doesn't understand the children. I'm a bit concerned about that, but at the present time I'm not opposing it. But I'm just wondering - these two - why by a backbencher and what kind of people will these police be?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, there is one provision within this Bill, and that is dealing with the matter of teachers' aides having the right to impose discipline, is something which is a matter which has been a subject of negotiations between teachers and different school boards for quite some time. I think that both teachers and school boards have realized that there are certain functions, certain activities within the operation of a school which can be effectively discharged by people other than school teachers, but one of the stumbling blocks was this matter of the imposition of, or the taking of disciplinary measures if and when the need arises, and this deals in connection with supervision of lunch rooms, supervision of playgrounds, and in some areas in fact adults perform the role of school patrols. Here we have children, and in some communities adults do that and no doubt do that job very effectively.

However, it's unfortunate that the Honourable Minister of Education isn't in his seat because I would like to hear his opinion on this matter. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill really expresses that to which we wish to give effect. The Bill calls for, or speaks of teachers' aides having the same rights as a teacher to impose discipline. Now the teacher has the right to impose discipline but a teacher also has the right to set standards of discipline, to set such standards of discipline as he or she feels are necessary to make for effective teaching. Now I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is the intention that the teachers' aides also have such a right. Now perhaps the teachers' aide has the right to impose such standards of discipline as may be prescribed by the school, by the principal or by the teacher of whose class this aide may have charge at any given moment, but I do not believe that the teachers' aide has the right to impose such standards of discipline as he or she may feel inclined to do.

I would therefore strongly urge, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister of Education do take a close look at this Bill and do incorporate a statement within it which would limit the right of a teacher aide to that extent, that would give the teachers' aide the right to impose discipline but that would make it quite clear that it still remains the responsibility of the professional staff within the school to set and determine the standards of discipline which are to be imposed.

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

MR. FROESE: I just had a question. Are the teachers that are presently serving, do they not have the right to impose discipline on the students at the present time, or what is the particular reason behind this, asking for this provision?

Then, too, we note the explanatory notes at the bottom that the limitation of \$8,000 on the aggregate amount that can be spent for special courses in the way of grants to teachers will be eliminated. Are they not proposing any new limitation? Is this going to be wide open as to the amounts that they can spend for this purpose?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 105. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 105, an Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956 (3), for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, there are three matters in this Bill. One makes provision for giving the city the power to construct a pedestrian deck above a street, and it would be able to construct this deck with the consent of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg or with the approval of the Municipal Board over a street that is under the control of Metro. But it would only be constructed upon petition as a local improvement, that is a petition signed by the property owners who own 60 percent of the frontage along which this pedestrian deck would be constructed, and it is the people who have this local improvement constructed along the frontage of their property that would pay the cost of this pedestrian deck. The city have in mind the possibility of having such a pedestrian deck constructed above Graham Avenue.

Another amendment provides that the monthly interest rate would be three-quarters of one percent instead of one-half of one percent on taxes on properties that are sold at tax sale. If this change wasn't made, well then we would have penalties on arrears of taxes at three-quarters of one percent, and once they went into tax sale it would go down to one-half of one percent, so it complements the legislation that has already been approved in the other Bill by the Law Amendments Committee.

The third point in this Bill is a provision that provides that the city may carry out any projects to commemorate the centennial of the Province of Manitoba in 1970 by a project having an aggregate cost not to exceed \$1 million without obtaining the approval of the ratepayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, I must say that on this Bill I have some reservations. I'm willing to let it go for second reading, but with the understanding that we have reservations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will have much more to say about this Bill at the committee stage because we have to be concerned with the development of Greater Winnipeg as a municipal whole - at least in my opinion we have to be - and I'm just wondering whether we are talking about both having a project of this kind done by first of all one of the 13 municipalities in the area; and secondly, whether we are actually making a backward step in depending on local improvement petitions if this happens to be a good idea. If it's desirable from the point of view of making Winnipeg a dynamic, moving city in North America and this is a good project, then do we have to depend on a local improvement petition by a group of property owners to make it a good thing? Now I know that's the way things happened 50 years ago, but we're now living in 1968. We don't expect freeways to be paid for by local improvement petitions; we don't even expect metro streets to be paid for by local improvement petitions. I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we're opposing this Bill, but when we are talking about grandiose concepts of this kind - and certainly this is the kind of imaginative things that we should be thinking of - that they should not be brought in at the spur of the moment and without a great deal of thinking going into it, and therefore I would hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs would have a great deal to say about the concept of the Bill itself.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm opposed to the principle set out in 593 (b). You continually see communities or cities coming in and asking the Legislature to pass bills which they could look after themselves if they did not want to circumvent their Charters. This is

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) exactly what we see happen time and again, and I'm opposed to giving them the right to collect this \$1 million -- or get this \$1 million by circumventing their own Act.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm inclined to say that this section referred to by the Honourable Member for Rhineland is not the one to which the Honourable Minister alluded when she spoke of certain reservations. This government is slipping around freely between ratepayer approval and all sorts of acts that derogate from their principle of ratepayer approval, and I'm guessing that this is one that the government wouldn't dare submit to ratepayers for approval and will go along with it. And, of course, I agree that the concept of ratepayer approval is wrong.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we tried our best to eliminate the provision for the increase of the penalty on resident owner's property up to a certain extent, feeling as we did that a hardship was being created on a large number of people on fixed and low incomes due to the fact that they are the sufferers when a large number of investors are taking advantage of the penalty, the low interest rates which have been charged up to now, namely six percent per annum. We were given statistics to indicate that 28 out of, I think it's 4,200 bills, 4,600 bills (I thank the Honourable Member) were that of owner-occupied property, and some \$800,000 out of - I think it was some \$800,000 out of 3.2 million, I think it was, and I'm not sure of that figure; roughly it was 25 percent of the moneys were represented in those 2,800 bills which was money of owner-occupied property, and the proposal to raise the interest rate to nine percent is going to be a hardship on a number of people.

We proposed an amendment in committee to another bill which would have relieved the burden on those people and yet maintained the principle of preventing the advantage which was taken by investors of financing their operations in that way. The government rejected this. The government found that it would not go along with the proposal that we made. I'm mentioning it now to indicate that the matter received a rather full hearing in committee. I don't want to prolong the debate further on the same principle except to indicate my great disappointment that this government has seen fit to use a remedy for what was an abuse, and in doing so hurt a very large number of people in a way that will be hard for them to take, and that is to pay a penalty which will actually put a profit in the hands of the municipality because we were informed that municipalities now borrow at about seven percent per annum, whereas they will be charging nine percent. So I'm pointing that out in my deploring the attitude of the government in this respect, and I think that the Liberal Party was split on this but it seems to me the majority of them favored the proposal which we had made in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to point out that with regard to the Pedestrian Deck, this can only be constructed with the approval of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg or the Municipal Board as well as being a local improvement, so that considerable thought will certainly go into this proposed Deck before it is constructed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 86. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES presented Bill No. 86, an Act to establish The City of St. James-Assiniboia, to establish the St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2, and amend The St. James Charter, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I think a bill of this importance demands some brief comment. I would like to publicly congratulate the mayors, the councils and the school boards for the leadership and courage in coming to an agreement which has completed this Bill. I think perhaps, Mr. Speaker, a detailed explanation is not necessary because the majority of the Bill is self-explanatory and administrative, and secondly, since the councils made public their agreement in principle and some of the detail at the end of last February, there has been considerable coverage by press, radio and TV. However, perhaps you'd be interested if I gave just a thumbnail sketch, Mr. Speaker, of the past history.

It was in the end of 1919 that the Legislature was approached by the Council of Assiniboia requesting that the portion just west of Woodhaven be separated from Assiniboia. This was passed by this Legislature or this House in February 1920, and St. James, Rural Municipality of St. James was created. The reason, very briefly, was urbanization and in particular the area of Woodhaven which was at that time being developed into a soldiers' settlement creating

(MR. STANES cont'd.) considerable municipal costs for services. I might add there was no referendum and no referendum, as far as I can see, was requested. This Bill of course, for exactly the same reason, really, which is urbanization, is re-uniting the total unit.

It might be added, Mr. Speaker, that since that public announcement by the two councils, which was made unanimously by the two mayors at the end of February this year, they engaged Mr. G. Campbell MacLean as their lawyer and he had hundreds of meetings with the councils, individually and collectively, with the school boards, and this Bill is a product really of the detail of his discussions with these two bodies, so in other words we start off with agreement in principle, we then as third party an agreement in detail, and this Bill is completely agreed by all parties.

I might add that because nobody really can foresee the problems that might be anticipated, you will note there, Mr. Speaker, that there is Section 43 which allows the Cabinet to make changes at the request of the two councils and the school boards, provided it's within the spirit of the Act. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, during the sittings of this House there have been many meetings held by the councils individually and collectively, by Chambers of Commerce and other organizations, to inform the public and to answer questions. Unfortunately I was unable to attend but very few of them so I'm not as well informed as some of the public. However, I'll do my best to answer any questions that the members might have. I might add that both councils, both school boards, and the libraries have been informed of Law Amendments in the morning and they're going to make every attempt to turn out because they are in full support of this Bill and they have the information. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, since the intent of amalgamation was made public I believe this item has probably received more news than probably any other bill that's before the House at the present time, so I'm sure that many members here are quite familiar with it. As the Honourable Member for St. James has already mentioned, Assiniboia was one of the first municipalities given charter in 1877 under the County Municipal Act, but since that time there has been breakaways and the first one to break away from Assiniboia boundaries is now what is called Charleswood, and later on - I believe between 1919 and 1921, St. James broke away and was formed at that time. I think the councils, as everybody is familiar, in the City of St. James and the council members of the Municipality of Assiniboia got together and agreed to join to form the new city called the St. James-Assiniboia.

I personally favour this union of these two areas and since both are in very good financial position I think that this would allow this city to expand. If the Bill is passed, I believe the combination of the two areas would make St. James-Assiniboia the second largest city in Manitoba, with almost 70,000 people. I may also say at this time that there are some people that are concerned about this amalgamation and I trust that there will be time given to advise these people. I have to inform some of these myself, to let them know when the Bill will be before Law Amendments so they can come up here and present their petitions and speak before Law Amendments so that all the members of this House are familiar with the arguments for and against.

The people that are somewhat concerned are probably the ones on the outside of the Perimeter Highway and towards Headingley, because they feel they may still have to pay the same taxes as inside of the Perimeter; at the same time they have not the same facilities as water and sewers, as sewer connections and facilities closer in, in the built-up areas. So I do say that it should go to Law Amendments and all the people should be made aware when it's going to be before Law Amendments so that people can make their presentations at that time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker. Thank you. I don't know if we're in a hurry. We want to stay here till we get finished. Well, let's not rush. -- (Interjection) -- No, I wish to speak and get it over with.

Mr. Speaker, we have here an Act of partial amalgamation in the City of Metropolitan Winnipeg. I had hoped to hear something from the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Urban Affairs on this Bill, what the policy of the government is, but she had nothing to say. To begin with, Mr. Speaker, the Bill as written, technically seems fine to me. I have no objections to it; I have no objections to amalgamation as such; but it seems to me that there is something not correct when the Bill itself presents a "whereas" which is not in conformity with what it is doing. It says: "and Whereas the Boundaries Commission is to make recommendation with

(MR. FOX cont'd.) regard to amalgamation of certain areas, it is not the intent of the councils of the City of St. James or the Rural Municipality of Assiniboia, or the trustees, etc., to interfere in any way whatsoever." But this Bill does interfere, because we do not know what that Boundaries Commission is going to recommend, what kind of boundaries, what kind of amalgamations, and so we are proceeding partially to do that anyway.

So therefore I say, Mr. Speaker, although I have no objections to the amalgamation of the two areas themselves, I still think that it isn't really proper for us to go about piecemeal in amalgamating this city from one end of the area to the other. Who knows, in a couple of months' time we'll have a petition for another area to start doing the same thing; six months later another municipality may decide to do the same thing. In the meantime, we have a Boundaries Commission which is supposed to be doing this work. And this government here hasn't told us whether it approves or disapproves or anything else, and I think that we should hear from them and let us know what the policy is in this regard. Do they believe in amalgamation or don't they? Do they believe in this helter-skelter hit-or-miss way of amalgamation, catch-as-catch-can? I think that we should be told. That's what we're here for - to legislate properly, not let things happen. Somebody should take hold of this and plan something and give it direction and momentum. I think it's a sad state of affairs that we have the problem of amalgamation at the present time, and we have the friction that is created between the corporation and the various municipalities, and it's strictly the fault of the government that we have it, because when they set up the Metropolitan Corporation they made no provision whatsoever to phase out the municipalities which the corporation was supposed to take over, some of the services, etc., so this is what has created our problem today.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that debate be adjourned. -- (Interjection) -- People are coming to speak on this tomorrow morning? Mr. Speaker, I consider this to be a very important piece of legislation and I'd like to debate it in full, but I don't think that I can do that at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has moved the adjournment.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 106. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) presented Bill No. 106, an Act respecting The Town of Souris, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have one or two questions I'd like to ask of the honourable sponsor of this Bill. If he's going to make an explanation of it, possibly I won't have to ask questions. I must say, Mr. Speaker, I think that at this stage in the House, irrespective of the fact that we're racing toward adjournment, the sponsors of bills should at least introduce them properly.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think, my honourable friend has now spoken. My honourable friend will be closing the debate.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken at all. I raised the question as to whether the honourable sponsor was going to introduce the bill properly or not, and my honourable friend -- I know it's a little late for my friend to be up of his own choosing. All I asked was whether the member was going to speak to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, if it'll please the Honourable Member for Radisson, I'll just tell him in a few short words what's in this Bill. If anybody who's ever been in the Town of Souris comes down over the big long swinging bridge, you come across this area, Idylwild. It was formerly in the Municipality of Glenwood. These people have now -- it's their wish that they be put in the Town of Souris, like that old Idylwild area moved into the Town of Souris. The Municipality of Glenwood have agreed to this; the Town of Souris have agreed to this; the Boundaries Commission have agreed to it; and we're all waiting and hoping that the Legislature will also agree to it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, this proves my point, that it's so worthwhile for the sponsor of a bill in this Assembly to point out what really is involved in a bill. By reading the bill that is before us, one did not know, as the Honourable Member has pointed out, that the residents concerned were well satisfied with the change of the boundaries; one did not know what the attitude of the Boundaries Commission was in respect of the change in the municipal

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) boundaries. Now that the honourable member has explained this as he should, despite the admonitions of the Attorney-General, we're in a better position to consider the Bill, and I have no objections of the Bill going to second reading because I did want to know. -- (Interjection) -- You know, the later the evening gets, some of these youngsters around this Assembly become more impatient, more obnoxious and less effective, and I'm thinking primarily of the one who has the responsibility of the conducting of the affairs of this Assembly, namely, the House Leader. -- (Interjection) -- No, I don't know what section it is, but it's so true, Mr. Speaker, that even you would accept it as part of any bill that's before the Assembly at this particular time, and . . . -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Stay good-natured until tomorrow afternoon.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, of course. My honourable friend the Minister of Education and myself will be pairing tomorrow morning to see our daughters graduate from St. John's College, and we will be there. I might say I think this will be the first official pairing during the session. However, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne for his explanation; we've no objections to the Bill now. And I trust and hope, I trust and hope that other members will follow his example and speak to the bill on introduction.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I will try to accommodate the honourable members in speaking briefly and not adjourning the Bill. I note here that there are arrears that the town will have to accept immediately on the Bill going into effect. I also note that there are a number of former bills or acts repealed. Do these acts contain nothing else than the description of the town? Is that what these other acts contain? And that they can be repealed? I certainly haven't checked back on them and I don't know how a person could go about checking back on all those former acts. I notice that there will be no award made either so that it's a clean sweep here and that any liabilities are being accepted as is.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 101. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 101, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of the Winnipeg School Division Number One, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, this would permit the trustees to invest the Pension Fund in broader fields and it would be almost similar to an amendment that was made to the City Charter a few years ago with reference to the Civic Pension Fund.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I know that when one reads this legislation one would immediately assume that the securities that are mentioned are obviously securities that have been looked into and that there could never be any problems with them because they have such high-sounding names. In particular, the securities that are authorized are "the bonds, debentures or other evidences of indebtedness of a Canadian corporation that are authorized under the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act (Canada) as that Act is or shall be amended from time to time as investments in which insurance companies in Canada may invest."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that happens to be very coincidentally almost identical to the wording of a prospectus of a corporation that I'm not going to name, but the prospectus reads as follows: "In the opinion of counsel, these 6-1/4 percent debenture Series E and F will be investments in which the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act states that companies registered under Part 3 thereof may, without availing themselves for that purpose of the provisions of subsection (4) of Section 63 of the Act, invest their funds."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the provision is exactly the same but I think that it's intended to be the same. If it's not, then I hope that the Member for Winnipeg Centre will tell me what the difference is, because this particular prospectus, Mr. Speaker, the prospectus was shown to me by a citizen of Winnipeg who bought \$20,000 in debentures of this particular company that is referred to in the prospectus, and now finds that he probably will not realize not only any interest, but he will not realize even the return of his capital, that is the monies that he invested in the company, because it's one of the companies that fell under in connection with the Prudential Acceptance failure that we all spoke about approximately a year ago and which gave rise to much of the deposit insurance legislation that we have in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know just how these permissible investments originate, but it seems

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) to me that investments which we are going to invest Pension Funds' money in, should be more secure, and if the honourable member wishes the names of the companies that are concerned where the debentures were not paid at all, can't even be redeemed, I'd be happy to give it to them. I don't think that there's any worthwhile purpose to be made in revealing them to the members of the House unless they want them. I've no objections. But it seems to me that sometimes these things are said once and then they are after that carried on and said again and again and again, and then are carried forth as a matter of course.

I wonder whether any members of the House know what bonds and debentures of Canadian corporations, authorized under the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act, shall be permitted to invest trust funds in, and whether they know that the provisions of that Act call for the kind of security that they would hope would be used by a pension fund which is dealing with employees' money. If they do, then possibly I'm wrong. If they don't, then I think that the members should have another look at this because I, having had the one experience with a particular person who has not lost pension monies but lost a good slice of his own money, am not certain and I agree that if I had not had this experience I wouldn't be looking at the clause in the way that I am, but having had that experience, then I think certainly there should be some information given to the committee as to the security of these positions and not merely be said that this is what other trustees are authorized to do. I think that the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre could ascertain that that type of investment has not always proved to be the kind of secure investment in which trustees are normally permitted to invest trust funds.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm interested in that point as well, and if I understand correctly, that trust funds can normally only be invested in companies that have shown consistent earnings over a seven-year period, and there's other stipulations that go with it. Now, is this particular bill designed to circumvent some of the qualifications that have to be met under a normal procedure of purchasing securities that qualify under the Act, and that they are trying to circumvent these provisions under this Bill?

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the school trustees are trying to broaden the fields in which they may invest their funds, and they refer to bonds, debentures that are authorized under the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act (Canada), and that Act provides that certain bonds and debentures are authorized for insurance companies, and the Superintendent of Insurance at Ottawa and the Ottawa financial people try to make sure that that Act is kept up-to-date so that it will give a maximum security to those who invest in the securities authorized under that Act; and I'm sure that if they have found that there are some loopholes, that in some cases they have made a mistake, that they will have and they will be looking at that Act from time to time to make sure that the securities authorized are as secure as one could possibly make them, but of course, no matter how secure you think some investments are you know that once in a while they aren't 100 percent secured and you take a loss once in awhile, so while they try to be as sure as possible of the investments that are authorized for insurance companies, they can't be perfect and once in awhile someone loses. But I'm sure that in committee additional information will be available to the Honourable Member for Inkster.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 110. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 110, an Act to Validate Certain By-laws of The City of West Kildonan, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I doubt that with my Honourable Leader being out of -- oh, he's in the House. I'd better explain.

Mr. Speaker, the Municipality of West Kildonan complied with all the requirements involved in giving proper notice to the members of the Local Improvement District in carrying out certain local improvements. However, it had formerly been under the Municipal and Public Utility Board, and when supervised by the Board, the Board approved all the budgets and expenditures of the West Kildonan Council. In doing that, the Board made a practice, as I'm informed, to approve temporary financing by West Kildonan in respect of local improvements as part of the approval by the Board, and on completion of the work the Municipal Board required West Kildonan to pass the necessary by-laws for the incurring of the indebtedness on the issuing of debentures, and West Kildonan continued to follow the procedure which it had

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) followed whilst under the control of the Municipal Board. However, it came out from under the control of the Municipal Board and, having followed the same procedure, found that they had temporarily financed its work by the temporary use of reserved monies and had not applied to the Municipal Board for authority for temporary financing. So when it came to the enactment of the debenture by-laws and the issuance of debentures in order to replace these monies, this oversight was discovered. As I understand it, everything else would have been in order had it clarified its position in advance of doing what it did rather than wait, as was the practice formerly, until after the monies had been spent.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 113. The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A BARKMAN (Carillon) presented Bill No. 113, an Act respecting The Town of Steinbach, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, maybe I should say a few words on this Bill. The Act shall apply only to a small part of the Town of Steinbach. I think it would only be in order for me to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that with the assistance and guidance of the Provincial Planning Service, the Town's Advisory Planning Commission, and the Town Council, the three that prepared this subdivision, I think they have done a good work, and it is a good plan. Much credit goes to the Provincial Planning Service for their ideas and their ability in this plan.

The plan basically changes the streets, the street pattern I should say, in such a way that many more sites will now be available. There will be orderly development. The building lots are more suited to the needs of today. There will be playgrounds (You wanted an explanation; I will try hard to give it to you) and good surface drainage. The water works and sewerage of course, with these type of extensions, will be more economical per lot in this new district. I could go on and say that countless numbers of meetings have been held with the Town Commission and the Planning Commission, and again I want to stress this point that we were very fortunate in having the guidance of the Provincial Planning Service. The Town has incurred quite a few costs; I believe the sum is close to \$10,000 by now, and all this was done on the basis that the project could be implemented and completed, and I believe that - I should say possibly under the Planning Act - the Minister gave an order, and under the Planning Act we thought under Section 29 would give us the jurisdiction and the right to the town to make application to the Municipal Board for approval of the plan of subdivision. That was over a year ago although we have worked with this plan for quite a bit longer than two or three years. However, the Board refused to consider the application on the ground that the Board has no jurisdiction unless the town owns some land in every plan of survey affected. By the new plan there are now, I believe, in this subdivision approximately nine such plans. In some cases a plan is only for a small parcel of land and certainly it would indeed be very expensive and consuming for the town to acquire some nine parcels or possibly even more, one or two more scattered pieces of land and then only to give the Municipal Board jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, this Act simply empowers the town to make application and the Municipal Board to consider the application for approval of the new plan of subdivision without the town first acquiring land. I should briefly mention there are about 50 pieces - 50 owners of land affected by the subdivision. The project itself has been going on for some time and needs this approval. I think it's also important that it should be remembered that the Board that I just mentioned may refuse a project if too many owners are against it. I'm happy to report that all owners, as far as we know, are for the project and not against it; but if they should be, the Board still has that authority to refuse the project, and without this Act, this subdivision plan, the whole project fails. There is not one owner of these 50, whose piece of land is large enough to make it worthwhile for themselves to go to this expense and make application to the Board, because of the heavy costs and possibly the compensation that may be awarded.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this Act shall give the town jurisdiction to do now, and in one district, what is needed, what the people of Steinbach want, and what I certainly agree with, will be beneficial to the town.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 112. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) presented Bill No. 112, an Act to provide the making of grants to the Brandon General Hospital, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LASSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, this is a case of where the surrounding municipalities are willing to enter into an agreement and provide moneys toward the local share needed for the erection of an extended treatment care hospital on the grounds of the present Brandon General Hospital, and in the Bill as you will notice, the amounts are set out. The wording is "not exceeding" - and obviously this is simply because at this present stage these figures are based on estimates, total estimates of cost, and must by that very nature be rather approximate.

The City of Brandon on a per capita taxpayer basis - assessment basis, I should say - and the municipalities sharing in a like manner and including the Rural Municipality of Cornwallis, the Rural Municipality of Elton, and the Rural Municipality of Whitehead, all are entering into this agreement.

"The by-law shall provide that each year, during the currency of the debenture or any of them for the purpose of paying the principal and interest falling due in that year, there shall be levied a special rate on all rateable land in the City of Brandon, in the rural municipalities of Elton and Cornwallis respectively, and all the rateable land in the Rural Municipality of Whitehead excepting that portion included in the Souris Hospital District, sufficient to pay and discharge the principal and interest payable in that year on or with respect to the debt according to the terms of the by-law."

Now normally I have always tended to resist any action that circumvents the rights of the ratepayers because I think this is a very worthwhile curb, at least upon municipal governments, and I think it in fact put them in many times a safe position in making them sure that they have a fair majority before they enter into any action, but this -- and I have made exceptions in past instances, such as for waterworks where essential, and I believe hospitals are essential, and I think it would be a rather foolish man that didn't make exceptions once in awhile.

Now in addition to the general purpose of the Act, and I'm sure all members have read it, I have copies of the resolutions by the Rural Municipality of Whitehead, the Rural Municipality of Elton and the Rural Municipality of Cornwallis, passed by their councils in agreement in entering in the plan, and I am sure if there is anything that I have missed that the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne might care to add, why he will cover it.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Brandon has pretty well covered all of this Bill and it's pretty well self-explanatory in the Bill itself. The municipalities I've talked to are in favour of this and I think it would be a great asset to the Brandon area in future.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I suppose we go to Page 12 now, do we?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we will have to come into the House tomorrow for some time on some of these second readings that have been adjourned, notwithstanding the fact that there's three bills on Page 12 that we haven't touched, I think it would probably be the general agreement that we've done a pretty good day's work now and should adjourn.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, before the Honourable the House Leader puts the motion for adjournment - which of course is not debatable - if every piece of legislation now and every bill before the Assembly, that it is intended to proceed with it at this session?

MR. LYON: All of the government legislation that we have had record of. Now there is a possibility that there may be one bill brought in at the request of one of the municipal corporations but it's not a government bill. It would be brought in probably to ease its passage -- if it's necessary at all, it would be brought in by government, but so far as government legislation is concerned, yes; this is all that we have before us. I only know of this one other bill, subject to advice that it will be given to me by my colleagues in Cabinet, that may have to be brought in yet, and it's one that I had no notice of, you know, before this time.

MR. PAULLEY: Then we will meet tomorrow morning, is that the idea? Meet tomorrow morning and then go into Law Amendments? Is it the intention to meet tomorrow morning, process the bills that have not been finalized this evening, plus the resolutions standing in the name of one or two Ministers setting up committees before we go into Law Amendments, or

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) will we simply meet to adjourn to go into Law Amendments? I'm sure -- I don't know if some indication can be forwarded to people who may be concerned with bills before Law Amendments but I'm sure that the members of the House would be interested to know even though we can't inform people. I wonder if the House Leader could give us some better indication.

MR. LYON: The intention, Mr. Speaker, would be to meet at 9:30, proceed through to the Orders of the Day, and then adjourn immediately into Law Amendments.

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Thursday morning.