

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable Member for Logan.

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs beg leave to present the following as their first report. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Dispense.

(Report not read) Your Standing Committee of the Legislature on Municipal Affairs was appointed on Friday, September 5th, 1969 at the First Session of the 29th Legislature.

Your Standing Committee was authorized by a resolution passed on Thursday, September 18th, 1969 in the Legislature to consider the draft revision of The Municipal Act and the draft bill respecting Local Authorities Elections and report to the House.

Your Committee appointed Mr. Jenkins as Chairman and the quorum was set at ten members.

Your Committee met on: Wednesday, October 8, 1969; Monday, November 17, 1969; Tuesday, November 18, 1969; Monday, December 1, 1969; Tuesday, December 2, 1969; Wednesday, December 3, 1969; Monday, January 12, 1970; Tuesday, January 13, 1970; Wednesday, January 14, 1970; Monday, February 9, 1970; Tuesday, February 10, 1970; Wednesday, February 11, 1970; and Saturday, March 7, 1970.

Presentations, written or oral concerning the drafts under consideration, were made by:

Alderman Joseph Zuken - The Labour Election Committee
Messrs. D. J. Walding and J. F. Gordon - individuals
William Norrie - The Manitoba Association of School Trustees
Alan Scarth - Citizens of the R. M. of East St. Paul
Reeve Gordon Scott - R. M. of East St. Paul
Reeve Camille Chaput - R. M. of Ste. Anne
Mayor D. A. Yanofsky - City of West Kildonan
Gil Rodger - Municipal Secretary-Treasurers Association of Manitoba
G. W. Simonsen - Manitoba Building Officials Association
Reeve R. P. Butler - R. M. of Birtle
R. B. Cantlie - private citizen
P. McCormack - The City of Winnipeg
Mayor H. Fuller - City of Transcona
Alderman G. E. Marshall - City of Transcona

Messrs. Alan A. Adams and Cameron Harvey did not appear before the Committee but their briefs were distributed to all members of the Committee.

A number of municipalities offered certain comments and recommendations which were tabulated by Mr. C. H. Chappell and referred to your Committee for consideration.

Your Committee in accordance with its terms of reference has considered the draft bill respecting The Local Authorities Election Act attached herewith, and shown as Schedule "A" and recommends the amendments herewith attached and listed in Schedule "B" of this Report.

Your Committee also in accordance with its terms of reference has considered the draft revision of The Municipal Act, herewith attached, and shown as Schedule "C" and recommends the amendments herewith attached and listed in Schedule "D" of this Report.

Your Committee recommends that a new bill for The Municipal Act be printed, including the recommendations listed in Schedule "D" herewith attached, and a new bill for The Local Authorities Election Act be printed, including the recommendations listed in Schedule "B" herewith attached, and that these two new bills be introduced at this Session of the Legislature.

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, may I just explain that the draft Municipal Act will be distributed and the amendments thereto. The Local Authorities Elections Act, Schedule "B", the amendments thereto - there aren't enough copies of the Local Authorities Elections Act, but there will be sufficient copies for each caucus room.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, where we have with us today, 27 students of Grade 5 standing of the Radisson School. This school is under the direction of Miss Caroline Dempster. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Labour and Government Services. We also have 45 students of Grade 8 standing of the Morris Junior High. These students are under the direction of Mr. Cumming and Mrs. Peters. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris. And 30 students of Grade 10 standing of the Neepawa Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mrs. D.W. Fraser. This School is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. And 50 students, Grade 11 standing of the Gimli Composite High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Melnychuk and Mr. D. Kubrakonch. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gimli. And 12 students of Grade 9 standing of the Chief Peguis School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Otto Toews. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES cont'd.

Adjourned debates on the proposed motion, the Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate on behalf of the Member for River Heights.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to present our Party's position in connection with this report. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I personally, and I think probably the members on this side, waited with anticipation for the calling of this committee. As the report indicates, the committee was called on February 23rd, and followed with another meeting on Tuesday, March 10th. The first meeting that was called on February 23, was to get organized; the second meeting on March 10th, was to report that we got organized and to bring this back to the House.

The Standing Committee on Economic Development is a new committee for this Legislature. It came as a result of a recommendation of the TED Report. It is one that I think is needed for the proper functioning of the Legislature, and it's one that I think all members of the House look toward as a committee that would in some very real and meaningful way deal with the problems of the development of the economy of the province and in turn would allow participation by all those who have an interest in economic development within the parliamentary process. The objective, Mr. Speaker, the objective, Mr. Speaker, was to allow regional corporations, and others who have direct interest in the economy of the province, the opportunity to be able to present their views to the members of the Legislature, so that the committee system that operates as it does so effectively in the House of Commons, would in fact have operated and could operate correctly here. Mr. Speaker, I think that I and many of the others who attended the initial meeting were a little bit concerned with both . . .

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe the motion is, "that the Report of the Committee be received," and on that debate and if we stay within the terms of the motion, it seems to me that the honourable member should not be debating as to the government policy, but merely whether or not the committee report should be received, and that the debate should be limited to that frame of reference. -- (Interjection) -- I would like to remind the Speaker and the honourable member that there is no motion in conjunction with the receipt of the report, that the report be concurred with, but merely that it be received.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Portage la Prairie): It's

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) not a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that in a Standing or Special Committee there cannot be a minority report, there can only be a report; and anyone who is on the committees who wishes to state a disagreement with the report, or wishes to raise an objection on anything that took place in the meetings of that particular committee is perfectly at liberty to stand up in this House and speak on the motion to present the report of the committee to the House, and I think my honourable friend the House Leader is in error when he points out to you otherwise.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, on that same point of order. If the government did not come in later on with a motion of concurrence, we would be prohibited from debating the issue and I am sure that the present speaker or the person speaking is quite in order.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm certain that the Honourable Member for River Heights will contain himself within the framework of the motion. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, does that indicate that he was outside the framework of the motion as he was speaking earlier?

MR. SPEAKER: I said that I'm certain he will contain himself within the framework of the motion.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I've had the occasion of sitting in this House for over three years. I've observed the members of the government when they were in opposition, who followed the exact procedure that I am following, and I think that both by precedent and by our rules, I am perfectly in order. And if I may, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to continue.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, in this report is that it really deals very superficially with a very superficial meeting that took place two or three weeks before the Session started. No one will quarrel with the government's attempt to try and make the committee system in this House work effectively; and I don't think anyone would quarrel with the fact that there were many meetings taking place of different committees in different locations in the Province of Manitoba that prevented the calling of some of the meetings earlier than the time that was set for this meeting. The problem is a problem of recognition of priorities, and this is the concern that I would express at this time: The concern that the government's obvious priority was not in economic development; and furthermore, that when the Minister of Industry and Commerce came to the meeting and presented the first two resolutions, that the resolutions themselves indicate that the government itself, really, was not intending to follow through with what the committee function was to be. Because had they in fact followed through the recommendations of the TED Report, and had they in fact conducted themselves in this manner, we would have had before us today at the Report of the Committee, a Report that would have given us an opportunity to evaluate fully and properly the government's course of action and its procedures in connection with economic development.

Unless there be any misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, I'd like, if I may, refer to Page 399 of the TED Report, and I'd like if I may, deal with the Standing Committee on Economic Development, and deal with the recommendation contained therein, which in fact was the basis for the formation of this committee, and which should have been the procedure that would have been followed so that the report that was being tabled today would have in fact dealt with the items that I am going to read into the record now. And I'm quoting from the middle of a paragraph where it states: "The responsibility of the Standing Committee on Economic Development in the broadest sense . . ."

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. You did express the hope that the honourable member would contain himself within the frame of reference of the motion before him. I just refer to Beauchesne, Page 251, the Fourth Edition: "Until the report and evidence have been laid up on the table, it is irregular to refer to them in debate or to put questions in reference to the proceedings of the committee." Mr. Speaker, the motion before us is to receive the report; therefore I would take it that the report is not received by the House at this time, and therefore it's not even within the propriety of members to deal with the subject matter of the report until it is received. The member is preventing the receipt of this or debating the receipt of it by referring to what is being done in the report and what was done during the course of the committee proceedings and to the like, and I would submit that the debate on this kind of a question should be limited to whether the report should or should not be received. And you, Mr. Speaker, made that point to the honourable member earlier in his remarks, and he knows it.

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. In our own Rule Book, on Page 18, Rule No. 34, and I quote: "the following motions are debatable, and that is to say, every motion, and it includes the receiving of a report of a Standing or Special Committee or a Committee of the Whole House."

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not arguing as to whether or not the motion is or is not debatable; I have indicated that it is debatable, as to whether or not it should be received or not; and I'm merely saying that the honourable member in accordance with the rules governing all debate, must maintain his remarks within the reference of the motion. And I would indicate, Mr. Speaker, again, lest my honourable friend try to create the conclusion that we are trying to avoid debating, there are numerous occasions upon which the subject matter which he wishes to discuss will be open in debate. It will be open in debate during the Minister's estimates. It will be open in debate during any Private Member's resolution that he wishes to put. It will be open for debate during any bill which may be relevant to the subject matter of what he is discussing. It would be open to debate if the report were being asked to be concurred with. Therefore, it's not in any effort to stifle my honourable friend, and we know that we couldn't succeed even if we made the effort, but merely so that the House proceeds in accordance with some semblance of order, and the motion before the House is whether the report should or should not be received.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat amazed at the Leader of the House. He is endeavouring to set up a stall that's going to carry him through the . . . -- (Interjection) -- The point I'm trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that you're still in control of this House, and you gave my honourable colleague the permission to continue, and I don't think it requires any interference.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, may I just refer to one example which the honourable member who just spoke will recall very clearly, because it occurred in his first eight days as Speaker of the House. After the Throne Speech was concluded, on that first week - and it's the first week in which I sat in the House - the motion was put as was put yesterday by the First Minister that the Address to His Honour be engrossed with the names of so and so and so and so, and sent on; and the Member for St. George -- Ste. Rose, -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry, I'm so used to regarding the member as the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the Liberal Party, that his name wasn't used that often. But the Member for Ste. Rose got up, and when the Speaker put the question, he said "Are you ready for the question?", the Member for Ste. Rose got up and said that the question was then debatable, and everybody agreed, and you as Speaker agreed that it was debatable; but the whole House subsequently agreed within a very short period of time, only as to whether it should be engrossed and sent, and this is the relevance of the motion that is now before the House.

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, may I just say, that I think the question before the House is whether or not the report should be received. But it's not a matter of yes or no, Mr. Speaker, if I can speak to the point of order. The member is entitled to build up his case as to whether he supports the receipt or whether he denies the receipt of the report in the House. I see absolutely nothing out of order, Mr. Speaker, and the Member for River Heights developing his case as to whether or not he believes the report should be received. There is no other way. The report is already printed in Votes and Proceedings. It's printed in Hansard. It was developed there and dispensation was given so that it didn't have to be read. All of this was done so that this debate could take place after the knowledge of the report was in the hands of all of the members of the House. Mr. Speaker, I submit, that in terms of it, the Minister for River Heights, or any other member, is entitled to make his case as to whether or not he supports receipt of the report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order. As I have said before in the House, it never ceases to amaze me how one's point of view seems to change, depending on where one sits in the House. And being one of those who tried both the right of yourself, Mr. Speaker, the left of yourself and now the centre, I think I'm an authority to speak on the subject. I'm surprised to hear my honourable friend, the House Leader suggest now there ought to be some special times for debate which apparently should be limited by the whim of the government in office. My honourable friend certainly was much more of a defender of free speech when he sat on this side than he now appears to be.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the rules are not there to stifle debate, and to say debate must take place at a specific and particular point. They are there to ensure that debate is relevant, and provided that the honourable member is speaking on the issues as to whether or not he thinks the report should be received, and he is expressing opinions as to why presumably in his opinion should not be received, and they are germane to the subject, then it seems to me that it is in order, and the whole question then must be is he relevant, not whether this is the right time to debate it or whether he will have another opportunity, that has no bearing on the situation; whether he will have another opportunity or not, is not the question. The question is that there is a debate before us, it is a debatable motion and provided he is debating the issue of the motion, the honourable gentleman is in order.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, if I may. I know that when I stand that my honourable friend the Member for Morris may refer subsequently to me once again as a rooster, and I accept the description attributed to me by my honourable friend the Member for Morris, but I do want to remind this House, and in particular may I remind the former Speaker of this House, the Member for Swan River . . .

MR. BILTON: You don't have to remind me of anything.

MR. PAULLEY: No. I don't have to remind him, he says, of anything; and possibly I may not be able to penetrate his skull, but I certainly, Mr. Speaker, will try to . . .

MR. BILTON: You are capable of being offensive.

MR. PAULLEY: I certainly will try to - the point of order is this - that there is an opportunity for the Member for River Heights -- (Interjection) -- Oh keep quiet. Of all the fellows who know least of procedure I think it's my friend from Lakeside. And he has proven it so often in the conduct of hearings on Southern Indian Lake and others, that I would admonish my friend just to keep quiet, because every time he opens his mouth he puts his foot in it, and the only -- (Interjection) -- and the only time that there is any difference at all is when he changes his feet. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I believe it was the intention of the Honourable Minister to speak to the point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right; that's right, Mr. Speaker, I do want to speak to the point of order. I want to say to my honourable friends opposite that we have established points of order in this House and there has been precedents established - they're contained within Beauchesne and other authorities as well insofar as procedures are concerned - and the motion that we have before us today is to whether or not the report of the committee should be received, and that is the only motion. My honourable friend the Member for River Heights who loves to glance up at the galleries and the Gods is attempting to bring into this debate . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order being raised here and I wish at least that we'd get on with the debate so that we can get onto the other matters and routine matters of the House.

MR. PAULLEY: May I say to my honourable friend that there is a point of order and I'm trying to establish it. I wonder if the rabble would just keep quiet for a moment. We had a rabble about 1970 years ago, and I suggest to the rabble that they just keep quiet for a moment or two. The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the motion before the House is to whether or not the report of the committee should be received. We are faced with a proposition on a point of order as to whether or not the report should be received. The committee was representative of all of the political parties, recognized political parties in this House. When a committee makes its report the committee ceases to be in existence except for the concurrence or otherwise in the recommendations of the committee. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker -- and this is what you said a few moments ago although it didn't penetrate the skull of the Member for River Heights -- what you said was the debate is as to whether or not the report should be received, not the contents of the report - the contents of the report can be debated on the motion of concurrence. And I suggest to my honourable friend the Member for River Heights that with his experience, with his intellectual ability, he really should know this; and I say to the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party that this is not something that is new. It is true that there is no minority report possible to emanate from a committee, but the proposition before us is, shall the report be received or shall it not? If there's objection to the receipt of the report, then my honourable friends have the opportunity of voting the receipt of the report down and to debate the contents thereof on a motion to concur in the thing. My

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) honourable friend shakes his head and I can hear it from here. I suggest to him that he read a little bit of procedure. The motion before the House is whether or not the report of the committee should be received. If the tenor of the House is such that the report should not be received then the only procedure is to vote it down.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I couldn't resist the temptation to follow my honourable friend in this debate. The political contortions of honourable gentlemen opposite never cease to amaze me. The indication in the Speech from the Throne that they were going to discard old ideas, dogmas and traditions that have outlived their relevance and usefulness really means listening to honourable gentlemen opposite, really means that they are going to discard them if they do not suit the government's purposes. That is the interpretation of the words that the honourable House Leader and the Minister of Labour have now taken.

The rule was read into the record by my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie, and it's very clear, very clear indeed. "The following motions are debatable, that is to say every motion for the receiving of a report of a Standing or Special Committee or a Committee of the Whole House". What do you suppose it means by a debate? Does it mean that the Honourable Member from River Heights just simply takes a daisy and says we receive it, we receive it not? It means that a debate follows and it follows on the contents of that report. I don't know how other than in that fashion that you can interpret the rule that is in our rules, not in Beausiesne, and our rules take precedent; the rules of this House are the ones that apply in this Legislative Chamber. My honourable friend the House Leader now goes to Beausiesne. He never looked there before until it suits his purpose and today for some unknown reason it suddenly suits his purpose to refer to Beausiesne. A document, Mr. Speaker, that he never even looked at before today.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, just on the point of order, because reference was made by the former House Leader to my intelligence and I must say that in watching him, he reminded me very much of Art Carney. He is a very good performer, he's an extremely good performer, he's an extremely good performer and he's an entertainer. But, Mr. Speaker, because of my legal background, and because of the knowledge that precedent itself follows, may I simply remind the honourable former House Leader that there was a debate that did take place, that I'm very well aware of, and that happened to be on the report of the Standing Committee on Automobile Insurance. I recall the Minister of Finance and the former House Leader debating it, and, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of my knowledge on precedent in the rules in this House, I am completely in order; and I would like you, Sir, now to rule on this so that I can continue in the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to thank the honourable members for their comments and assistance to the Chair. Beausiesne Citation 324 (1) reads "Until the report and evidence has been laid upon the table, it is irregular to refer to them in debate, or to put the questions in reference to the proceedings of the committee." In the present case the report has been laid upon the table and I do agree that it is improper at this point to debate the merits of the recommendation of the report as such. However, so long as the honourable member contains himself to the issue before us, and that is whether the report should or should not be received -- and this I do not know at the moment what position the honourable member proposes to take -- but no doubt it is his intention, or so it appears to me, that it is his intention to offer the House reasons in support of the position he proposes to take. And if he is doing that, then it is in order; if he goes beyond that then he certainly would be out of order.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, lest there be any misunderstanding, it is my contention that the report of the committee should not be received. Mr. Speaker, my reason for suggesting that is again because I refer to the TED Report, to Page 399, and to the reasons for the establishment of the committee. And if I may, Mr. Speaker, so that those who may not be familiar with this section, I would like to read into the record what it states and what it contains: "The responsibility of the Standing Committee on Economic Development" -- this is the suggestion from the members of the TED Commission -- "in the broadest sense would be to maintain continuous surveillance of the progress and problems of Manitoba's economic development and the activities of the Manitoba Government affecting achievement of our economic goals. It is therefore proposed that the Minister of Industry and Commerce present to the committee annually a review of government policy on economic development and a report on the economic situation of the province. This would provide the committee and the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) public an explicit statement of the basic government policy on economic development, against which could be measured annually the performance of government departments and agencies concerned with economic growth.

"Members of the Board of Directors and officers of the Manitoba Development Fund would appear before the committee to provide information on policy, broad operating statistics, financial conditions and general operating policies. The chairman and members of the proposed advisory council on economic development¹² I may say, Mr. Speaker, that is now functioning - 'referred to later, would also appear before the committee and report on their activities and findings. All government departments and Crown Corporations, and that would include Hydro as well, and the Agricultural Credit Corporation, and agencies involved in any aspect of economic development, would appear and report on matters affecting economic growth. Offices and members of boards concerned with the marketing of Manitoba primary and secondary products would also be requested to provide information to this committee on their activities and problems. The committee would further provide a forum to which regional development associations and similar development agencies could turn."

Mr. Speaker, my reason for suggesting that the report of the committee should not be received is that there is really nothing meaningful in that report, because nothing really much happened. Now the reason it did not happen is that the government was not prepared to follow through in connection with the suggestions that were made on the TED Commission. As a matter of fact, the resolution which proposed this committee also made the suggestion, amended as it was by the Member from Ste. Rose, suggested that the chairman of the committee need not necessarily be a member on the government side. Unfortunately the Member for Ste. Rose was not present at the meeting, Sir, at the first meeting. Had he been there it would have been my suggestion that he in fact become the chairman, because I think economic development, as has been said before, is more than just the partisan responsibility of the government. I think it's the responsibility of every member of this House and I think that we have to share that responsibility in the same way that there are other committees of the House of Commons that are chaired by members other than the government and are involved in the day to day operation of government activities, in a way in which the Legislature can function and help and assist and guide the government in the determination of its economic policies.

Now another reason for why I believe that the committee's report should not be received is because when the Minister walked in, he had a report, statistical information, a summary of what had taken place in 1969, and for reasons best known to himself and the government, he determined that it was not necessary to present it at that time but brought in the resolution that we should review the statistics of the last 10 years, the decade of the 60's. Now there are several possibilities. I would think that one of the reasons why, I don't know this, but one of the reasons why this information was not presented was because the information happened to be very good, because the statistics for 1969 happen to be excellent and the growth happens to be quite an achievement and culminates the 10 years of economic development that occurred in the 60's. Now, the Minister saw fit to produce a resolution and the government majority passed a resolution which indicated that they want statistics on the last ten years presented, and that's interesting; but we must remember, Mr. Speaker, that we have in fact completed two major studies in the 60's. One was the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future which dealt at some length with the state of the economy at that time and made projections until 1975; the second was the TED Report which in fact dealt with the report of economic activity in 1980, dealt with what they considered the targets and the actual projection, and no one, if they'd just apply themselves, would not be in a position to determine pretty accurately what the statistical information was and would have a basis on which to make a judgment. We have had two major reviews.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been a better opportunity for us to have reviewed last year and to get on with the job, and this is the real concern and the reason why the report of the committee should not be received, to get on with the job of creating jobs in Manitoba; because in effect, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated already in this House, the main issue in Manitoba is how we are going to develop enough jobs for our people, and the difficulty here is that the government did not see fit at this time to deal with it, except to talk about the past ten years. We are looking backwards again, Mr. Speaker; we continue to look backward and not forward.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the second resolution which is contained in the committee's

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) report, is the question of the Manitoba Development Fund, a disclosure of the Manitoba Development Fund. Mr. Speaker, there are many significant and important economic issues and I am not denying the disclosure is an issue that has been raised and has to be settled, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the fundamental issue facing Manitoba today. The fundamental issue facing Manitoba is how to create jobs and how we are going to do it, with the recognition that it is not government that creates the jobs but government helps through their instrument of government to create the climate, to develop the atmosphere, to encourage the expansion, to in fact assist our people to be able to sell in other markets, to be able to provide the jobs and to be able to raise wage levels in this province. It would seem to me that we would have been better served to have met much earlier, Mr. Speaker, because economic development must be considered a priority, and to have been in a position to have had the government present, albeit maybe only its first initial report, subject to some major changes that could occur after government policy was determined in the future, and we at least would have had some basis on which we, and in addition others who are watching what is happening in this Legislature, and who are watching what is taking place in our economic development, would have some basis to know what in fact the present government is committed to.

Now I think it would have been easy, Mr. Speaker, because I think that the government and the Premier have publicly outside of the province announced what they are intending to do, but the problem, Mr. Speaker, and the problem was apparent at the committee hearings, and this is another reason for confusion and one of the reasons why again the report should not be considered, because there has to be, from our point of view, a little bit of doubt as to whether the government has yet made up its mind where it's going, because the declarations that we have heard already in this House and the statements that we heard in the Committee, show that there is a variation of opinion in terms of economic development, even for the few items that they talked about in terms of the future.

Now I would have felt, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been wise and it would have been important for the committee to have studied and to have had the opportunity to have had presented before it the various chairman and members of the board that have been referred to already. Had this happened, Mr. Speaker, then I believe that we would not have had the position develop that has developed in this House where charges have been made, where in fact representations have been made which would lead people to believe that we have a confused situation with respect to a number of matters. It would have been far better, Mr. Speaker, for many of those people who are involved as lay people rather than professional people in the various agencies and boards to have had an opportunity to present their point of view so that we would have had a benefit of their point of view and it would have been in a better position to assess the decisions that had to be made.

Now when the motion was brought into the committee in connection with the disclosure of the Manitoba Development Fund, it was my contention and the contention of the members on this side that really this was not the most important matter to be discussed before the committee, that in fact it was really something that the government had to make up their minds on and the government having the power could then introduce whatever legislation it wants to do whatever it would want. Mr. Speaker, lo and behold, the government has already introduced in the Speech from the Throne, or indicated, that it will be introducing this legislation; and I agree and that is proper. They have accepted that suggestion and I only hope that they would accept some others; because, Mr. Speaker, the problem of economic development is a severe one. As I have already indicated in this House, Mr. Speaker, the problem is almost Herculean, there is a massive job that has to be undertaken, and it would appear at this point that there still is confusion, there still is disagreement, that there are those who believe it should go one way. The Premier believes that the TED Report is a blueprint, a good blueprint, and . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll give the honourable member the courtesy after I've completed my remarks.

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon?

MR. SPIVAK: I'll give you the courtesy after I finish my remarks. Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that the TED Report would have been presented to the Standing Committee,

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) with any modifications that the government saw fit to declare, as the basic report for economic development for the next decade, subject to its review, subject to any declared policy of change that would be forthcoming in time, because at least then we would have had a basis on which to do the evaluations and to do the judgment in connection with our economic activity.

The Premier has already declared that he supports it, and I support the Premier in this respect; but I know, Mr. Speaker, that many members that were present at the committee, and many members who are sitting there including some of the Ministers, are a little bit fuzzed up as to whether they really are for it or not. The reason why I feel that we should not have the committee's report received is that I really believe that the report should not be received simply because I think it's time that the government made up its mind and declared its economic policy, and when it does so, and when it's prepared to then present it before the committee, we then are in a position to make the judgment of what they're really talking about.

Mr. Speaker, to suggest that the meeting of the Standing Committee on Economic Development should consist itself with instructing the Minister to compile statistics that were already in the process of being compiled in his department anyway, not to deal with the statistics of last year which he had on him at that time, for to deal with disclosure of the Manitoba Development Fund -- we bring up the ghost of the Manitoba Development Fund whenever we are a little confused as to what we're going to do -- and to then say this is all the government is prepared to consider, and then to have members of the committee suggest when we started to introduce resolutions for consideration, are we going to be here all day because you can send 20 or 30 resolutions, and you know, we can just go on and on and on, to suggest that that's the way the committee should function I think is wrong and I think will defeat in a very real way the intent of the TED Commission.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other reasons why I think the report of the committee shouldn't be received is because one of the areas of concern that should have been discussed and that was not discussed was the whole question of American and foreign investment and our whole relationship between Manitoba and the midwestern market of the United States. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that there should have been, and it's necessary and vital at this stage, for some declared policy and an opportunity to hear the presentation of the government, and in turn to be in a position to assess the actions that will be taken to determine what in fact their position is.

Mr. Speaker, at this time in Manitoba's economic history, American and foreign investment is required. The only thing we have to worry about, Mr. Speaker, is controlling it and using it in the interests of our people; and if we do this it will provide jobs for our people and I suggest again that jobs are what are needed. Mr. Speaker, it would have been far better for this committee to have had the opportunity to have heard the government's position, to have then been able to have heard from the various people involved in economic development on behalf of the government through the various boards and agencies, to have been able to hear from others who have opinion, and from the academics who have opinion, so that we could in fact have the widest discussion so that that policy at least can be resolved and known; because if it's not known, Mr. Speaker, obviously we are penalizing and restraining the ability of things to happen in Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- We'll hear it pretty soon. Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe we will hear it pretty soon. We didn't hear it from the Speech from the Throne; we haven't heard it in any of the statements that have been made. We know that the Premier has been abroad in Japan; we know he's been in the United States; we know he's been in eastern Canada seeking investment, and I would assume that when the Minister of Industry and Commerce makes up his mind whether he's going to want American investment or not, he'll go out as well; but as yet he hasn't made up his mind, and we don't know what he is going to be doing. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government must be blamed at this point for not having indicated what its intentions are; not for the fact that results are not occurring, that's not the issue, because they've only been in there for eight months; but surely, Mr. Speaker, we could have expected at a meeting that was held less than a month ago, we could have expected, Mr. Speaker, that there would have been some declared policy in connection with this and other issues.

Mr. Speaker, there are many many other issues that I could discuss. I have not discussed all of them, nor is it my intention to in any way deal with them. The question of pollution was raised. It's not contained within the report of the committee but it was raised by

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) the Minister, and it's a valid one. The problems of pollution are one of a series of matters that we in this province must be concerned with, and the restraints we put on in connection with our economic development in connection with the social objectives we want to achieve are extremely important. And no one quarrels with that, and no one quarrels with the government's right to make its decision on what it would do; but my God, Mr. Speaker, we have to know what that decision is before we can discuss it. Now if they haven't made up their mind in this area then this is fine. They can announce that they are considering it. No one quarrels with that. But in terms of the basic tenets of economic development, in terms of developing and increasing the productivity in this province, because that's going to be the only way in which wage levels are going to be raised in this province, it's important and essential that we know.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for rejecting this report is that the Minister of Industry and Commerce was not prepared to say as we did, that the midwestern market in the United States presents a most important single challenge to Manitoba manufacturers; because if we can penetrate that market, if we can in fact develop the scale and specialization in our industry, we are going to be able to gain the productivity gains, in company with wage increases that will provide the benefits for our people. Because, Mr. Speaker, if we do not do that, we may develop into a very tight society, people may -- (Interjection) -- Yes, beautiful people, -- the numbers that we want may not be here; and in turn we may in fact find that instead of staying in the position we are relative to Canada we may fall behind. Because, Mr. Speaker, lest the government not understand this, we in this province have to run very hard to stay in one place, and we can't afford, we can't afford . . .

HON. ED SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): You fell behind right through the 1960's.

MR. SPIVAK: We did not fall behind in the 1960's. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the First Minister that very soon the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Industry and Commerce are going to stand up in this House and announce the statistics for 1969, and are going to say "My God, these were terrific statistics."

MR. SCHREYER: I'm talking about the 60's.

MR. SPIVAK: Oh yes. Well what happened in the 60's sees its results in '69; and we're going to see what's going to happen in the '70's; and we're going to see how 33,000 new jobs . . .

MR. SCHREYER: It took you nine years. It took you nine years to build up to that.

MR. SPIVAK: It took nine years? Well, Mr. Speaker, this is very important. There's a certain lesson that the First Minister must realize. Economic development does not come at one minute. He knows as well as I do and as well as the Minister of Industry and Commerce who will find out. And when you go out to try and sell Manitoba to a developer, unlike what the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources thinks, unlike the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who thinks people will just come in here, you have a heck of a job and you have a difficult job. The task takes time and the results come in time.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable First Minister went to Japan. Now no one expected him to produce any results immediately, and I don't think any results have been produced at all, but that isn't the point. The point is there may very well be some results in the future and he's to be congratulated for going there. And the Minister of Industry and Commerce should understand that in going to the American cities to try and sell American investment, that it's important; and not only that, the results may not be forthcoming right away, but they'll be forthcoming in time. And the results of 1969, those statistics that the Minister of Finance will be talking about in his budget address, those statistics that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is going to be talking about when he presents his estimates, were statistics and were records that were achieved as a result of the initiative and planning that occurred in the 60's and as a result of the COMEF report. And all I say, Mr. Speaker, all . . .

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): On a point of order. Has the member from River Heights been given unlimited freedom to range on this topic? It strikes me he's getting way off the topic here.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm indicating as I've indicated before why the committee's report should not be received. And again, Mr. Speaker, it should not be received for the reasons that I've suggested, because I've suggested, Mr. Speaker, and I say again, that it's important that we in the committee have had the opportunity to review the statistical information that the Minister had in his possession but was not prepared to present - for reasons best known to myself - because I think it would have given us an indication and it would have

(MR. SPIVAK con t'd.) supported the position that I'm taking now, and that we on this side take, that planning and the activities that occurred in the 60's have proved their results in '69, at the end of the 70's.

But, Mr. Speaker, economic development and elections are two different things. Now maybe, it's possible that the Member from Elmwood doesn't understand this and it may be that the government think that they can tie them all together. But let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the increase in wages that is required for our people, that the ability of this province to attract population, that the desire of our people to add to their quality of life - all of these things will only be achieved if the economy is moving, and in turn if there is the degree of confidence and the climate of activity which comes as a result of a plan and which comes as a result of some knowledge of all those who are going to be involved in government with knowing what's going to happen. Now we have confusion on the other side, we have disagreements. We see it in the House. We don't know realistically whether the Member from Crescentwood, the ideas of the Premier or of the others, we don't know this, because let me explain, Mr. Speaker. It's become pretty obvious, and it was obvious to the committee, that the Member from Crescentwood's ideas are in fact held by a majority - well, not a majority, but a fair number of those in the committee, and that's fine, and I'm not quarrelling with his right to have those views and I'm not quarrelling with his right to express them; and if in fact these are the views of the government, let us at least know them so that we ourselves know what we're talking about and those who are going to be dealing with the government will know what they're talking about. And if they're not, then let's have some public declarations here in Manitoba. There's no point, Mr. Speaker, as I have already reported, for the Premier to go to New York and talk about the TED Commission and say that it's an enthusiastic set of guidelines for our further development, without at least declaring in this House in Manitoba that he believes in it. If this is the case, Mr. Speaker -- now I recognize there could be changes and I recognize there could be adjustments, but if this is the case at least, Mr. Speaker, we should have had the government's position presented to the committee so that we were in a position to deal with this effectively.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have given the arguments of this side as to why we feel that the committee's report should be rejected. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, the committee met on Monday, February 23rd, 2-1/2 hours or maybe less. It met on Tuesday, March 10th, and unfortunately I was half an hour late and it was over, and it dealt with this report. It met to get organized; it met to get organized, it met again to report that it was organized, and this is all we have. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you something. It's not good enough. It's not good enough because economic development is too vital to this province. Job formation is too important a problem. The attitude and the involvement of government is so far integrally interwoven with the business and commercial activities of this province that no one can wait very much longer. And again, Mr. Speaker, it's not that the government has been criticized for its lack of action - they've only been in there for eight months - but at the same time they must, and there's an obligation to explicitly tell us what they're going to do, and there's an obligation as well to allow the committee system to work so those in the regional corporations, so those who have other interests in connection with commercial and industrial activities and those who are on the board, those who are on the board, not people who are going to be speaking for those on the board, but those who are directly involved and have been involved in the last ten years, are in a position to come forward to express their views so that we can get the benefit of their knowledge and their experience because they have produced for Manitoba - and the statistics in 1969 are going to show that they produced for Manitoba - and then we in turn can deal with other problems. But let's at least have this.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if now my honourable friend would permit a question. My honourable friend for some considerable time has suggested that the report of the committee should not be received. Is it not a fact, is it not a fact that the report of the committee suggests that the committee should be reconstituted to consider the problems that my honourable friend has raised this afternoon, and is he not of the opinion that if the report of the committee which suggests the recommendation of a reconstitution is defeated, as suggested by my honourable friend, that there will be no possibility of considering the matters raised at such length by my honourable friend the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, of River Heights. I'm asking my honourable friend a question.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, as much as I had not intended to enter into the debate . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I think that it is proper for me to ask the honourable member who has spoken and just taken his seat, a question. My honourable friend can reject my question and if my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition interjects in between time, then the Member for River Heights is precluded from replying to my question. If he can tell me that he doesn't accept my question, which is in my opinion a legitimate one, it must be without interruption or interjection of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Maybe one of these days my honourable friends opposite will learn something about the rules of the House.

MR. MOLGAT: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker. . .

MR. MOLGAT: . . . rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was going to speak, because really it was a point of order that was being raised with my honourable friend rather than a question.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm rising on a point of order when the matter . . .

MR. WEIR: I was going to take my place in debate and use my place in debate to discuss the matter really of the order of the question.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has the floor.

MR. MOLGAT: I rise on the point of order relative to the -- these are the questions on the point of order made by the Assistant House Leader. It appears to me that on the Monday 16th of March, this House made a decision on a motion by the Premier of the province, that a number of standing committees of the House be established, one of them being the Committee on Economic Development. So that matter I believe is settled -- the Committee is established.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Speaker, that isn't the point on which I asked the question of the Honourable Member for River Heights. He is opposing the receipt of this motion of reception of the committee report. That's all.

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I will speak in terms of whether or not to receive the report, but what I want to deal with is the position of my friend the rooster, the old rooster, the Minister of Labour, the former House Leader, the Dean of the House, the Dean of the House, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who says that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Clerk has drawn to my attention that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has in effect spoken. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): I move that debate be now adjourned, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, after what has just transpired in the past hour, I can't think of a more appropriate debate at the present time than a debate on the rules, if I understand my honourable friend correctly, the House Leader and the Minister of Labour. Then in order to make some comments on the presentation of this particular report, I must first state that I am in opposition to the adoption of these rules.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope that it is not the intention of the honourable member to debate the rules, but rather the motion before us is the receipt of the report.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, how one can discuss the adoption of this committee report without making some reference to the rules, and I don't intend to deal with this particular one that we have been dealing with for the past half hour or so, except to point out that there is one recommendation in the committee's report that I would most certainly want to accept, and that is the one which suggests that the committee meets again.

We've learned a few things in the last few days that this government has been in this House, and how they intend to change the rules, and if that's the case, then, on the basis of the experience that we're gaining today, and on a few other occasions, then I think you'll agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that a careful examination of the rules -- and we thought we had done a pretty comprehensive job. We thought that we had covered that Rule Book and taken care of all the situations that could have developed and all the problem areas that we felt had arisen in the past, but the House Leader has indicated to us that he intends to create far more problems than we ever thought were possible. And the suggestion that he's made about not debating this

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) particular motion, is one of them.

Now I think that the Committee's report and the setting up of that committee was a good idea. I think it was necessary because I think from time to time, in a world that changes as rapidly as this one does, that it's necessary to change your rules and your procedures to conform with the changing attitudes and the changing problems that the government has to deal with, or indeed that this Legislature has to deal with. One of the functions of this Legislature I submit, Sir, - and one of the prime functions of the Legislature - is to provide an opportunity for members of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition to elicit information from the government and to question the government, and to examine the government's legislation. You know, Sir, there isn't a great deal of difference, when you come to think of it, between a totalitarian form of government and a democratic form. A democratic government such as we have in this country has as much authority as you can find in any totalitarian state. They can do pretty much as they please. There's only one difference, and that is they have to submit their legislative program, they have to submit their spending program and their record of administration to examination by an opposition, and therein lies the great significance. So therefore in order for the system to function properly, it is important, extremely important that the members of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition have every opportunity to carry on that examination of the government's program, to question and to examine. And no impediment such as has been attempted to place on the Opposition by the House Leader today, should be entertained.

Now it's amazing how sometimes what has become a rule, how some of these rules become established as precedent, and I had an opportunity of going back over the records for the past few years to see if I could find out how some of these rules get interpreted, and once having been interpreted become precedent. I was looking at the debates of 1959, and during the course of the Throne Speech debate at that time, a motion to adjourn the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance was brought in - it was brought in I think by the then Member for Osborne; I believe that was the constituency; he was the Leader of the NDP Party at that time - Mr. Stinson. He asked for leave to adjourn the House to discuss a matter that had absolutely nothing to do with the Legislature of Manitoba, and I think one of the understandings, and indeed one of the explicit rules, conditions in that rule, is that the matter must relate to the administrative responsibilities of the government, but the matter that he wanted to discuss had to do with the labour problems in Newfoundland of all things.

Now, the Speaker very properly ruled that out of order, and because of the minority situation in the House at that time, because of the fact that the combined opposition members had more members than the government, the Speaker's ruling was overruled, and therefore a precedent was established, not only on that occasion, but five days later it happened again, when the Honourable Member for St. George, Mr. . . . brought in another motion to discuss flood control. Again the Speaker properly ruled that motion out of order because the Throne Speech debate was taking place and there was an opportunity during that period for members to avail themselves on whatever subject they wanted to debate.

Here is one instance, Mr. Speaker, where a clear interpretation of the rules of this House must be made so that there can be no misunderstanding, and when you have precedents established under those circumstances, then it's no wonder, no wonder, Sir, that the rules of this House become cluttered up with precedents that have no relevance whatsoever.

Now during the course of the deliberations of this Committee, there were many things besides the rules that were discussed, and again I want to say that I am glad that we're going to, and I hope that the government will reconvene this committee, because there are three or four matters that we never even thought of discussing that I think should be discussed now and some conclusions arrived at, because there are going to be problems if the House Leader persists in aborting and changing rules as frequently as he has indicated he plans to do during this Session. Some talk was centered around the committee system, and I only want to say that insofar as the committee system is concerned I do think that there can be a better use of the committees of this House, but I don't think that we want to assume that we can pattern our committee system after anybody else's and particularly pattern them after the House of Commons. There are 265 members in that Chamber and far more members available to staff committees than there are in this Chamber. I would not think that it would be possible that we could, for example, give considerations to the estimates of the departments that are under consideration here through the committee system, because I feel it would deny too many members the opportunity of taking part in those debates and in taking part in that examination of the estimates.

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.)

We discussed the question of television and radio in this Chamber, and I was always under the impression that the television media were very anxious to come into this Chamber and to televise the proceedings of this House, and it was with some surprise that we learned that they have no intention of doing that unless the taxpayers are prepared to pick up the bill for it. And I would suggest, Sir, that if they want to come in here and televise the proceedings of this House that they supply the cameras, they supply the equipment, and they man the cameras and they do the work and they do the cutting - they can do whatever they like; but I don't think that the taxpayers of this country should be asked to set up the television cameras and provide for them that kind of service.

I do think, Sir, that in the consideration apart from the rules, that some consideration should be given to better facilities, not only for the members of this Chamber - and I think that they're hopelessly inadequate - but I think that, in light of the importance of communicating the events that take place in this place to the public, that the facilities for the press and the radio and television people should be improved considerably so that they can do a better job of providing to the public of this province a more accurate account of the proceedings of this Chamber.

Sir, I'm sure you will agree with me that the deliberations that took place in this Committee were fruitful; that they did centre on a great many of the problems that we have been faced with in the past; and I know that you will agree with me, with the experience that you've had in the last few days, that there are still a number of problems that are as yet unresolved, and that they have to be taken into consideration as well.

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

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I think this is the time that we mutually agreed that I could rise in withdrawing my Private Resolution, and at this time I would like to state that I want to discuss by and large the portion, what is it - to do with wages anyway -- indemnity, and the fact that they agreed to turn it over to a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am wondering whether it may not be more appropriate for the honourable member to deal with that particular topic at a later point in time, for this reason, that I believe there is reference made to that item in the Committee Report, and if I sense the intent of the honourable member's comments correctly on the basis of his introductory remarks, I think that it is his intention to deal with a matter contained in the report rather than the question of the advisability of the receipt or rejection of the report as such. In that light I feel that it's quite proper to deal with the importance of it, with the importance of further study, whatever else the member wishes to raise, but not to discuss a specific proposal which is contained in the Report and which may be more appropriate to be debated at a later stage.

MR. BEARD: I wouldn't mind abiding by your decision as long as there is assurance that we can continue this in Committee stage.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm disturbed at what is taking place in debating the motions to receive. We have a report before us that deals with the numerous changes that are being proposed in the conduct of this House and the proceedings, and who knows what matters will come forward in the actual motion of concurrence, what is going to be deleted, what is going to be contained therein. The Honourable Member for Churchill was going to debate a certain point. He might be deprived of this later on in the session. I, too, was not a member of the committee that sat in going over the rules of the House. However, I did attend one or two meetings in order to hear the discussions and the various recommendations that would be brought forward. There are certain things in this report which certainly will deprive members such as the member for Churchill, myself, and probably the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, depriving them of certain rights that have been theirs in the rules so far. I am talking of the principle whereby leave of the House to proceed was the case so far. Now from here on, if this is accepted, you will have to ask the support . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind the Honourable Member for Rhineland that I do hope that it is his intention to bring these remarks within the framework of the motion before us, because if it is not, may I suggest to him that there may be a more appropriate time to debate the issue that he has raised and such other issues as he may choose to discuss.

MR. FROESE: It's receiving portions of this report that I am referring to.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify to my honourable friend that the receiving of the report will not deprive the honourable member from debating the question which he says would deprive any members of rights when that question is being considered on its merits. So, despite my difference of opinion with the honourable member, it's only the question of relevance, that's all, not the question as to whether it's debatable, and if the honourable member feels that what he is saying is relevant to the motion of receipt or reject, then I've had no argument with members of the House, but certainly it's not true that if the report is received your rights are therefore deprived, because that will not then become a rule of the House until further proceedings are taken, at which time full debate on the issue itself can take place.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, can the members of this House be assured that the motion of concurrence, when it does come forward, will contain the total report as such? I think this has a bearing, because as we know, under the rules the reports cannot be amended by this House, they have to be referred back to a committee for reconsideration. There has been no committee appointment so this cannot be done under the present circumstances, so there is no alternative left other than to accept or reject; that's as simple as it is right now. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, if I am going to be ruled out of order on speaking on these matters, I will desist from doing so at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is perfectly at liberty to debate the motion on the Order Paper, and the motion is that the report of the committee be received.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I fail to see where the position that the Honourable Member for Rhineland is in differs in any respect from that taken by the Honourable Member for River Heights, my colleague. The Honourable Member for Rhineland is obviously opposed to acceptance of the report at this point and is buttressing his reasons for that opposition. And I can't see, Sir - perhaps the finer points of administration of the affairs of the House escape me - but I can't see where his position differs in any way from that upheld by the Chair, Sir, and finally acquiesced in by the government leader, from that taken by the Member for River Heights.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not the intention of the Chair to enter into debate with honourable members of the House, but may I remind honourable members that the only comment made by the Chair is that the debate be within the framework of the motion. Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to add some remarks to the resolution that is before the House this afternoon with regard to the Standing Committee of Privileges and Elections, and of course as you well know, Mr. Speaker, this committee by virtue of a resolution as of October was struck off and it was considered advisable for this committee to study and review the provisions of the Election Act with a view to making such recommendations respecting amendments thereto or improvements in the law relating to the election of members of this House. And another resolution I think possibly might be in order at some time in the debate. However, this committee were to enquire into and to report upon the desirable and practical measures which might limit or control the provincial election expenditures in the light of Manitoba's requirements and of course the experience in other jurisdictions, and the report of this committee can be referred of course to further study.

We met briefly on February 2, 1970, Mr. Speaker, with a very short meeting and basically no business was conducted. We were called back into session again on the 11th of March 1970, and at that meeting the committee recommended to the Clerk of the Legislature that we required certain information and material which was necessary for us to compile a report. And I find it rather disturbing, Mr. Speaker, to find in the Speech from the Throne that the government of the day have more or less disregarded the fact that this committee had been struck off, because it says in the Speech from the Throne that this committee -- it says, "Since the last session of the 29th Legislature, Members of the Legislative Assembly have

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) been actively engaged in their work on a number of legislative standing and special committees," and I hope that this is not related to the Committee of Elections and Privileges on which I was a member because we did not take an active stand during the intervening months between the last session and this one.

It interests me very much, Mr. Speaker, in other aspects at this time because I think the idea of the committee was good and it received unanimous support from the House. We were promised at that time that there would be an open type of government, and certain charges were made in the House here, in fact at Vancouver or Victoria, relating a certain architect - I still don't know who the guy was, we never got around to studying that in the committee - however, the committee was not called until February 2nd to deal with this very serious matter and I think that the committee would liked to have studied it. And then of course we find that legislation, Mr. Speaker, is now in the Speech from the Throne which will likely destroy the wisdom and the philosophy that this committee might have presented to the citizens and the people of Manitoba.

MR. DOERN: Will the Honourable Member submit to a question?

MR. McKENZIE: When I'm finished, certainly yes. And without a report, Mr. Speaker, from that committee of any great significance, as I said earlier, we find legislation which may in fact be contrary to what the terms of reference or contrary to the feelings of that committee, and I wonder where is the open government type of promise that was given to the committee.

So with some reluctance, Mr. Speaker, while I think that the committee should be re-constituted and allowed to carry on with its work, I can't see that it will serve any useful purpose if we are going to strike off a committee, and while we are in study the government is going to bring legislation before the House which we maybe should have been dealing with.

Now I'll be pleased to deal with your question if I can - the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member whether he wouldn't agree that actions speak louder than words? And secondly, that the member will have an opportunity to debate the proposed legislation.

MR. McKENZIE: That is a very difficult subject to debate, Mr. Speaker, "Actions speak louder than words." I wouldn't care to answer in any brief form, maybe 40 minutes I would, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, could I have the indulgence to have this matter stand.

. continued on next page

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. A MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (St. James) introduced Bill No. 15, an Act to amend The Companies Act; and Bill No. 2, an Act to bring into Force the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, 1970.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Center.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I would beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Center.

MR. BOYCE: Here again, Mr. Speaker, I would beg the indulgence to have this matter stand. (Agreed)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is it correct that the Minister has received an offer of resignation from the Deputy Minister of his department?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Ste. Rose, the honourable member knows, matters pertaining to deputy ministers come under the purview of the First Minister.

MR. MOLGAT: Then I shall ask the First Minister, has the First Minister received a resignation from the Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, such an offer has been received, that is correct, and because of reasons of compatibility of temperaments, personalities, which oftentimes occur, the offer has been accepted.

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

MR. WEIR: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are we to assume that it comes as a result of an irrational outburst by the Minister of Industry and Commerce in this House yesterday?

MR. SCHREYER: I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be more correct to say that changes in deputy ministers are not unknown, either at provincial or federal levels. They have occurred oftentimes in the past and this should be viewed in that context.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the First Minister aware that it is also possible to change Ministers under circumstances like that and save good civil servants?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, I am aware of that, Mr. Speaker, but I don't regard it as advisable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: I have a supplementary question to my first question to the First Minister. Were reasons given by the deputy minister in his resignation?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance. Could he advise the House when he expects to bring in his budget and his budget address?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. Johns): May I say, Mr. Speaker, at the moment I am most concerned to try to get my capital supply in, and the moment I have an opportunity I am supposed to do so - the Interim supply. The answer to the specific question is I have not yet made that decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could he tell us what Manitoba's share is going to be under the Federal Government's Regional Development Incentives Act, whereby they are offering \$250 million which is earmarked for the creation of new industry in 1970-71 in Canada? What will Manitoba's share be of that \$250 million?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll take this question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Health and Social Services.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I took a question as notice on the 20th of March. The question was posed by the Honourable Member from Rhineland.

(MR. TOUPIN Cont'd)... Unfortunately, the question is not complete. He finished off by saying: "I should give a word of explanation here. It seems that when they get their first pension cheque," - and that's where it ends. Could I get a clarification on that please?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on that same point of order, I tried to give an explanation but was prohibited by the House Leader from doing so. I was going to give an explanation at that time on this matter. I haven't got my notes before me but I would be quite happy to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the First Minister. Can he indicate whether the news report is correct that the Board of the Manitoba Development Fund is being relieved of their responsibilities and will be replaced by a new Board as of March 31st?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I do not believe that it is proper to ask questions as to the accuracy of news reports.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, can I ask the First Minister if he is in a position to indicate whether the Board of the Manitoba Development Fund will be replaced as of March 31st?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for reminding the honourable member of the well known rule that questions are not to be put based on newspaper speculation. However, his having restated the question, I can answer it as follows, that we have already extended the term of the Directors of the Manitoba Development Fund. We have done that already once, and when we decide to make a change we shall announce it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister, or perhaps the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Can either one of them indicate whether or not the Manitoba Government is in any way taking part in the Mid-Canada Development... group, either in a sustaining way or have they designated an observer from the government to participate in some of the deliberations?

MR. GREEN: Yes, I can advise the honourable member that there was some participation by senior civil servants in our department and the Task Force appointed the Member for Rupertsland, Mr. Jean Allard, to participate as an observer.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I suppose perhaps I can get it on estimates but perhaps the Minister may want to answer the question before me now. As I recall, there was a sustaining membership fee involved of some \$5,000. Is this the degree of participation that the government has entered into with this group?

MR. GREEN: My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that we are maintaining the sustaining membership, but the participation of Mr. Allard, the MLA for Rupertsland, is in addition to the sustaining.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure at this time to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Fund for the year ended March 31, 1969.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs. Is the Minister or the Government or the Centennial Corporation considering giving any medals or some memento to all the school children during our centennial year?

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I didn't hear the latter part of that question.

MR. PATRICK: Is the Minister or the Government, or perhaps the Centennial Corporation, considering giving some centennial medal or some other memento to all the school children in the Province of Manitoba during our centennial year?

MR. PETURSSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is under consideration and the Corporation has made that as a part of its program, to present school children with a medal commemorating the Manitoba Centennial.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs. There seems to be a problem obtaining centennial flags in the country. Would the Minister care to elaborate or advise the House how we can get centennial flags in the country?

MR. PETURSSON: Centennial flags are on sale in the department stores are they not? They were. Then they have been bought up and a new supply would have been ordered probably by this time and they will in due course be available again.

MR. McKENZIE: Are they available like in stores out in the country points?

MR. PETURSSON: Stores out in the country can get the flags. That is they are just as available to country stores as they are to city stores.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. McKENZIE: Would you care to - like put it on the record where they can be procured at the wholesale level? - (Interjection) - No, for the distribution.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, may I refer the Honourable Member to the Centennial Corporation Offices in the Centennial Centre Building, 555 Main Street, Winnipeg 2.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Can the Minister indicate whether or not he will be in a position to supply additional information with respect to this year's drainage program at the time his estimates come up for discussion? I know the basic information is there in his estimates, but will there be any further schedule attached thereto at the time that we discuss his estimates?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I will be in a position of giving further details than what is contained in the sheets. Just how far I'll be able to go I'm not able to say at this moment.

MR. ENNS: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker - a supplementary question. As has been the custom - and the Minister of Transportation indicated that he would be in a position to furnish us with a schedule of construction program - it has been done in the past in a similar manner with the drainage programs in Manitoba and this is the specific item I was referring to.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll certainly attempt to co-operate with my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Some time ago I directed a question to him in regard to the Catell-Five Roses Food Processing Plant in Transcona, and I believe the Minister indicated at that time that the newspaper report was correct, that the company was moving into Alberta. A further question was directed to the Minister, the question of how many employees would be out of work and how many farmers would be directly affected. I believe the Minister undertook to give us the answer to that at that time.

MR. EVANS: I believe I indicated that there would be about 69 employees affected. The number of market gardeners affected is very difficult to estimate, but I figure it will be rather a minimal amount, a minimal number affected.

MR. WATT: I would ask a subsequent question then to the Minister. What would he consider to be a minimal amount of farmers? - (Interjection) - Can my honourable friend the First Minister tell me what the maximum number of farmers is in the province?

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

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Honourable the First Minister. I requested this some few days ago. Has the First Minister received correspondence from the Deputy Chairman of the Metropolitan Corporation in connection with the proposed convention centre in Winnipeg?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I invite my honourable friend to look at the volume of the mail on my desk and on its way to my desk. I must confess that I have not had it brought to my attention as yet, but I shall make a note now to enquire about it.

MR. HARDY: I appreciate the comments of the First Minister, and in so doing, Sir, I wonder if he would indicate as to whether or not the Metropolitan Corporation has indicated that they are prepared to make a financial contribution to this venture?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question and relate it to the context of the letter that presumably I am to receive soon from the Deputy Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce if he has any good news for the people of Morden which will be left out of work by the cannery closing down.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I am not at liberty at this time to provide any details, but I can assure you that we're doing our darndest to correct the situation in that town.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Are there regulations with respect to logging operations in the province to stop logging companies from cutting right up to the right-of-way of roads?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just -- question from my honourable friend's address earlier in the session and I directed it to the administration. I'll have an answer for him in due course.

MR. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question to be also enquired into. Would the same regulations apply to Churchill Forest Industries?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Labour. Has he found time to investigate the two deaths at Columbia Forest Products in Sprague?

MR. PAULLEY: No, I'm awaiting a report from the coroner's inquest into these deaths.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I believe it was yesterday the Honourable Member for Rock Lake asked me a question as to the date of the opening of Spruce Woods Park. The suggested date, as we know it at the moment, is perhaps June 20, 1970.

While I'm on my feet, I recall a few days ago the Honourable Member for Fort Garry asked me a question regarding the Ceremonial Guard at Lower Fort Garry. There have been some discussions taken place - and I might say here that this a federal matter of course - but Lower Fort Garry as the honourable member must know is an historical fort and it is now under the Department of Cultural Affairs and perhaps if any other questions are related to that particular subject they will have to be directed to the Department of Cultural Affairs.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba estimates and sums required for the service of the province for capital expenditures and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, together with the estimates accompanying the same, be referred to Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss this, but I haven't got the figures before me yet.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I think the estimates are now being distributed on Capital Supply. I draw members' attention to the fact that these are self-sustaining corporations for which supply is being proposed. We're anxious to have it soon so that nothing can be held up. I am withholding, and will bring in at a later date, the portion dealing with General Purposes, but I propose now that we deal with the Schedule "A" which has been distributed now. I expect your guidance, Mr. Chairman, on how to deal with it. I presume we read each item and I can make some comment on each item. Is that the proper procedure?

MR. CRAIK: . . . suggesting that you will go through it all or . . . as you go through it item by item.

MR. CHERNIACK: Line by line.

MR. CRAIK: Pardon?

MR. CHERNIACK: Line by line, I thought.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we do this, this is the first time I have seen this sheet of figures, and I wonder whether it is necessary that we proceed at once with it. Is there urgency that it be done? If the Minister could indicate the urgency, because I think the normal procedure has been that we've received the information at least a day or two before the members are expected to debate the question. The amounts we're dealing with are sizeable. Now if the Minister can indicate that there is some particular urgency, I'm prepared to have a look at it; if not, I would recommend that we take this into consideration the next time we meet on Monday.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, the schedule was given to the Honourable Member of Ste. Rose's leader yesterday, and there was an indication -- the major urgency is the School Capital Financing Authority which wishes to proceed as quickly as possible. I cannot say that it is of the utmost urgency because we will be dealing at this session with interim supply, which of course the honourable member understands is urgent. This other matter is urgent but it's not that urgent that it can't stay over a day or so. I had no indication from the leaders of the two opposition parties that there would be any reason to hold it back but if there is a desire of honourable members it be held back I can bring it back tomorrow.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I may have misunderstood. Interim Supply -- I recognize we're almost at the end of the month now, here we are the 25th and my honourable friend must get his money. I had understood that's what we're dealing with and not the capital. However, I have no major objections as long as we get all the answers that we need.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's true we got this yesterday. My understanding, rightly or wrongly, was that there was some urgency by the end of the month, and I don't see any difficulty in dealing with this matter by the end of the month, no difficulty at all. I had thought that if we had reached this stage and if the Minister of Finance had been able to give us a little more detail than what we have on the page today, and allow the matter to stay in committee so that it can be considered, and that we seek the final information that we might want tomorrow. I would think that it would be possible to deal with the entire matter by tomorrow, but I would think that we might be able to give it a little more proper consideration. For the most part I'm prepared to acknowledge that it would appear to be routine, the routine capital estimates in this area that we go through year by year, but it does amount to \$129 million and I think that there might well be some comparisons that some members might want to make with other periods rather doing it all at once. If we were to allow them overnight, I think it probably could be dealt with by tomorrow.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, the schedule that was given to me by the Clerk would indicate that in the normal course we could deal with this through Committee of Supply, into Ways and Means with concurrences and first readings today and then second and third readings tomorrow, but if that's not acceptable then we could delay everything by a day and deal with it on Monday. However, it is, as I understand it, required that it should be completed and Royal Assent given by Tuesday, which is the 31st. I had indicated -- I think the Leader of the Opposition was not here -- I indicated that I have brief comments to make on each of the items. I could make them all at once and then go back if that's what honourable members would like done, or we could deal with them line by line. I certainly would not like to have any member feel that he hasn't had an opportunity to look into it, and we can see how it works out.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't quite sure, because I was out of the House, exactly at what stage we were at. I don't really care at which stage of the committee that we have the pause. I think that it would be better to be at the committee stage so that we can have the freedom of discussion back and forth. I would be very happy, and I think by leave we can move up at any of the various stages to complete by tomorrow, and I would be quite happy to co-operate by indicating the leave from this side as long as we have the freedom of discussion at a committee stage, whether it be this one or at a further clause by clause stage or anything. I would be very happy for the Minister to give a general explanation of all points, not necessarily line by line, just give us a general outline of what's being done.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, if that's acceptable, Mr. Chairman, then I would indicate each item separately but all at once, and then we can go back to deal with them or lay them over for tomorrow, whichever is acceptable to the House.

(MR. CHERNIACK Cont'd).

The first item is The Manitoba Telephone System request for \$14 million. This is required by the Telephone System to be provided along with the borrowing authority presently authorized, which will allow the corporation to complete its projected construction program for the fiscal year 1970-71 and to commit itself to projects being planned for the 1971-72 fiscal year. I think it's realized by members of this committee that the Telephone System has such large commitments that it must make them for a period beyond a year. The existing authority is for \$18,340,138. I'll pass on then to the next item but we can come back if it's so required.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, . . . put some questions at the same time and then have it over in committee. . .

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . is just that I think it could be done one way or the other. I'm quite prepared to do it this way and then pass the item, but the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition suggested that I go over all of them and then come back. I'm willing to do either, but surely not both.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . we stick to that procedure, that the Minister of Finance gives his total explanation and then we will go back and take each item individually and at that time he can re-explain and any member may ask questions. Will the Minister proceed?

MR. CHERNIACK: Then I'll move on to the Manitoba Water Supply Board which required borrowing authority of \$420,000, which along with the existing borrowing authority will allow the Board sufficient funds for its purposes to the end of the 1970-71 fiscal year.

The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation has requested borrowing authority for \$17 1/2 million. The Corporation presently has unused capital authority of \$14,300,000. The anticipated requirements for 1970-71 will require borrowing authority totalling \$16,800,000. The Corporation proposes to use the existing authority of \$14.3 plus 2 1/2 million of the additional authority now being requested to carry out the 1970-71 program. The balance of the capital authority requested, 15 million, is requested to permit commitments to be entered into for the 1971-72 fiscal year. The 1971-72 again, as I explained on the Telephone System, would be to make it possible. I might say there is a great deal of pressure on this because the indication from Central Mortgage and Housing is that commitments must be made this year in order to take advantage of the amount of money that has been set aside, and that's why it's essential. So to summarize, the existing unused capital authority - 14.3; the capital authority requested - 17.5; for a total of 31.8. The 1970-71 anticipated capital is 16.8, and the projection for the following year is 15 million. I'd indicate of course that, of this, an estimated 90 percent will be CMHC borrowing according to the present formula, so that this authority includes the total Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation borrowing and we are anxious to take the fullest advantage of all monies made available to us by the CMHC.

MR. FROESE: Did the Honourable Minister say 90, not 19?

MR. CHERNIACK: Are you talking about the . . .

MR. FROESE: CMHC.

MR. CHERNIACK: The percentage, it is estimated at 9-0 percent, 90 percent. The Manitoba School Capital Financing Authority requires \$25 million for the 1970-71 fiscal year for the financing of schools through the purchase of school division debentures. Since some \$2,000,000 is expected to be available from principal repayment of previous loans made to school divisions, the Authority only requires new borrowing authority in the amount of \$23 million.

The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation requires borrowing authorization for \$15 million so that funds can be made available through advances to farmers.

The Manitoba Development Fund has requested borrowing authority for \$60 million. Approximately \$35 million is already committed to various projects and the funds will be required to meet these commitments. Included in the \$60 million is an amount of \$25 million anticipated to be required for new projects during the year.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, one point in detail, if I might, and then a general comment. I wonder if we could have -- we've had an indication of the present authorization or unused authorization of I think most things except the Agricultural Credit Corporation. I wonder if we could have it for the Agricultural Credit Corporation, the unused capital they have on hand. And then from you, Mr. Chairman, who will be the chairman during current estimates, I would be prepared from our position, if we have the reasonable flexibility during current estimates of discussing the capital nature, not the amounts, of voting the funds today and proceeding on . . .

(MR. WEIR Cont'd) whatever basis my honourable friend would like to suggest and discussing the policies themselves when the Ministers are in the House. I know my honourable friend the Minister of Finance doesn't really want to discuss the detail of the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Education and so on, and I would be quite happy, as long as we have the understanding that we would have the usual flexibility that we have had I think over the years, to be able to discuss the policy matters at that time. So with the one question I would be prepared to move...

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the manner in which these notes have been prepared for me, I am under the impression that the Agricultural Credit Corporation does not now have an existing authority as a carryover, but certainly I undertake to correct that statement. I think I see a nod up above and that would indicate that I seem to be right. If I am wrong I will certainly report. I would certainly support the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's suggestion that during estimates, dealing with the salary of the respective Ministers, there should be every opportunity to discuss the program that would be involved here. I don't remember that it was ever prevented and I really don't see how it could be.

MR. ENNS: One question of the Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman. On the item (2) Manitoba Water Supply Board, I take it that the request here for the capital is simply to enable the Water Control Board to continue its present functions in that there is not a request here for an extension of program that to date is not within its jurisdiction to do. Perhaps the Minister is....

MR. CHERNIACK: I have the same assumption as does the honourable member. Again, during the estimates of the Minister of Mines and Resources, I'm sure that could be clarified.

MR. ENNS: One supplementary question might clarify it for me. Can the Minister indicate - and I don't have the comparable figures requested last year - is this comparable to the amount that the Manitoba Water Supply Board required last year or in previous years?

MR. CHERNIACK: I have an indication that last year, 1969, the Water Supply Board had requested \$800,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, could the Honourable Minister indicate what portion of the School Capital Financing Authority amount, \$23,000,000, is for schools already approved - school construction already approved? What portion of it? I think you indicated in the MDF portion \$60 million, that 25 was reserved for new expected business. I was wondering if he had the same figure for the school construction program.

MR. CHERNIACK: I gather that this is not committed and that this is the major reason why there is anxiety to have this through, so that tenders can be requested.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions and also I think points that should be debated. The first item we have on our list is the Manitoba Telephone System requesting \$14 million. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance is this going to be a continuing program whereby we will have to supply Telephone with 14 to 20 million each year? I think this is the procedure taking place over the last number of years. I think we shouldn't forget that the former Member for Lakeside, Mr. Campbell, used to point out that even this, although you might call it an investment, it still means a debt, a debt to the people of this province that they will have to pay for. Mind you, we will be getting, I expect, expansion in services. Where the money is going to be used we don't know at the present time, unless the Minister cares to give us that information.

Then, too, what is going to be the interest rate on this amount that we are going to borrow? What rates do we have to pay at the present time? Will this entail an increase in rates in the telephone charges in the future? Because these monies will be borrowed most likely over a lengthy period of years and the way our debt is reduced at the three percent Sinking Fund, this means that we can probably pay on it for the next 25 years, and if the economy should go down, and as far as the farm situation is concerned certainly this is what it looks like, that we can expect more difficult times ahead of us, and then to be burdened with these increased costs, I think this is something that we should consider at this point when we give these amounts that they are asking for approval, and the total of the request here today is \$129 million. This is a very substantial amount, and while I might not question it in certain areas as much as in others, like the Water Supply Board, it's not that big an amount and I certainly do not have the reservations there that I would have on other counts. In connection with the Water Supply Board, I would like

March 25, 1970

(MR. FROESE Cont'd) . . . to know what towns will be serviced; what is the money for. Certainly this would be of interest to honourable members of the Assembly here.

Then the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, \$17.5 million. How much of that money is going to be spent outside of Greater Winnipeg? Is not all of it going to the Greater Winnipeg area? I certainly would like to know how much is going to be spent outside of the city, because otherwise the rural population will be subsidizing the Greater Winnipeg area and I think we should, as a rural area, should have a just accounting of this.

The matter of the School Financing Authority was already questioned by the Honourable Member for Riel; \$23 million is requested in this area.

Then we have the Agricultural Credit Corporation for \$15 million. Parts of that could be - who knows what kind of loans are being made today. It's going to big corporations; it's not going to small farmers. It is going to the big corporations and they will be getting the larger shares of these monies that we are investing. We are probably defeating our purpose here by extending monies of this size and this scope to the corporations and not giving assistance to the smaller farmer who probably is in just as desperate a position as some of these big corporations.

The Development Fund is asking for \$60 million. We have heard that monies are going to the CFI. If the major portion of that money is going out in that respect, or are the monies that the CFI gets coming from some other source than the monies that we are approving here under the Development Fund allocation. I think I would like to have some light thrown out on these questions that I have put before I submit some more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Official Opposition has already asked for the carryovers. I wonder if the Minister would be good enough to supply the members of the committee with a printed list of the amounts that were carried over and the date on which they are carried over, because some of my notes do not quite agree with some of the figures he gave us today. Did I understand correctly that under the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, the Minister indicated that there was 14.3 in carryover from previous years - previous appropriations. Well my notes indicate that at the last session in August of 1969, the 27th of August, when we received the figures the request then was for \$6 million at that time and I had asked then what the carryover was from the previous year. The figure that I have noted down is \$5 million which would indicate of total of 11. Now I would have to go back to Hansard to verify whether I made a mistake in taking it down or not. Maybe if the Minister would agree to this, the simplest way would be to simply give us a list - he doesn't need to give it to us today, but if he could give it later on at the committee stage when we are in Supply - of exactly what is outstanding. And then when he does that, could he give us not only the outstandings on the six items on this year's list but also on all the other capital areas that have previously been appropriated, because I note for example that there is nothing this year for the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board and I would like to know how much there is still there and unused. There is nothing for the University of Manitoba which has appeared in the past. There is nothing for the Highways Branch which hasn't appeared now for some two years. The last time was in 1968. And there may be other capital appropriations of that nature which I think the House should know at this point so that we will know exactly where we stand and what has been appropriated and what's available.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, dealing first with the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, the appropriation for the Highways Branch will be included when I bring the General Purposes portion of the Capital Supply. The Manitoba Hydro, the existing authority is 60 to 70 million dollars and it's not expected there will be more required in this next fiscal year. I also want to make the correction that I promised to make if I found that my information was not correct on the Agricultural Credit Corporation. It was not correct. The present remaining authority is \$3,300,000. The other questions asked, which I think leaves the University, and generally I'll try and get that information for my honourable friend.

Dealing now with the points raised by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, the Telephone System has a continuing program of improvements and for supplying services to as many areas as is feasible. The Telephone System has reported with some pride that it expects in this year to have installed a communication service to all, or practically all settlements of 50 residents and over. It is constantly improving its equipment so that I don't think that I can indicate that there will be no more requests in future years from the Telephone System.

The Manitoba Water Supply Board. The request was made - apparently the Honourable

(MR. CHERNIACK Cont'd) Member isn't worried about money being spent in that direction - he wants to know what towns would be serviced. I presume that when the Minister deals with these matters he will be able to reply.

A question raised on Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. The honourable member is worried that all the money will be spent in the Winnipeg area. I can assure him that from my recollection a very substantial amount has been set aside for outside of Manitoba, and indeed as the honourable member probably knows, this has to come from the municipalities. We are hoping that we can get the municipalities to agree to do the job and we are only hoping that they will ask for more and more than they have been getting up to now, but unfortunately many of the municipalities of Manitoba have not asked to participate in housing and renewal schemes. Nevertheless, I have been informed by the Minister in charge that in his estimate at least 50 percent and he thinks more, of the monies would be spent outside of the Winnipeg area.

Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. I have no reason to accept the statement that this money will be used for large corporations to the disadvantage of smaller farmers. Again the Minister of Agriculture will be able to deal with that.

As to the Manitoba Development Fund, it has both commitments and it has expectations of working towards the economic development of the province. Generally speaking, the interest rates that we have undertaken to pay since this administration has come into power have been most comparable to the general situation as to interest rates. The honourable member says interest rates may go up. Indeed they may go down, and this is something that no one can forecast. He asks how much will they go up and I ask him the same question, because we don't know and we do our best to work within the market and see what we can manage as far as borrowing is concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Are there any subsidies involved with any of these concerns that we are allocating capital supply to as far as interest is concerned?

MR. CHERNIACK: To the extent that there may be any, they will be revealed in the debate on current estimates.

Mr. Chairman, would you want to deal with each of the items then - I don't know the procedure that well - or is it one resolution? I don't know what it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I understand that we would proceed on a point by point basis. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, could we not have this held in committee now so that we could read up on the information and assess it more properly in the intervening period and deal with this tomorrow?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the committee to proceed on a basis of each item on Schedule A?

MR. CHERNIACK: The practice has always been that we do proceed. I did agree that if there was a general feeling that this should be laid over - it does have to be dealt with this month - and I'd like to hear more of a consensus before I agree to one member holding it over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . Leader of the Official Opposition or the Liberal Party as to whether they oppose us proceeding at this time, or are they in agreement that we should proceed?

MR. SHERMAN: We have no objection of proceeding at the present time; we're in agreement that we'd proceed, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

Schedule "A" - Requirements of the Manitoba Telephone System, \$14 million - passed. The Manitoba Water Supply Board, \$420,000 - passed. The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, \$17 1/2 million - passed. Manitoba School Capital Financing Authority, \$23 million - passed. The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, \$15 million - passed. The Manitoba Development Fund, \$60 million - passed. Resolution - passed.
The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I would just like to raise objection on the Schedule as a whole. I think we are going into debt far too much at this point. If our economy was such that we were expanding I don't think we would mind so much, but when you take a look at the rural, the farm economy, I think we should take a second look at what is happening and what is going on. I don't think we can afford to make debt to the extent that we are proposing under this schedule. And it's not going to be just a year or so, this means that these debts and the payments that

(MR. FROESE Cont'd)... will have to be made will be with us for the next 25 years and the money, the way it is borrowed today, with the high rates of interest, and if I recall correctly, when these funds are borrowed that they will have to run their course and that they cannot be repaid, you don't have the options to repay previous to the time that they become due.

So I feel that we're going overboard as far as the farm section is concerned in this province. I have already indicated the other day that if the present proposal on the wheat quota system is proceeded with, that the farm income in this province will be \$50 million less than in the previous year, and this will just put the farmer in a much worse position than he's ever been. I don't think that we should pass it that lightly and just keep on spending and expanding when the economy cannot afford it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, we have now heard the annual speech of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. I point out that the request is for authority only. The expenditures will be made on the basis of what is needed and what the market will bear, and I hope we will bear in mind the concern of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, but certainly other than for him, I think it's been generally accepted that we must borrow for these self-sustaining funds in order to enable them to carry on. And I point out that they are self-sustaining funds, that the payments for these funds -- repayment, does not come out of general revenue. Certain loans that have been made do contain options to prepay, but in general they are commitments for a set period of time which is I believe in every case a lesser period of time than the use of the capital investment to which they are put.

I think for the record it would be of interest to the Honourable Member for Rhineland and possibly other members that I read the borrowing authority that has been granted in previous years, just to indicate how we stand in relation to that. 1965 - 39 and some million; 1966 - 179 million; 1967 - almost 41 million; 1968 - 248 and a fraction million; 1969 - \$310,800,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Honourable Minister of Finance now wish to proceed with interim supply?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes please, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$173,845,880, being 40 percent of the amount of the several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st of March, 1971, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1971 -- passed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Committee rise and report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has passed several resolutions and begs leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education, that the Resolutions reported from Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Capital Supply. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$129,920,000 for Capital expenditures. Schedule "A" - Requirements of The Manitoba Telephone system - \$14,000,000; The Manitoba Water Supply Board - \$420,000; The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation - \$17,500,000; The Manitoba School Capital Financing Authority - \$23,000,000; The Manitoba Agricultural Credit - \$15,000,000; The Manitoba Development Fund - \$60,000,000; Total - \$129,920,000.

Interim Estimates - Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$173,845,880, being 40 percent of the amount of the several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st of March, 1971, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1971.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for various Capital purposes, the sum of \$129,920,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund — passed.

Resolved that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1971, the sum of \$173,845,880, being 40 percent of the amount of the several items voted for departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1971, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund — passed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Committee rise and report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has passed several resolutions and begs leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, that the Resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means be now read a second time and concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Capital - Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for various Capital purposes the sum of \$129,920,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Interim Supply - Resolved that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses for the public service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1971, the sum of \$173,845,880, being 40 percent of the amount of the several items voted for departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1971, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Transportation, that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 29, An Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for Capital purposes and authorize the borrowing of the same, that same be now received and read a first time.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 21, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1971, that the same be now received and read a first time.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a general disposition that the House conclude early today, therefore I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the House do now adjourn, and I'd like to remind the members that we meet at 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, just for one minute before we move on that question, I'd like to ask the Minister of Government Services, in respect of the departmental estimates now before us, whether it will be possible to conform to past, what I believe was past practices, and make available to the members a list of all the numbers of people employed to match the salaries items that are shown for each of the different departments.

MR. PAULLEY: Actually, Mr. Speaker, this should be directed to the House Leader, but it has been generally agreed upon that a list of the civil servants in each department has been made available to each department, not necessarily and precisely by name and salary

March 25, 1970

(MR. PAULLEY Cont'd)...but the total number of civil servants, and I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable the House Leader will be able to obtain the co-operation of all departments in having this assessment made.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 10:00 o'clock Thursday morning.