

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements; Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions.

The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, my records show that there are some 16 Orders for Returns that haven't been filed with us today, and I am going to ask the Honourable House Leader, are the Returns going to be filed to the members or to the Whip?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I believe it's only two years ago that the rules were changed to permit Orders for Returns to be filed inter-sessionally. Before that, they used to die on the Order Paper. Now I understand that the Orders for Returns will be filed and members who requested them will receive notification that they have been filed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call the resolution of the Honourable the First Minister, the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was on the floor. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, just before the House Leader called adjournment at 5:30, reference was made to a television interview or television program in which Professor Kuiper and Mr. Cass-Beggs were participants with respect to regulating Lake Winnipeg, and there was an issue raised as to whether in fact the level of the lake would be maintained at 715 or not. I would like to make reference to the transcript, which has already been referred to in past debates in this House, of the CBC television program 24 Hours, December 2, 1970. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'd like to refer to Mr. Cass-Beggs' statement when he said and I quote: "Frankly, because we don't know in detail, we do know that the lake will fluctuate; it will be varying over limits that are not as wide as it varies in nature, but as for keeping it continuous at 715, of course that's absurd. There's no storage effect if you never draw the lake down, so that it will fluctuate. It's not likely to get to 711 unless we are in a serious drought condition, and it won't be up to 715 except at the tail end of the season if we are lucky enough to have adequate flows to get it up there."

Now this is the statement of Professor Kuiper in that discussion: "You say, Mr. Cass-Beggs, it is absurd. It will stay at 715 for any length of time. We regulated the lake on paper, in the lake - studies ten years ago - for power interest, and you will see several periods of 3, 4 or 5 years in a row where the lake level stays constant at 715 for power interest to attain that storage and release that storage when the dry years come, so in my opinion it is quite feasible that for power interest alone, the power operator would wish to retain the lake level at 715 constant."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the position of Professor Kuiper in the debate with Mr. Cass-Beggs, and indicates that the lake level in his opinion, based on the studies that were made by his department, would have a lake level at 715 constant. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has made much to-do about the fact that on this weekend the lake level was 716, that in effect they were drawing it down two feet and that in effect the people of Lake Winnipeg, the cottage owners and the property owners of Lake Winnipeg, would be very happy with the regulation that the government proposes. But, Mr. Speaker, if Professor Kuiper is correct, the regulation of Lake Winnipeg will be at 715 constant which means that -- yes, Mr. Speaker, it will be at 715 constant, which will mean that it will remain at 715 through the full period, full period of time, and that in effect -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says he didn't say that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . Mr. Speaker, and my interpretation, based on what he said, and I must . . . my interpretation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I would ask respectfully all honourable members to adhere to our Rule 40 and that they honour the debate so that there are no interruptions, otherwise the honourable member who is debating can continue debating from here until Kingdom Come - I don't know what that means, but I've heard the expression - and I would certainly hope that he would finish it sometime this evening, but with interjections it will not occur. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, one of the problems with the government is that they think they know it all, and they are not prepared to acknowledge that maybe someone who has more knowledge than them knows something more - and I'm not referring to myself. If my interpretation of Professor Kuiper's statement is wrong, I would like to hear that from Professor Kuiper, because I want to quote something else that he said in that particular television interview, or television discussion. He said, and I quote: "I feel that public hearings would be essential to proceed with this project. I have a few concerns about the way things are going and I feel that many citizens of Manitoba probably have the same sort of concern."

Mr. Speaker, this is Professor Kuiper whom the government wants to quote as supporting their position. This is Professor Kuiper supporting Lake Winnipeg regulation. This is Professor Kuiper who I suggest indicates that, based on his studies, Lake Winnipeg will remain at 715 constant for power purposes, and Mr. Speaker, this is Professor Kuiper who has asked in this television interview that a request be made for public hearings, and this is Professor Kuiper who Mr. Campbell referred to as supporting his basic position of the need --(Interjection)--Oh yes he did. I tell the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that when former Premier Campbell came up before the committee, he indicated that he would have not proceeded with this matter before the Board nor would he have taken the action if there were not people of substance who supported his position, and he named two people, one of whom was Professor Kuiper and the other another professor whose name I do not remember. I was familiar with Professor Kuiper's because I had read the transcript before we had commenced the meeting.

So, Mr. Speaker, we go back to the original resolution that was before us. The Premier originally intended to allow public hearings to take place, not in a question that the committee had jurisdiction to do it, but that the resolution would in fact provide that public hearings were to take place, and the Premier decided to take that and withdraw that, so we now have a committee as it was formed that possibly could meet within the next six month period, to deal with the matter before us. We have, as well, a motion before that committee that the report of Hydro be received. That is now before the committee and, as the Honourable Member for Riel has already indicated, that would mean that once we met in session we would have to deal with that motion, the government majority would see to it that that motion had been put, and for all intents and purposes, the work of the committee would be finished. So this act, Mr. Speaker, and this resolution, essentially is a sham. This resolution is just another way of the government trying to weasel out - and that's the only expression that can be used - weasel out of its responsibility to provide within this Legislature the kind of opportunity for a full examination of the matters that are important and critical to the people of this province, one of which has been Hydro.

Mr. Speaker, this is why the amendments that are proposed by the Honourable Member for Riel should be supported. It will provide for hearings; it will insist that the committee meet within a specific period of time, in a short period of time; and it will provide for the kind of continuing discussion and debate that is necessary to clarify it; and if in fact the amendments proposed to the resolution are adopted and the hearings are held, we will have the opportunity of calling people who have some expertise in the field to offer their contribution and then we will be able to judge and see whether the government's position is supported or whether we really have a situation in which we have the government and Cass-Beggs on one side, and frankly a majority of those people who are competent in this field on the other, and the public can judge as to the legitimacy and the validity of the position that the government is taking in risking, at this particular time, in risking anywhere from \$50-140 million as has been estimated by Mr. Campbell and others - Mr. Campbell in his presentation. When I say "others", there have been other people who have not appeared before the committee that are prepared, I think, to present substantial information to support that conclusion and to support

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . the actual cost that the people will be paying when you consider it amortized over a period of time.

One of the problems here on the part of the government, as in so many other cases, as is indicated in so many other cases, is that it can't admit that they may have made a mistake, and, Mr. Speaker, they did make a mistake, and it's about time they were prepared to stand up and admit it rather than force an onerous cost to be absorbed by the taxpayers of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, if we on this side appear to look annoyed and frustrated with the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, it is because we are annoyed and frustrated with him. He has repeated the same speech a number of times in this Legislature and he rises again this afternoon and bases his entire grievance and argument on the assertion that the Opposition has not had an opportunity to debate Manitoba's hydro development program, and Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth of the matter. My colleague and I put our heads together and it's quite evident and pretty obvious that during the course of this session I would say that members opposite have concentrated on Hydro and the hydro development program perhaps more than on any other single issue with the possible exception of that of unicity itself, and that during the debate on the Throne Speech, during the debate on the Budget Speech, during the estimates of the Department of Mines and Resources, during the capital estimates, on a number of times on a motion to go into Supply on a grievance motion, members opposite have raised the Hydro matter time and time again, and they have made basically the same argument. Why are they doing this? Because they think that they have an issue here that they can make some political gain on, and there is nothing wrong with the Opposition trying to make political gain. After all, that is part of the very substance of the affairs of this Legislature.

They think they have an issue because a former member of the Board of Directors of Hydro resigned. He resigned giving reasons why, in his opinion, it would have been better to transpose the sequence of Lake Winnipeg regulation and Churchill River Diversion and, because he felt so strongly about it, so convinced was he in his mind, he resigned - the honourable thing to do. What the Leader of the Opposition failed to tell honourable members and tell the world, however, this afternoon was that, of the seven members of the Board, six voted in favour of the course of action we are following, but the member opposite would want this government to follow the course of action that is approved by one and disapproved by six. That is the kind of queer, perverse concept he has of democratic process or of decision-making. One says no, six say yes, so the Leader of the Opposition would go with the nays. Six say aye, one says nay, the Leader of the Opposition would go with the nays. That is the kind of perverse thinking that seems to motivate him these days. It must be his frustration in being in the Opposition that leads him into such an illogical box.

And then this afternoon he made the mistake of getting involved with the subject matter of Lake Winnipeg regulation and Southern Indian Lake. It's obvious from his remarks this afternoon that he has no appreciation, almost no appreciation whatsoever, as to just what is involved with regulating Lake Winnipeg between 711 and 715 and diverting the Churchill River at South Bay on South Indian Lake by means of a 30,000 cubic foot per second diversion. I don't really believe that the Leader of the Opposition appreciates what is involved. If that sounds egotistical, it isn't, Sir. It's just that in relation to the understanding of my honourable friend, I feel that I have expertise to spare - in relative terms only.

The Leader of the Opposition makes reference to the fact that one member of the senior staff of Hydro resigned because he felt that, again, that there should be a transposal of the sequence of Nelson River development so that Churchill River Diversion precedes Lake Winnipeg regulation and that, in his view, if I understand the honourable gentleman correctly, Lake Winnipeg regulation may never be necessary. Now, every person is entitled to his honestly held view and I don't question for moment but that the staff person from Hydro who did resign really believed that the high level diversion of Southern Indian Lake was the right course of action for Hydro to follow, but it is obviously the view of the majority of six out of seven of the board of Hydro that this was the wrong policy to follow, and the government of Manitoba shares that view. It's as simple as that.

Now my honourable friend this afternoon, it was, you know, really interesting and amusing at one and the same time to hear him talk about the ecological effect to South Indian Lake

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . of the raising of the water level of ten feet and thirty feet. He would have us believe that there is virtually no difference between raising South Indian Lake to 870 or 869.5 on the one hand, and 850 on the other hand. Well now, Mr. Speaker, for one thing, raising South Indian Lake to 850 feet means that approximately one-tenth of the land area that would be flooded under high level diversion, will be flooded under the 850 low level diversion, that's point one. Point two: by going to 850 feet and no more, one is assured that Granville Lake will not be raised one inch.

I don't know if my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition has ever seen Granville Lake, but it is one of the most beautiful and picturesque lakes and areas of the province, and I can assure my honourable friend that those from the Water Commission, and others, who have actually made an on-site inspection, would regret very much the very prospect of any flooding of South Indian Lake, let alone flooding of Granville Lake and the upper reaches of the Churchill River all the way as far back as High Rock, Pickeral Narrows and Pukatawagan, but under the high level diversion scheme, not only would South Indian Lake have been flooded and 700,000 acres come under water in near proximity to South Indian Lake, but Granville Lake would have come under 10-15 feet of water and the upstream area of the Churchill River all the way back to High Rock. I wonder if my honourable friend appreciates the difference, therefore, between the high level and the low level in terms of its ecological effect. There is just a great, great deal of difference.

Now there is one other point I would like to make for the benefit of honourable friends opposite. They say that, well, as my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition was so candid as to admit on television about two months ago, and I must say that I respect him for it, he admitted very candidly on television two months ago that the high level diversion concept was a mistake. Yes, he said that and, you know, I accept that statement from him, but he now has the idea that the 854, the sort of low intermediate level flooding concept, is the right one because, if you follow that one, if you adopt that one, then he thinks that Lake Winnipeg regulation could be avoided.

Now there are one or two people that are enough, not presumably but who are admittedly quite knowledgeable on this matter, who say that an 854 foot, the intermediate level flooding of South Indian Lake, is the desirable policy option to take because then you can avoid Lake Winnipeg regulation for the rest of the '70s through most of the '80s, presumably as far as 1990, but I say to my honourable friends - and you don't have to be an engineer expert to understand this - that you cannot commit hundreds of millions of dollars to the building of generating stations on the lower Nelson and not have an adequate guaranteed storage system for the water, and 854 feet to South Indian Lake does not give you any storage worthy of the name "storage". The high level flooding would have given you ample storage, but the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and we on this side, agree that the high level diversion option is out; it was the wrong one so it's out; and that leaves you, Sir, with two other options: either to proceed with Lake Winnipeg regulation for storage and Southern Indian Lake low level diversion for flow, or else you drop that option, which I believe to be the right one, the one we are following, and you opt for the sort of the grey middle, the grey compromise option, which is take Southern Indian Lake up to 854, an intermediate level flooding, and hope that you can get by without any storage anywhere, either on Southern Indian Lake or on Lake Winnipeg, and I say to my honourable friends that this government would be irresponsible if it allowed for the expenditures of hundreds of millions, as we are, on development of generating stations at Kettle, at Long Spruce, which is the next one, ultimately at Limestone Point, each one amounting to several hundreds of millions, without making sure that there is adequate water storage either on Lake Winnipeg or on the Churchill River at South Indian Lake. It has to be one or the other. So let's put this idea of 854 without storage, let's put that aside as being the kind of option that no responsible government would want to live with.

My honourable friend wants to leave the impression that this government got itself frozen into a political or policy situation because of what was said during the election of 1969. I am not aware that any single one of my colleagues, or myself, had ever said during the election of '69 that we would definitely, that we would definitely floor or not flood South Indian Lake. As a matter of fact, we took pains to keep the options open pending an exhaustive engineering study, which was done, and that's what the Task Force report is. Now it may not be the ultimate insofar as being exhaustive, it may not be ultimately exhaustive, but it is, we are satisfied, an adequately thorough-going study. My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition must be confusing the statements that were made by the former Leader of the

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . Liberal Party in 1969, who made the declaration during the month of, I think it was June 1969, that regardless of the circumstances, in effect, regardless of the circumstances, Southern Indian Lake flooding would not be proceeded with. Regardless. Under no circumstances. We let it be known that if the engineering studies showed that there was a significant cost differential, I think I was so bold as to put a tentative figure of \$3 million differential as being a kind of a standard of measure, that if the cost differential were to be less than \$3 million, we would opt for a course of action that would enable us to stay away from a high level flooding; and I'm not only confident, Mr. Speaker, I am serenely confident, completely confident, that the policy direction we are following with respect to Hydro development is the correct one.

Some of the decisions, the options were no longer there for us to take but in some cases the options were still open, and I am satisfied that my colleagues and I, based on the recommendations we have received from our advisors, and based also on the recommendations of the Hydro Board of Directors itself, I am satisfied we have taken the right course of action. Insofar as the ultimate proof of it is concerned, that will have to await the passage of time and we are very confident in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has covered some of the technicalities of this issue and done so thoroughly from his party's position on the question. My leader has covered some of the technicalities of the question as to whether Lake Winnipeg regulation or diversion of the Churchill River is the desirable procedure to take, and done so thoroughly, armed with my party's points of view and knowledge of the question insofar as we possessed the details. I'd like to address myself for a minute or two, Sir, to the resolution itself on the Order Paper.

The resolution is easily understandable, Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt about the government's intentions; there is no mystery about the motives implicit in this resolution. The intention of the resolution, the intention of the government is simply, clearly and candidly, to pigeonhole the long-awaited report of the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources and to stifle criticism and debate with respect to the question to which the First Minister and my leader just in the past few moments have addressed themselves.

The First Minister has done an excellent job of rationalization in defence of his government's position. He's delivered himself an excellent political defence of a highly political position. The Minister of Mines and Resources did the same thing earlier today. The Minister of Mines and Resources said that he was prepared to admit that everything he had done since he came into politics had been done on the basis of making a political decision, and he didn't apologize for that. He said that making political decisions, in his view, is the highest calling that a person can undertake, and I subscribe to that philosophy.

But, Mr. Speaker, neither the Minister of Mines and Resources nor the First Minister can hide behind a cloak of self-righteousness on a question such as this. The fact that the Minister of Mines and Resources is committed to a career of making political decisions doesn't guarantee us or his party or the people of Manitoba necessarily that those decisions will be right. It does not necessarily guarantee that the people of Manitoba, on this question or any other question with which the Minister of Mines and Resources is concerned, are going to profit and benefit as a consequence of his decisions. There are good political decisions and there are bad political decisions, and the Minister nods his head in agreement as I knew he would, so I suggest that the kind of argument he advanced this afternoon was specious in the least, if not utterly misleading, because the very fact that he is interested in making political decisions and is dedicated to making political decisions was, at least in my interpretation of the position that he took, proffered to us, held out to us, as a kind of a cloak of sanctity that was intended to guarantee to us that because he was committed and dedicated in this way, everything was all right by Manitoba and by the world.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Resources went on from there to say that there was never a word of criticism from the Opposition on the question of Lake Winnipeg regulation until we heard the submission a few weeks ago from the former Premier, Mr. D. L. Campbell. Well, in response to that, Mr. Speaker, to quote a declamatory quotation already delivered in this Chamber in this session by the Minister himself, so what? So what? So he says that some of us on this side didn't arm ourselves, or weren't in a position to arm ourselves with arguments and criticisms and raise them and fight the issue until we heard

(MR. SHERMAN Cont'd) . . . .from Mr. D.L. Campbell. Well, so what, Mr. Speaker? Is the Minister suggesting that there is no place, there is no room in the role of the Opposition or anybody in this Legislature for information, for new information, for enlightenment if you want to put it that way, for qualified, skilled, competent criticism? Is he suggesting that simply because some of us perhaps didn't mount an intensive offensive until Mr. Campbell made his views known, that we therefore had no right to develop an attack or an offensive afterwards?

In the first place, that argument is, as I have suggested a moment ago, utterly specious. In the second place, I'm not entirely sure that it's true. I think that my colleague the Member for Riel from the outset has been critical; with his engineering and scientific knowledge of the questions involved, from the outset has been critical of the choice of the Lake Winnipeg regulation plan over the Churchill River Diversion and some of the other alternatives proposed. It's my understanding that my colleague from Riel has always publicly and clearly and candidly made that position of opposition on his part known. If some of the others of us on the committee failed to act as vocally and as decisively as the Minister thinks we should have six months ago, then it's simply because we were waiting for expert opinion and expert comments and technical information that we were not armed with until certain people, among them Mr. Campbell, made arguments clear and unequivocal that impressed us with the basis and the foundation of knowledge on which they were developed.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines says that the government has not refused to bring in a report from this particular committee, the Committee on Public Utilities and Resources. He says that the report hopefully will be presented before the end of this session. Well, he knows that any gesture of that kind at the point that we have now reached in this session, becomes more meaningless, becomes more worthless by the hour, by the moment. He knows that bringing in a report like that as the last specific or overt move of the government in this session, at perhaps two or three or four o'clock in the morning, is a worthless gesture on the government's part, and once again it's an argument which is false and misleading in its presentation and in its relevance to the issue.

The issue is that a report on a highly contentious decision of this government, studied and approached by experts, is awaited very keenly by not only the members of the Opposition and the members of the Public Utilities Committee, but by the people of this province, because of the question, the money, the resource development at stake involving the province and the people of this province. The issue is whether or not that kind of question is going to be allowed to be opened to public scrutiny and debate; whether the debate is going to be allowed to continue; in fact whether it's going to be allowed to be held at all; and I submit that the import and the intent of this particular resolution is precisely to stifle and stymie that.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister addressed himself in the main to this question yesterday, not on the resolution itself but on the same principle involved when the question of a report from the Public Utilities Committee was raised by my colleague from Riel. At that time it seemed to me that the First Minister was taking extreme pains to find, for himself and for his government, a defence and a rationalization of their position. I find that inconsistent with some of the high-blown stated intentions and ideals outlined by this government at the start of this session. I suggest that some of the high intention and lofty principle of the Throne Speech has been replaced at this late and closing stage of the session by crude political maneuvering, by crude politics. That's what's happening on this particular issue. And I think there is a provocative question that we are left with as a consequence of this resolution and as a consequence of the position the government has taken, in stubbornness, throughout the past six weeks, ever since the report of the Committee on Public Utilities and the decision to regulate Lake Winnipeg and the division among certain members of the Hydro Board became known, and that is the question, Mr. Speaker, as to whether in fact the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, Mr. David Cass-Beggs, will ever be back to fulfil the role he was assigned to fill by this government. I think it's an interesting and a provocative question at this stage as to whether Mr. Cass-Beggs will ever be back. It seems one is left with the suspicion --yes, that's true; as my colleague points out, he doubtless would find it difficult to reject and repudiate the kind of stipend that he's receiving for the job he's doing but--(Interjection)--well, I accept -- can we get him into a Public Utilities. . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member address himself to the Chair?

MR. SHERMAN: I accept the First Minister's invitation, Mr. Speaker. I accept the First Minister's invitation to meet the chairman when he comes back to his \$62,000 or \$64,000 a year job, but I suggest that it's very easy to be intrigued by and provoked by that question at this stage of the game, at this stage of the debate over this crucial issue of the decision that the government is taking in hydro-electric development in this province. That provocative question nags at us in the Opposition, as this session draws to a close, whether or not Mr. Cass-Beggs, the chairman, will ever in fact --I'm asking the question--whether he will ever in fact --(Interjection)-- I've posed it; now, Mr. Speaker, it's intriguing the Minister of Finance. Now it's intriguing the Minister of Finance. There are a number of...

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the same sense that the Honourable Member from Fort Garry is intrigued with the remote or not-so-remote possibility that Mr. Cass-Beggs may not come back from his holiday, would the Honourable Member for Fort Garry be interested to know that there were some members on this side who were intrigued with the thought that the Member for Fort Garry last week when he was away on holidays might not bother coming back?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that doesn't rank with the \$64,000 question that I posed but it certainly, at this stage of the session, Mr. Speaker, warms the cockles of my heart to know that I was missed by the First Minister and the Minister of Mines and by all his colleagues.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I realize I have had to allow a lot of latitude and probably will have to allow a lot more, but I do believe we are debating a resolution with an amendment and I would like to have the honourable members apply themselves to the resolution before us. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am attempting to address myself to the resolution before me and what I have said is based on my contention, that I think is demonstrated by the conduct of the government, that the intent of the resolution is to stifle this debate, and there is no question in my mind, there is no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that it's the fine hand of the Minister of Mines and Resources that's really behind the resolution, because I found the First Minister having extreme difficulty yesterday in defending the position that his government has taken. So I leave the debate on that note, Mr. Speaker, that the question of the hour, really, is whether we'll ever have a chance to examine the conclusions of the committee and of the witnesses that appeared before the committee, and see those witnesses again before the committee that we requested when the committee was in session, and will we in fact see it with the chairman that we have come to know so well and love so dearly?

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

MR. JORGENSON: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order, please. The motion before the House is the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Riel.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Craik, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, G. Johnston (Portage la Prairie), Jorgenson, McGill, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Sherman, Spivak, Watt.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Toupin, Uskiw, and Walding.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 15; Nays 24.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Nays have it, and I declare the motion lost. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Minister for Labour. Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I will make just a few brief comments on the motion. Mr. Speaker, the government paid \$800,000 to Underwood McClellan for a study on the Hydro proposal. The study found that the high level diversion as first requested by Hydro was not necessary. The study found, as well, that a middle diversion could work. The study found

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) . . . . as well that Lake Winnipeg should not be controlled until 1933 if the middle diversion was proceeded with. That's No. 1.

No. 2. Mr. Cass-Beggs, in his testimony last year on June 11, 1970, said and I quote:

"Question: If Hydro does proceed with the middle diversion, will a swamp be created around Southern Indian Lake?"

"Mr. Cass-Beggs: I think I could only quote the opinions that have been given by fairly competent people in the ecological field, that the middle diversion is not much more to be preferred than the high level diversion as far as the damages around the lake are concerned."

Mr. Speaker, I admit that with reference to Granville Lake that the issue is different, but with respect to Southern Indian Lake and the ecological damage, the question of the degree is not as high as others would make you believe. Mr. Speaker, once the flooding is commenced, the ecological damage will be done, and so, Mr. Speaker, it's the government's intention, it's Hydro's intention to proceed with a diversion which will in fact flood Southern Indian Lake and that's why the Burntwood Bridge is built as high as it has been, and everyone knows it and there is just no point of trying to kid the members opposite or the public in this respect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I also quote the television transcript that I referred to before:

"John Harvard: Mr. Cass-Beggs, I know these gentlemen want to get at you, but I want to start off by saying: why no public hearings? Because if you harken back to the Southern Indian Lake controversy, to Hydro, everything looked so rosy in the early stages and then suddenly the public hearings were held and things weren't so rosy. Wouldn't the same thing apply here?"

"Mr. Cass-Beggs: I don't think so. The position, of course, the decision on hearings or not is up to the government, not to Hydro, but the position taken is that the hearings are to assess the details of damage and so on, while the Lake Winnipeg proposal is clearly acceptable to the vast majority of the people, and the government makes this judgment and proceeds with the basic problem."

"Harvard: Well, are you saying that this is a political question that you can't answer? Surely Manitoba Hydro must have some social conscience. You must care about the public's reaction and the public's confidence in you."

"Mr. Cass-Beggs: Well, of course, and the public has reacted extremely favourably to the proposal. It is nothing at all in the same category as the original high level proposal."

Now, Mr. Speaker, one has to ask the government, how do they measure public reaction? Do they measure it by an 8,000 or a 10,000 rally outside of this Legislature or do they allow people who claim to be representative of a group of significant numbers who are affected by the action of government to be heard? And that was what was requested of the hearings by the Lake Winnipeg cottage owners and that was what was asked for by the members of the Opposition in asking them to be heard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hearings have not been held, the verdict has been given, and now we are going to possibly have a sham trial in the hearings that the Water Commission will hear with respect to the pattern of regulation. But the decision has been made. The government says we have made the decision, one person has dissented on the board and he's considered and his opinion has to be judged on the basis of six to one; but we suggest, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis of the technical information that we have had made available to us, on the basis of the expertise that has been made available to us, there is a real question of judgment on the part of the government and they would have been far better off to have either established a technical inquiry, independent of the politicians, to be able to make a judgment as to whether the government was proceeding accurately or was interpreting the information that they had correctly, or further, they should have allowed the openness that a hearing would have allowed for presentations to be made so that we in this House could have made a judgment as to whether the government is proceeding correctly or not, and based on the procedure that they followed, on the sham that they have created in attempting to try and stifle the ability to, not discuss and debate the issue, but to have the technical information presented, to have a cross-examination of the board of members, to have the people who presented the Task Force with the information upon which the judgment of the chairman was made, presented for the committee's scrutiny and for the committee's study.

By presenting all of this, Mr. Speaker, by in effect putting us in this position, they obviously have to have something to hide. What that is we do not know at this point, Mr. Speaker, but let me suggest this. Let me suggest this. Mr. Campbell has replied to the



(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) . . . . members of the committee, has refuted the representations of Mr. Cass-Beggs, has in fact challenged Mr. Cass-Beggs' statement that his arithmetic is garbage, and until there is a proper hearing to in fact properly present an argument against that, the government is charged at this point with preventing the kind of openness that at least would satisfy the people of this province that their action is correct. Mr. Campbell has made representation of the cost to the people of Manitoba; Dr. Kristjanson resigned his post on that basis; and the government can announce that there are a thousand Hydro employees against the one who resigned, and they may say that there are six members of the board against the one, one of whom I believe includes one of the members of the government as a representative from the government on that board, and they may talk all they want. The truth of the matter is that that one person's argument at this point has been subject to a dispute and subject to a discussion that was never properly allowed to be discussed and aired in our committee, and the refusal by the government majority to allow that has to reflect on their attitude, has to reflect on their openness, and has to support and give validity to the representations of Mr. Campbell. We will proceed with the hearings; the government has a majority. One really wonders whether those hearings are going to be the continuation of the sham that has been carried on so far.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister will be closing debate. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Yes, Mr. Speaker, and the First Minister would be closing debate so I have a few comments to make to the resolution. As honourable members know, it deals with the matter of setting up the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources and what is surprisingly lacking is the matters that should be referred to a committee of this type. It just mentions matters referred. The matters that were referred to the committee earlier have been discussed in committee and I don't know of any new matters that are being referred. Unless the amendment had been accepted I don't feel that the committee will be called. I doubt very much whether that committee will be called after prorogation because the matters that were being discussed in committee and probably in the government's mind were finalized; at least no report has been brought into the House and therefore I don't see why they should call any further meetings, especially after the amendment was defeated. I think if the amendment had been accepted it would be a different matter altogether because then there would be purpose in having the committee constituted and act. We have other committees that haven't been called at this session; the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations hasn't been functioning for the last two years. This is the second year in a row that that particular committee has not been called once, it hasn't been organized; and this year again it wasn't even called to get organized and certainly a committee could have been called to get organized because there would be no cost involved. Later on if it's called after the session there is cost involved in just in organizing it. I take great exception to this, that why set up committees if we don't even call them or have them sit once during the session?

So, Mr. Speaker, with these words, I certainly don't have great hopes that this committee that we are constituting here will even meet in between sessions.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer some of the specific points that were raised in debate, and answer them as quickly as I can. To those members on the other side who persist in arguing that we are trying to stifle the debate on Hydro development, I merely point out to them once again, that it is we who have introduced this resolution here to re-establish the Committee on Utilities and Natural Resources, so that it can meet between sessions, and by virtue of having introduced that resolution there has been ample opportunity for debate and there has been debate, and the debate has taken place because of an action we have initiated in having the resolution on the Order Paper.

Point two, I can tell the Member for Rhineland that if he has any concern that this committee although authorized to sit will not in fact be called, I can allay his fears. The committee, once the House passes this resolution, the committee will be convened and it will be convened within a matter of 30 days approximately. We have no desire whatsoever to curtail opportunity for discussion on the matter, but I want my honourable friends opposite to know that they did have approximately 8 to 10 hours, if my calculations are anywhere near accurate, 8 to 10 hours, if not somewhat more, of committee time in which to take up the Hydro report and the Task Force report which was subsumed under the annual report. Honourable members opposite in their own wisdom decided to take up almost half of that time in procedural wrangling, but that's not our fault, Mr. Speaker; that was their decision. And in the end, when we could have carried on for another hour or so, at the time of the fifth and last meeting of the Hydro Committee, the Utilities Committee, it was the Member for Riel who moved the adjournment of it, although I don't propose to take any great deal of time on that specific point.

Let it be clear, however, Mr. Speaker, that the committee will be reconvened pursuant to this resolution when it is passed; and that secondly, if they are trying to use as a secondary argument the argument that public hearings will not be held, how many times does the Minister of Mines and Resources, how many times do I have to assure them that the Manitoba Water Commission will be holding public hearings. They will be holding public hearings. There can be no question on that point. And if they think that there is something that is anti-climatic about having the Water Commission hold hearings just because an interim licence has been granted, I make it clear to my honourable friends that the Water Commission - the hearings that will be held will have to do with the pattern of regulation, not a very unimportant little thing, the actual pattern of regulation will be determined pursuant to hearings that will be convened under the aegis of the Manitoba Water Commission.

I say in conclusion therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition has failed to make a convincing case: (a) that there has not been ample opportunity for debate because there has been a good deal of debate on that question. The Opposition knows that. Insofar as the allegation that there will be no public hearing, there will be public hearings. Insofar as we proceeding without properly constituted authority, we are following a policy that was recommended by a Board of Directors and a majority of six to one. I really fail to see - when all is said and done, I fail to see just what it is that motivates my honourable friends opposite.

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

MR. GREEN: Yeas and Nays, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please. The motion before the Assembly is the resolution proposed by the Honourable First Minister.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barkman, Barrow, Borowski, Cherniack, Craik, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Gonick, Gottfried, Graham, Green, Hanuschak, Henderson, Jenkins, Johannson, Johnston (Portage), Jorgenson, McBryde, McGill, McKellar, McKenzie, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Moug, Patrick, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Sherman, Spivak, Toupin, Uskiw, Walding and Watt.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 41; Nays nil.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. In my opinion the Yeas have it; I declare the motion carried. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that Mr. Speaker now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a committee to consider Bill No. 107.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 107, An Act respecting the City of Brandon and Certain Municipalities. Section 1 (a) passed - page by page? (b) (i) . . . The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words on this particular section, "Brandon District Planning area." I think we heard from the municipalities that they don't want any part of the Brandon District Planning Area; they have their own planning area, and I would like the government to remove this particular section, subsection (b) in Section 1.

Why should the town of Souris whose municipality is 30 miles away from the city of Brandon be part of the Brandon District Planning Area is more that I'll ever know. They have nothing in common with the city of Brandon. I can understand why the municipality of Cornwallis should be in a planning area because they do have something in common, because they surround Brandon, also parts of Elton might be considered, but I don't think there is any justification for Souris or Wawanesa, for the municipalities of Oakland or Glenwood, to be part of this particular area; and when it's not going to be legislated at this time, I don't see any justification for even having it here.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the government, now that they are amending this bill, I think they would be well advised to take this section out. I don't know whether I can move this be deleted or whether I just vote against it; I guess that's about all I can do. Mr. Chairman, I'll just sit down and say nought.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I understand the honourable member's concern. Let me say that I do think that his concern would be more reasonable if in fact the organization of the Planning Commission mentioned in the Bill was of such a nature that it would be compulsory for each municipality to join. The joining of such a planning area is strictly permissive, it's up to each municipality to decide on its own whether or not they wish to join. Secondly, the municipalities are named due to the fact that further on in the bill the municipalities are used as a base for devising the uniform tax levy in respect to the agricultural tax within the Cornwallis municipality.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ayes and Nays - call in the members. The question before the House is Section 1 (b) (i).

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 22, Nays 15.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I was paired with the Minister for Labour. Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. (b) (ii) passed; (sections 3 to 7 passed.) The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. We are on clause (b) of 1 . . .

MR. PAWLEY: You are on section 3?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. We are on section 1 clause (b) (i) to (x) and I'm on (vii) right now. (The balance of Section 1 was read and passed)

Section 2--passed; section 3 - the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that Section 3 of Bill 107 be struck out and the following section be substituted therefor: "Payment by Brandon to Cornwallis: 3 (1) In each year before the first day of October, the City shall pay to Cornwallis an amount equal to 75 percent of the difference calculated under subsection (2).

"Calculation by Municipal Board: 3 (2) Before the first day of June 1972, the Municipal Board shall calculate and notify the city and Cornwallis of the difference between (a) the amount that would be required to be raised in 1972 from business taxes, imposition of a general municipal mill rate in '72 to balance the 1972 estimated budget for Cornwallis if no monies were payable to Cornwallis by the city under this section; and (b) the amount that became payable in 1971 by reason of (i) municipal taxes for 1972 on businesses within that part of Cornwallis that is not within the City extension; and (ii) the imposition of the general municipal mill rate for 1971 on the property within that part of Cornwallis that is not within the city extension.

"Exclusion of certain unusual expenses: 3 (3) In calculating the difference under

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd). . . . subsection (2) the Municipal Board shall not include in the 1972 estimated budget for Cornwallis any estimated expenditure for new programs which were not planned for the year 1972 prior to the 29th day of July 1971 and which could have reasonably been foreseen, and the Municipal Board may exclude from the 1972 estimated budget for Cornwallis any estimated expenditure which the Board considers unreasonable in the circumstances."

Mr. Chairman, if I could spend a few moments discussing the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . I just put the question first?

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment comes about as a result of the various hearings which took place yesterday in regard to the development which would occur if section 3 were left intact within the bill.

If we go back to 1960 and years since that date, and this is verified by the submission by the R. M. of Cornwallis, there has been a great deal of difficulty between the City of Brandon and the R. M. of Cornwallis as to the boundaries between the two jurisdictions. This development has been one which could normally be expected when you have a growing city sprawling out into the rural area immediately surrounding the city itself with the continued concentration of industry and commercial establishments just outside the city area.

In the proposed amendment (3) of yesterday, an amendment which came about as a result of a recommendation which had been in the earlier report by Dr. Dulmage that had been established in order to enquire into the boundaries of the Brandon area, there would have been a uniform tax rate throughout the City of Brandon and the R. M. of Cornwallis in regard to both the commercial and the industrial property. This uniform mill rate would have affected a number of the commercial establishments quite severely in that part of Cornwallis which would not have been added into the city of Brandon. This became quite clear as a result of repeated submissions that were made to the committee by different people particularly those in business within the close proximity of the Shilo Camp area.

In some cases in practical terms this would have meant a doubling or tripling of the taxes insofar as the municipal levy only was concerned in that area, because we do have to keep in mind that the mill rate in the R. M. of Cornwallis is 12 mills only, among the lowest in the province. So that we are proposing to delete this section because of the severe difficulties it would have created insofar as some ratepayers were concerned within the Cornwallis area.

However, in deleting section 3, the R. M. of Cornwallis does suffer as a whole to some extent, because under the section dealing with calculation of uniform rate for commercial and industrial property, Cornwallis would have received back so much per head for the commercial and industrial tax which was collected over the Brandon-Cornwallis area, but it would not have relieved the burden as same affected some of the commercial operators within the Cornwallis area. So we are withdrawing it with the hope that in so withdrawing it that the City of Brandon and the R. M. of Cornwallis will within the next few months prepare and develop some form of development plan so that they will not repeat some of the problems which they have encountered over the last several years; because certainly a uniform tax levy would have assisted to some degree in avoiding the peripheration of commercial and industrial establishments just outside of the city limits. I think, however, that a plan of development approved by the two parties can perform that same role.

Now in substitute for section 3, because of the obvious difficulty that Cornwallis would suffer under by losing the benefits under section 3, subsection (5), and because of the other financial difficulties that they would encounter, we are proposing a formula by which there will be some assistance by the City of Brandon to Cornwallis.

It's obvious from our investigations that by Brandon taking in part of Cornwallis, that part of Cornwallis that is left outside of the city of Brandon would enjoy a reduction in the amount of expenditure. There is no question about that. There are certain expenditures relating to police protection, fire protection and other services, that certainly the expenditure would be reduced. But, on the other hand, it is unquestionable that the revenues that would be received by Cornwallis, the new Cornwallis, would also climb - would not climb but would not decrease proportionately at the same rate that there would be a decrease in the amount of revenues. Therefore Cornwallis would be caught in a situation by which they would have a

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . much reduced assessment, their assessment would be decreased to approximately 1.7 million dollars. But against that assessment they would not have as much a reduced total of expenditures as they would in order to maintain their present mill rate; and it's clear that their mill rate therefore would be considerably increased if there was no form of assistance. Therefore we are proposing in this amendment that a formula be devised by which in the year 1972, the amount that would be required to be raised in that year from business taxes and imposition of a general municipal mill rate in '72 to estimate the 1972 estimated budget for Cornwallis, in the same way as if no monies at all were payable by Cornwallis to the City of Brandon under this section, that we obtain that total, and from that total we subtract business taxes for 1971, which is certainly an item which we have, within that part of Cornwallis that is not within the city extension - and by saying "have" it can be easily calculated - plus the imposition of a general municipal mill rate for 1971 again on that part of Cornwallis which is not brought into the City of Brandon, that we then after obtaining this difference between the total amount which would otherwise be levied in 1972 and the amounts which would have been levied in 1971 for business tax and a general municipal mill rate, that in obtaining that total, that the municipal board after its calculations, because the municipal board are charged with the responsibility of making the calculation, that the city of Brandon would pay 75 percent of that difference to the R. M. of Cornwallis.

Provision is also included in order to not permit any new programs which were not foreseen as of the 29th day of July 1971, that the municipal board would exclude any such programs in their calculations. And this is only reasonable that the R. M. of Cornwallis would hold their expenditure to their normal level and would not take advantage of the fact that they are receiving a percentage of grant from the city of Brandon in order to up abnormally their expenditures within their boundaries; that is covered. Plus another section which states that the municipal board could take into consideration in making their calculations expenditures which are "unreasonable in the circumstances."

Let me say, for example, that if R. M. of Cornwallis continued with their present rate of expenditure in regard to fire or police protection, despite the fact that the number of people in the area covered by the R. M. of Cornwallis had been substantially reduced, that I do believe that the municipal board would find that that would be unreasonable in the circumstances. In other words, they would be expected to work in accord with their actual needs insofar as their expenditures would be concerned and not to take advantage of this provision.

There has been consultation since this bill was introduced, the amendment was introduced this afternoon with the city of Brandon. It is my understanding that the city of Brandon is in accord with the basic nature of this amendment. In discussions with them, the further item dealing with the "unreasonable in the circumstances" has been added.

The R. M. of Cornwallis on the other hand is not prepared, there has also been discussions with them, are not prepared to commit themselves in support of it. I think that's understandable because it is a pretty far-reaching amendment. All I can say is that the city of Brandon has indicated their basic support for it, despite the fact that the amendment will insofar as the city of Brandon is concerned, slow down some of the financial benefits that they might have otherwise enjoyed under Bill 107 in that they will be paying the 75 percent levy.

I would like to indicate, too, that although this is in the statute, it would strictly speaking, from a legal point of view, continue for an indefinite period of time. It would be the intention to review this in the future on annual basis insofar as the impact of this particular section was concerned upon Brandon and Cornwallis. I don't think that anyone would expect we would want to maintain a static situation in regard to anything of this nature; so that it would be reviewed as to impact. If there was ever any alteration or change of course it would require legislative change.

I think that this is a reasonable solution to the problem confronting us in regard to Cornwallis and Brandon. There is definite advantage to Brandon in extending the boundaries; planning, financial advantages. On the other hand, this amendment provides for some degree of compensation to Cornwallis, in fact, very substantial compensation so that the residents and the taxpayers of Cornwallis will not be faced with enormous tax increases because of the passage of this bill. In other words, they won't be requested to bear the burden of the costs only onto themselves of a measure which is going to benefit the vast majority of the people in the long run within the Brandon-Cornwallis area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Chairman, in acknowledging the explanation of the Minister and his earlier remarks this afternoon, we have the wording of his proposed amendment and the later addition that he referred to as having been suggested and generally agreed upon by the City of Brandon.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, we recognize this as a major change in the bill. The structuring of this legislation was hasty and our misgivings that we had and expressed a week ago tonight are clearly borne out by the fact that the government is now acknowledging that there are unworkable features of the bill as it was originally presented. They are giving weight to our demands that time be given to hear the people who are going to have to live under this legislation. They have heard them and they have recognized that their criticisms, many of them, are very valid indeed.

We are not certain that we understand all the implications of this amendment. We recognize it, we think, as a concession to the people of the municipality of Cornwallis and particularly those living outside the areas that it is intended to now annex into the City of Brandon. We think it is of real benefit to them because it is, it recognizes the complaints that were presented to the committee by about three quarters of the people who appeared before the standing committee yesterday and on Saturday. But, Mr. Chairman, the real problem here is that we don't have a calculation, we don't have a cost-benefit comparison upon which to base our positions at this moment.

We are told there will be benefits, that it will probably be less beneficial in the long run to the people of Brandon, that it will probably be a better deal for Cornwallis, but there is no calculation. We feel that we are being asked to make a judgment here without practical values being placed on these points. We recognize the government at this late hour is attempting to hastily reconstruct a bill which we recognized in the beginning and in the long debate of last Tuesday as being late in arriving in front of us. Why the structure was not made earlier, we haven't been told. We know that the architect's plan was in your hands in mid-April. Dr. Dulmage had presented his report. Many of the problems that arise here, Mr. Chairman, I suggest are the fact that you are fragmenting that Dulmage report and you attempted to calculate uniform rates for commercial and industrial properties in only two jurisdictions. You decided to throw away the area planning concept and went for the smaller area, so by changing the architect's general plan, you can't make him responsible for what happens as you go along. You are improvising in this situation and you are coming up now with an amendment which we do feel is an improvement on the original bill, but which we say now that it should have been substantiated with calculations that we could show to the municipality of Cornwallis, show to the City of Brandon, show to the people who are living outside the areas to be annexed, and say, "This is the change. This is what it will mean."

We recognize this amendment as a grant to the municipality of Cornwallis in lieu of tax assessment reductions that will be a grant in perpetuity unless it is changed by the act of this Legislature. Now how anyone can presume to have the wisdom to make a grant and state it in dollars, that will be a reasonable grant for years to come, I don't really know. I think any kind of a grant taking into account changes in property values, in the value of dollars, needs to be subject to constant review and constant adjustment. Those are the weaknesses as we see them. It's an improvement; the bill was late; the improvement's even later. There is little time to tell the people involved exactly what it means to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Chairman, I agree with a great deal that has been said by the Honourable Member for Brandon West. The problem as he, I believe, understands it, is that we don't actually have those figures and we are told that it's not possible to extract them out of a budget for the whole of Cornwallis, as I believe we discussed that this afternoon. I agree with the honourable member that there is a variation from the Dulmage proposal but I think he agrees that it's an improvement over it; and one of the reasons, as I see it, is the very matter he refers to and that is the plan. I believe that there must be a development plan for Brandon, the second largest city in this province, and that that must include the concept of what we have learned to call green belts and some sort of proper control of land use, and we members of the committee that have been involved in proposing this amendment felt it essential that work be commenced very soon in the development of a plan involving zoning and land use concepts for the entire area around Brandon.

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

Now, the proposal contained in the setting up of the Brandon District Industrial Commission is, of course, completely voluntary. It is just the mechanism whereby it's possible to bring together the representatives of the municipalities in and around Brandon, and it would be hoped that they would take this on as being a worthwhile project for them, firstly to form this voluntary group, and secondly to start thinking along these lines; but I think it's governmental responsibility at the provincial level to participate in this kind of discussion and to participate in developing this kind of a plan, and I would think that if there is reluctance on the part of municipalities to join this voluntary group, then one should not of course compel them to do so, but that should not prevent a plan from being developed and I would expect that it should not be too long before we are back in the Legislature with a proposal involving the plan, and I think that's essential and one that we should agree upon as being on the agenda for the near future.

Now the other point raised as to the actual amounts involved, we did discuss in committee this afternoon the fact that after a year's experience we will have actual figures on which to assess the impact of this proposal. Certainly there will be no harm to Brandon because the choice of pulling the bill would be most damaging to Brandon. The choice of trying to develop a formula which is still just an estimate, is one that I think is better left to the time when we have actual figures based on the operation of Cornwallis and as we know it, and I would think that the concept of perpetuity, which is in the bill, is one which must be accepted in the sense that we believe that we again should come back to the Legislature with a review of what indeed is the impact on the figures as we will know them then. Whether that would be the next session or the following session, depends on whether the information is then readily available and can be dealt with, but certainly I believe that this matter will be reviewed within the next year, year and a half, just to carry out the purposes which the Honourable Member for Brandon West has so well described.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Yes. Mr. Chairman, the Minister has mentioned that there will be a review every three years. The trouble, of course, with this kind of a review is that the circumstances under which the grant is made are gradually lost sight of, and it becomes very difficult to make a sort of an adjustment on that basis from year to year as we proceed without having established some formula for that at the time that the grant is being established.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I believe the Member for Brandon West quoted me as saying every three years --(Interjection)-- Yes. Well, I didn't mean every few years - I meant within the next few years and I think I said year, year and a half. I don't believe that we should determine now that every few years we'll come and review. I think that within a year, year and a half, we should be able to really start talking in terms of more concrete formulae, not one that's presented now, and at that time we would make the decision as how we deal with it in the future. It's a very difficult thing and it's not new or uncommon at this time, as the Honourable the Minister for Municipal Affairs stated. This is a developing problem, it's happening all over the continent, and one which I think we have to watch carefully. So I don't believe that it's a question of review in periodic occasions but rather to come back within the year, year and a half I describe, when we'll have actual information on what really happened in that time; and the impact, as I believe it, won't be so difficult for Cornwallis to accept in the first year. By then we'll have more information and we should be back discussing it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Chairman, the only thing, the point I want to make at this time, is actually a question. The Minister of Municipal Affairs stated that there would be a large saving for Cornwallis under this measure, and I am wondering if he has any estimate at all, even a sample estimate, of what the amendment does to the tax rate in Cornwallis. Has he any sort of estimate that led to this rationalization that gave a 75-25 split on the difference that he can present to us, any background information in the way of assessment, mill rates or anything else? It seems basic that he'd have to have this and I think, from his earlier statement, he indicated that it was there, that maybe it wasn't all there that we want, but at least he had some information on what impact this has on the mill rate, whether it means 10 mills, 20 mills, or so much for the municipality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

July 27, 1971

MR. PAWLEY: I want to say that certainly all the basic facts are there, the mill rate, the assessment of the total R. M. of Cornwallis, the assessment of that which remains in Cornwallis, the total business tax, and you can guess some of these areas as to what business tax would be left and what not, but the problem with projecting - and I know the honourable member is concerned about this - but to project is to very, very lightly mislead, because the largest single item within the Cornwallis budget is streets, and it's very difficult to estimate what percentage of that money that is spent for streets is spent within the new city of Brandon and how much would be spent outside of the new city of Brandon. One might look also at lighting. We would estimate that the entire lighting expenditure would be within the new city of Brandon, but then you have police and fire and other items, so that I would only be able to say to the honourable member that you could not, with any preciseness whatsoever, you could not properly guess what projections you would have, especially when you have to deal with the entire question of the single largest expenditure by far, and that is the street expenditure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 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 don't really want to repeat the remarks that my honourable colleagues the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Finance have offered to the House, but I must say that in answer to remarks made by the Honourable Member from Brandon West, who is rather critical of us, I suspect, making certain changes in this bill, that it certainly should not be unusual to any member of this House by now, having those of us who have been here at least for two years and many who have been here a lot longer, that it is not unusual indeed to change a bill or parts of a bill after hearing public representation. In fact, this is part and parcel of the legislative process and it is one of the attractive features of the legislative process in the province of Manitoba. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, nothing is final in the realm of legislation and this government, to its credit, is prepared to examine briefs presented to it, positions offered by parties involved, and to make adjustments as we see fit in accordance with our best judgment. The Minister has indicated, and I believe the Minister of Finance has reiterated the fact that we really do wish to look at the situation in approximately a year and a half or so from now, after which time there will have been one year's experience with this bill, and to assess the situation and to make any changes that are deemed necessary for the economic and social well-being of the people, both in the city of Brandon and in the rural areas surrounding the city of Brandon.

I agree with the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Municipal Affairs when they say that it is very difficult to estimate the costs. I suggest you could put several experts together on it and you'll come up with several answers, and we could indeed, Sir, spend many hours, many days, many weeks in this question of estimation and be very little further ahead, very little wiser. What we are proposing, I believe, under this particular section, this amended section 3, or this new section 3, is a fair proposal and is one that in effect we are going to see the effect of, and will be in a much better position. We think that it is a fair proposal and, as the Minister has indicated, we have checked with both municipalities and I think that particularly in the case of Brandon they feel that, although they are gaining a little less or somewhat less from this, they feel in their judgment - this is their estimate - that this is something they could certainly live with and they do not criticize the government for this.

There was a remark made about the fragmentation of the Dulmage report and reference was made also to the fact that we are not going ahead or not proceeding with a district planning commission involving six rural municipalities. But again, Mr. Chairman, I would remind members of the House that, to the credit of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, he has spent considerable time discussing this question with the representatives of the six municipalities surrounding Brandon, plus the representatives of the town of Rivers, the town of Souris and the city of Brandon, with regard to the district planning commission and they were unanimously against the idea of a district planning commission and, as a result, we did not proceed. The Minister decided that we should not proceed in this case, and this is an important point too. It's because the Minister did have this particular meeting plus a series of other meetings with representatives from that particular area that accounts in large measure for the bill appearing a little later than it would have otherwise, in fact considerably later than it would have been able to have been on the Order Paper and in the hands of the members. The fact is that the Minister spent literally days upon days with various groups, with municipal



July 27, 1971

3239

(MR. EVANS cont'd). . . . representatives, on this particular matter. I know, because I joined him, not on every occasion but on many of those occasions, and so I think for that reason alone we should not be--I don't think it is deserving, or this government is deserving of the criticism that this bill has been presented at too late a date. The fact of the matter is that it's based upon the willingness of the Minister to listen to all and sundry who are involved in this important question. And again I say we should make no apologies for changes that are made at this time. Nothing was final in the realm of legislation and I'm sure that as we gain experience we will wish to have amendments and changes.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that somewhere in this debate the Member from Brandon West will get up and say that he agrees with me that this piece of legislation will make for a stronger and a better city and urban area known as the City of Brandon. I hope he does agree with that.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, because the noisier they are the longer it'll take - it's as simple as all that. In fact, I wanted to be very brief but I did want to get some further information. The Minister mentions that there will be a review every so often - three years have been mentioned, other figures have been mentioned, but I do hope when reviews are made and possible changes will be advanced, that Cornwallis will not be adversely affected in future changes that may come up. Is there an assurance that they will not be adversely affected in future amendments that may come up? Secondly, mention was made that there was no calculation - I think the Member for Brandon West mentioned this - and that figures were not available. Are figures available in connection with Section -- the Member for Brandon West mentioned there were no figures, no calculations available. Are there calculations available in connection with Section 2 of the bill?

MR. CHERNIACK: On a point of order. The honourable member has indicated to us that he would like us to go back to Section 2 to discuss that, and might I say that for my side we're quite willing to do that, but I should think that we should complete Section 3 and then go back to Section 2 to accommodate the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed) 3 as amended, 3(1)--passed. Oh, the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I think I should recognize the comments of the Honourable Member for Brandon East, the Minister. He seems anxiously seeking some commendation for his efforts in this respect. But, Mr. Chairman, nothing in what the Minister said, none of his explanations dealt with our basic complaint about this bill, that it was two months late in coming before us; it was hastily put together; and it was a poor job of legislation. Nothing has been said to tell us why it took three months to bring this bill before us. If he had even recognized the performance of the Minister of Finance in putting Bill 36, a much more elaborate piece of legislation, before this Assembly well ahead of time, then if he'd adopted that system we might have been able to say "well done" or something of that nature. But, Mr. Chairman, he mentions the frequent meetings of the Minister of Municipal Affairs with the people concerned. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, the Minister might have spent that time much more profitably had he had the the bill in front of him to show the people from Cornwallis and from Brandon what he was talking about. Surely we wouldn't have run into a major change in this Act at this time on Tuesday night; we wouldn't have even been here tonight had this bill been available a month, six weeks ago, to show to Cornwallis, to show to the City of Brandon; the technical imperfections here would largely have been removed. So this is our problem. This is why we're here tonight. We've got a poor piece of legislation and we're doing our best at the last minute to make it palatable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Section 3 of Bill 107 was read and passed.)

The Honourable Member for Rhineland - I believe he wanted to ask a question on Section 2, and I think he had leave.

MR. FROESE: I did ask the Minister - sent him a note whether there would be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland. Order, please.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I asked for some information in connection with Section 2, whether there were any calculations available in connection with this, whether the Minister could give us some indication as to the mill rates that they expect on farm land that will be annexed to Brandon; and also the section deals with the Brandon District planning area. I did ask some questions to members coming before the committee in connection with this - none of them indicated that they knew that there was such a planning district in effect - and if the rates are going to be averaged over the whole situation, the whole area, just what will the effect be, and will this mean a lower rate as a result to the people whose farm land will be annexed into the City of Brandon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, just so that I can reiterate so that the Honourable Member for Rhineland has a clear understanding of this section, the six surrounding municipalities are averaged out insofar as their basic agricultural mill rate is concerned, and that mill rate is applied to the R.M. of Cornwallis. Insofar as what the mill rate would be, let me say that at the present time in the R.M. of Cornwallis it is 12, which I understand is the lowest mill rate in the Province of Manitoba. In the other municipalities involved, the mill rate in most cases is nearly double that in the Cornwallis municipality; and in one case, in the instance

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . . of the R.M. of Elton immediately north of Brandon, the mill rate is 28, so that there is no question or no denial that the averaging out will bring about a higher mill rate insofar as those brought within the City of Brandon that are utilizing agricultural land. But let me say to the Honourable Member for Rhineland that that mill rate will be in accord with the mill rate that is assessed as against other farm lands within the same general locality, so there is no harsh or undue hardship being done in this particular case, and I think that the proposal has sense; it certainly has protected the agricultural people brought into Brandon. If this had not been done, let me say to the honourable member if he suggests that this section be deleted, if it is deleted then the mill rate would go up many times more than what it would under Section 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4(1)--passed; 4(2) . . . The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Transportation, that subsection (2) of Section 4 of Bill 107 be amended by adding thereto at the end thereof, in separate lines thereof, the following words and figures: "But the reduction mentioned in the subsection does not apply to residential lands on which the construction of any dwelling is commenced on or after the 26th day of July, 1971."

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4(2)(a) as amended--passed(b)--passed; (c)--passed; (d)--passed; 4(2)--passed; 4(3)-- The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two items in respect to this question of taxation and the calculations that I think might properly be brought up under this section, and perhaps the Minister could give us his comments on these specifics as they affect the Municipality of Cornwallis. One item which concerns the municipality is the cost of a road which was built to service a specific industry, Dryden Chemicals. The road was approximately four miles in length. It was built by the municipality for the exclusive purpose of serving that industry site and was on a cash basis; it cost them a little over \$80,000. They built it in 1968. They estimate the road to be one that might be prorated, the cost prorated over 20 years, so that perhaps 16 years of the 20 years are still to go and it might reasonably be expected that they have a \$64,000 investment in this road which might be considered in the calculation of payment to the municipality.

They're also concerned, Mr. Chairman, about the question of land which is transferred to other jurisdictions, as will be the case if this bill becomes law, and how it is treated under the Municipal Act. Now there seems to be some problem here with possibly a confliction. Under 27(9) of the Municipal Act, it says that where part of a municipality is transferred from one municipality to another, if the municipality from which the part is transferred is the owner of land situated in the part transferred that are not in use for municipal purposes, the title of those lands shall be transferred to the municipality in which the part of the municipality is transferred. In other words, land now owned by Cornwallis, if it becomes part of the City of Brandon and is not being used for municipal purposes by Cornwallis, might under the Municipal Act have to be transferred to the City of Brandon - title of the land, that is. Now this would appear to conflict with the intent of this bill. Would you comment on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Before the Minister gets up to reply, I also wish to comment on this particular section, because this section makes comment on an award of the Municipal Board under the Municipal Act by reason of the transfer of lands from Cornwallis to the city. Does this mean that this will be the only award or will there be another award under the Municipal Act - Section 40 I think it was under the old Act; I don't know whether under the new Act it's the same section - but is that the same award we're speaking of here or are there going to be two awards?

MR. PAWLEY: First, in answer to the Honourable Member for Rhineland, there'll be of course one award only and that will be the award that is provided for under this bill before us.

In regard to the question from the Honourable Member from Brandon West, we're proposing an amendment which would exempt lands owned by Cornwallis, the R.M. of Cornwallis, from taxation, and we would be open to amending our proposed, or changing our proposed amendment that the honourable member has a copy of, to make it clear that the lands will continue to be owned by the R.M. of Cornwallis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, there's definitely a confliction between the intent of this

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) . . . . . bill and the Municipal Act in that section, and I think it should be clearly spelled out in the bill that title will be retained by Cornwallis even though it's not being used for municipal purposes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4(3)-- The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, while we are on this subject and for lack of a better place to bring it up, the question of arrears of taxes on land that is now going from Cornwallis to the City of Brandon, I think you will recall that Bill 26 - I think that was the number - about a year ago or more, brought into the City of Brandon and some areas of Cornwallis in the southwestern portion of the city and the R.M., this was by mutual consent, and one of the terms of that bill was that any arrears of taxes on lands being taken into the city would be collected by the City of Brandon, and that they would reimburse, on takeover of the land, the municipality for all the arrears, in other words, it was an account receivable of the R.M. which Brandon accepted as an account receivable of the city and paid it out to the municipality. Now the Municipal Act would have it the other way round; 27(6) of the Municipal Act indicates that except as to land sold for taxes, the arrears of taxes upon lands that are part of any such transferred territory belong to the increased municipality. In other words, the City of Brandon would seem to own all the tax arrears on land which they are now taking in. I think that the precedent established in the original bill a year ago should be embodied in this Act and that arrears of taxes should be paid out by the city on takeover and then collected by the city.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . the Honourable Member for Brandon West it is my understanding that the division of the assets and liabilities at the time of the award would be governed, insofar as the tax arrears are concerned on the lands brought into the increased municipality, would be subject to the provision of the Municipal Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Do I understand that to mean that the calculation of the payment would include, as a flat sum, the arrears now being collected by the City of Brandon?

MR. PAWLEY: Well, I'll just read section 27(6) which would be the governing section, "except as to land sold for taxes, the arrears of taxes upon lands that are part of any such transfer territory belong to the increased municipality and for the purpose of collecting the arrears those taxes shall be treated as if levied by the increased municipality." So I do believe that would answer the question.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm aware of this section and this is why I bring it up, but this is a confliction with the precedent which we established in a bill a little more than a year ago, where it was expressly set out that the lands taken in, the municipality would be reimbursed for the arrears which would then be collectable by the city.

MR. PAWLEY: All that I can say to the Honourable Member for Brandon West, where there is no special request, and the bill in question was a private member's bill last year, that in any other award the provisions of the Municipal Act do govern and in this particular case it is 27(6). Of course the bill before us last year was a private member's bill and by request the section which the Honourable Member for Brandon West refers to was included in that bill, but where there is no special request, then the governing authority is the section of the Municipal Act.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, surely the circumstances are roughly the same, Brandon is accepting and asking for the inclusion of certain areas outside its boundaries that now belong to the R.M. of Cornwallis, and surely since we accepted the principle in the earlier bill, then if we are now to do the same thing, albeit without the express consent of the R.M. of Cornwallis, the results should be no less favourable in my view to the R.M. of Cornwallis when we are proposing to impose this legislation upon them.

MR. PAWLEY: All that I can say if the honourable member is concerned about the interests of Cornwallis here, it is Brandon that in the award or the division of assets and liabilities, assumes the tax arrears under the section as part of its asset, Cornwallis is settled accordingly, and Brandon from my interpretation of the section would assume the responsibility of collecting the arrears.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Remainder of Section 4 and Section 5 were read and passed) Section 6(1).

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Transportation that subsection (1) of section 6 of Bill 107 be amended by adding thereto at the

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . . end thereof the words and figures "on the basis of recommendations to be made by the commissioner appointed under Order in Council 1227/70 to make recommendations in respect of the boundaries of the city. "

This would not be reconstituting the Brandon Boundaries Commission as such but simply would be identifying the person, Dr. Dulmage, President of the Brandon University as a person to whom would be given the responsibility for the drawing of the ward boundaries in regard to the City of Brandon. We have every confidence in Dr. Dulmage and this would provide for him having that responsibility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6(1)-- The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I think we understand what the Minister is proposing in this amendment. We are aware of Dr. Dulmage's qualifications and his interest in this specific problem. We are thinking that it might be that some additions to a commission which would be responsible for drawing ward boundaries might be even more useful and more complete in their understanding of the problems involved, and it is with this in mind that we have proposed an amendment to the amendment.

I would like to move that subsection (1) of section 6 of Bill 107 be amended by adding thereto at the end thereof the words and figures "On the basis of recommendations to be made by the commissioner appointed under Order in Council 1227/70, Mr. Charland Prud'homme, Q.C., of Winnipeg and Mr. S. A. Magnacca of Brandon to make recommendations in respect to the boundaries of the city." This should be to the ward boundaries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a sub-amendment to the amendment that after the words . . . the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: To shorten this discussion, the government is prepared to accept that amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if I can argue with my colleague. On the basis that I am apprehensive about the naming of two individuals in an Act and what happens if those individuals refuse to act or are unable to act for any reason whatsoever, then it seems to me we are trapped. Now I'm wondering whether it wouldn't be acceptable, since the Minister has indicated he's willing to accept the people named, if it could not be taken that an Order in Council will be passed adding these names, rather than putting them into legislation which it seems to me is looking for a difficult situation. I don't know whether it's ever been done but I would think it is a most unusual proposal and one which as I say might frustrate the whole thing, and therefore possibly since the Minister has made this statement, whether that couldn't be accepted as being an approach that Cabinet would be bound to honour his statement and make the change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On a point of order. Is this not a money resolution? On a point of order, is this amendment not a money amendment? Well it would involve payment of services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the Honourable Member for Rhineland is trying to be helpful or whether he's being mischievous but it wouldn't have occurred to regard this amendment as an amendment having an expenditure of public monies involvement. If that were the case then of course it would not be in order for the Honourable Member for Brandon West to move it.

I suppose that in the purest and strictest sense, the addition of two additional persons does mean additional expenditures to the Crown, however modest and small that amount may be. However, if it's by leave and by agreement in effect it is as though it is being moved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I don't think we need get hung up on that.

MR. PAWLEY: I wonder if the honourable member would be prepared to alter the wording to indicate "and two other parties", and as the Honourable Minister of Finance indicated we would honour the suggested names.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, we accept the fact that the government goes along in principle with this. We recognize the difficulty that the Minister of Finance has pointed out. It's a very real one and we are prepared to go with whatever device that he would feel would overcome this difficulty.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you just wait a moment we'll have Legislative Counsel make the redraft here.

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd)

The amendment to 6(1) will read as follows: "On the basis of the recommendations to be made by the commissioner appointed under Order in Council 1227/70 to make recommendations in respect to the boundaries of the city, and two other persons named by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council."

You have heard the motion, are you ready for the question? 6(1) as amended--passed. (Section 6(2) to (4) was read and passed). Section 7. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Transportation, that section 7 of Bill 107 be amended by numbering the present section as subsection (1) thereof and by adding thereto immediately after subsection (1) thereof the following subsection, "Time for making application: 7(2) An application under subsection (1) in respect of a calculation or reduction in any year should be made not later than 30 days after the city passes a rate by-law adopting its annual estimates for the year." Now just by way of explanation, this arises as a result of the brief by the City of Brandon to the Committee of Municipal Affairs, in which they had indicated that it was their view that section 7 of the Act. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Is someone using a camera in the gallery? That is not allowed. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . that where a dispute arises, no time limit had been set on when the application was to be made, so they proposed that there be a time limit. I think that their proposal is a reasonable one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Section 7 was read and passed). 8(3)(a). The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: That page 6 of Bill 107 be amended by adding thereto immediately thereafter after the word "said" in the fourteenth line from the bottom of the page, the words "west half of". It's simply a correction of the legal description.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 3(a) as amended--passed.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General that proposed section 3(a) of the Brandon Charter as set out in section 8 be amended by numbering the proposed section as subsection (1) thereof, and by adding thereto at the end thereof, the following subsection "Lands outside limits of city . 3 A (2) All lands outside the lands described in subsection 1 which prior to the 27th day of July 1971 had been acquired by lease or purchase by the city is then incorporated for the public purposes of the city, shall form part and be within the limits of the city." This arises out of the desire to include such an area as the airport, for instance, within the city, which presently lies outside of the city limits.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 3 A(2) to Section 112, 10, were read and passed). The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that Bill 107 be amended by renumbering section 12 thereof as section 13 and by adding thereto immediately after section 11 thereof, the following section, "Exemption from taxation, 12(1) Land owned by Cornwallis on the coming into force of this section situated in the city extension and not used for revenue purposes, shall continue to be vested in Cornwallis, and shall be exempt from taxation by the city except taxation levied for local improvements during such time as those lands are owned by Cornwallis, but any such lands used for revenue purposes are liable to assessment and taxation to an amount in any year not exceeding the net revenue therefrom in that year.

"Liability for Relief, 12(2) All persons who on the first day of January 1972 are residing within the city extension and who on that date are residents of Cornwallis as the expression 'resident' is defined in the Municipal Act, shall be deemed to be residents of the city on and after that date and the city shall indemnify Cornwallis against any liability for their relief, care, maintenance or hospitalization from and after that date."

First, we have attempted to look after the suggestion by the Honourable Member for Brandon West to make it quite clear that the lands brought into the City of Brandon owned by the Municipality of Cornwallis at present, shall remain vested in the title of the Municipality of Cornwallis. In addition, the amendment ensures that lands owned by either Brandon, that lands owned by Brandon or Cornwallis shall be exempt from taxation if they should fall within the other municipality, and in particular this relates to the request and the submission by

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . . Cornwallis that that increase which is included within the new City of Brandon would be exempt, and of course would also ensure that the lands of the City of Brandon owned outside within the Municipality of Cornwallis and elsewhere would be exempt.

The second part of this amendment dealing with the relief, care and maintenance, relates back to the submission that was made by the Municipality of Cornwallis in which they requested that this section be included within the bill in order to protect them from possible liability to such residents after, in fact, the annexation had taken place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 107 was read section by section and passed).

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill 107 and recommends it to the House with certain amendments . . .

#### IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that the report of the committee be received.

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

#### THIRD READINGS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education, by leave, that Bill No. 107, an Act respecting The City of Brandon and certain Neighbouring Municipalities, be now read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, on Bill 107, an Act respecting The City of Brandon and certain Neighbouring Municipalities, I think we have discussed at some length the various clauses, and there have been some major changes as we have noted. I'm not going to belabour the point that the bill was late in appearing and that many of the difficulties arose for that reason.

Mr. Speaker, I have not at any time indicated that I was against any bill that would provide for some extensions of the City of Brandon boundaries, nor for some adjustments that would provide a greater revenue tax base for the city. My purpose in making my critical comments on this bill has been to see that the rights of those minorities, those people who are being affected by the terms of this bill, are being properly brought to the attention of this Legislature and are being properly protected, at least to the full extent of our powers in Opposition to do so. We feel that to some extent we have succeeded in that we have been able to bring the people of Brandon, many of those people directly affected, to appear before the committee, and as a result of this we feel that some iniquities in the legislation have been removed, that there has been more fair and better treatment for many of the people, particularly those who are living outside of the areas to be affected by the boundary changes but within the Municipality of Cornwallis; we think that the amendments which the government has brought in are going to be in their favour and that those changes were very much needed. Mr. Speaker, there may be many more changes which will have to be made to this bill and these, in the short time we've had to deal with it, may have been overlooked, both by the government and possibly by our side, in trying to examine each one of the clauses and to make sure that they are as well put together as it is possible to do in the time allowed.

I'm still concerned somewhat about the question of the tax arrears on properties belonging to Cornwallis that are about to be taken into the City of Brandon. I feel that we should look again at the precedent established in Bill 26, where it was specifically set out that these arrears would be paid to the Rural Municipality of Cornwallis and that they would then be collected by the city.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would say that we have done the best we have been able to do in the time that we were permitted to have to examine it. It's not by any means a piece of legislation that we can feel is good in all senses but, under the circumstances, many improvements have been made and the result of the debate has been very beneficial to the people of the area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, before we give final reading to Bill 107, I was rather tempted to hold up -- (Interjections) -- but my better judgment -- I decided not to, although sometimes I feel that the House Leader deserves to be halted for a change.

I wish to express a few thoughts on third reading of this bill. First of all, I feel that by passing this bill we're accepting, or the House is accepting the principle or the concept of regional government for this province. This is more or less incorporated in the bill, which is a concept I don't subscribe to. This is why I took strong exception to the bill in the first place.

Then I also felt that this was an imposition on the people directly involved from the representation that we heard in committee on this very bill. They took strong exception to this legislation being passed at this session, and especially in the dying hours of the session. Certainly in connection with the unicity bill, the Greater Winnipeg bill, the government stated that this was more or less fulfilling an election promise; that they were elected on that basis. This is not the case with the present bill before us, Mr. Speaker, and therefore I don't see the urgency of having legislation at this time passed at this time of the session.

Also, I had the question, why the large additions of farm land to the City of Brandon? In my opinion this was completely unnecessary. This was uncalled for, and this is what many of the people appearing took strong exception to, that we're incorporating large tracts of farm land to the City of Brandon and I'm afraid of what can happen to some of the people, to the owners, and I do hope that this government is very careful that things don't happen, that land assessments increase to the extent where they maybe have to default on taxes and therefore that their land might be confiscated as a result. Certainly this would be very bad indeed.

Another matter that is in the bill is the Brandon district planning area and I've never liked the legislation in connection with planning, because whenever you do have planning of this sort, it takes away the rights of individuals, of owners, it affects the ownership of land by an individual, and that other boards will decide for you on many of the things that should be the decision of the owner.

I do hope when the awards are established for the City of Brandon that the additional area is given a fair representation. I think the Minister will look into this, and certainly now that the committee set up to do the work has been enlarged and has been accepted by the government, and I thank them for it. I think it is well for them to accept that amendment.

Another point, and this is my last point, has to do with the matter of the reserves. Cornwallis has built up a reserve; people in that area have paid these monies into the reserves and now most of this reserve money will no doubt go to the City of Brandon to pay for their debts, and they have a large debt, which was brought out in committee, a debt of probably ten, eleven million dollars -- (Interjection) -- closer to 20, says the Member for Souris-Killarney. Actually in that respect it will only pay for a small portion of that debt that Brandon presently has, and I don't feel that this is a fair way of dealing with reserves. I took exception to that very point in connection with the City of Winnipeg bill and I think it applies equally to this bill here before us.

Mr. Speaker, these are my objections and these are the reasons why I will oppose the bill on third reading.

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

MR. EVANS: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, just permit me to make a very few closing comments in the last stages of this particular debate.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland wondered, you know, he said this was not in our election platform so why are we, you know, rushing forth with this. Well, I beg to inform the honourable member that this was, this was in my election program. It was. In fact, this was the only pledge in the election that I conducted in Brandon that affected the local area of Brandon. It was the only local pledge that I made, or a pledge that related to the local area. We had much to say about Medicare premiums, about shifting of educational costs; these are all things that the government carried out, and many other productive programs, but we did say locally that we recognized there was a need for a rationalization of the boundaries and this is the fulfillment of that pledge.

Now, very briefly, Mr. Speaker, . . . (applause)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm certain that if we all co-operate we'll get out of here shortly. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Obviously honourable members want an encore. I won't take the time of



(MR. EVANS cont'd) . . . . . the members of the House to answer all the questions and points raised by the Member from Winkler because I'm afraid, as usual, he's confused on a number of the matters in the bill. I just want to say that I'm pleased that the members of the Opposition are in agreement with this bill that has been proposed by the government, that they agree that we've had the fortitude to act very quickly upon a recommendation made by a Royal Commission on this particular matter.

Now when any boundaries are changed, and Bill 36, I suppose, is an example but there are many other examples in Canadian history, when any boundaries are changed there are people that tend to be unhappy and I suppose this bill is no exception. Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, I am convinced that in the long run the people in the City of Brandon and the area immediately surrounding Brandon, the rural area of southwestern Manitoba, will in the long run benefit by this. This legislation . . . (applause). Okay, okay. There's no doubt that this is a milestone and that without, without any question, Mr. Speaker, and I know we'll get the greatest round of applause, that we have now laid the foundation for Brandon to become maybe the largest city in Manitoba. Who knows?

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

MR. FROESE: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have support?

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please. The question before the House is third reading of Bill 107.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barkman, Barrow, Borowski, Cherniack, Craik, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Ferguson, Girard, Gottfried, Graham, Green, Hanuschak, Henderson, Jenkins, Johannson, G. Johnston (Portage la Prairie), F. Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McBryde, McGill, McKenzie, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Moug, Patrick, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Sherman, Spivak, Toupin, Uskiw, Walding and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Froese and McKellar.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 39, Nays 2.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Ayes have it. I declare the motion carried. The Honourable Minister Without Portfolio.

#### REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister without Portfolio) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, by leave, I beg to present the Report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee of the House on Economic Development was appointed at the Second Session of the 29th Legislature on Thursday the 16th day of April, 1970, pursuant to Rule 68(1) of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. The Committee was composed of Hon. Messrs. EVANS, SCHREYER, TOUPIN and USKIW, Messrs. ALLARD, BEARD, DESJARDINS, DOERN, FOX, FROESE, GONICK, JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek), JORGENSON, McBRYDE, MCGILL, MOLGAT, PATRICK, SHERMAN, SPIVAK and TURNBULL.

Your Standing Committee on Economic Development by virtue of resolution passed on Friday, July 31, 1970 was authorized to sit during the session and in recess or after prorogation, and to hold such public hearings as it may deem advisable, and to report to this House at the next session of the Legislature.

The terms of reference of the Committee were to maintain continuous surveillance of the progress of Manitoba's economic development and activities of the Government affecting achievements of provincial economic goals.

In addition to the above terms of reference the whole question of the federal White Paper on Taxation was referred to the Committee for immediate study by a resolution adopted in the House on Friday June 19, 1970, and by a resolution adopted in the House on Friday, May 22, 1970, the following matter was referred to the Committee for a thorough study - that is the whole question of the application by letter dated February 20, 1970 to the Railway Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to remove Agents from fifty-seven towns and villages in Manitoba and to remove Caretaker Agents and Caretakers from a further thirteen points in Manitoba.

(MR. CLERK cont'd)

Your Committee met on Wednesday, September 9, 1970; Friday, December 4, 1970; Friday, January 29, 1971; Friday, February 12, 1971.

With respect to Mr. Mogat's resolution adopted in the House on Friday, June 19, 1970 your Committee at its meeting held on Wednesday, September 9, 1970 was informed by Hon. Mr. Cherniack that he had received a communication from Ottawa informing him that any implementation of the Benson's White Paper on Taxation would be delayed. In the light of this communication the Committee felt that until the recommendations of the Federal Government are finalized, the Committee could not carry out its study as recommended by Mr. Mogat's resolution.

With respect to Mr. Johnston's (Portage) resolution adopted in the House on the 22nd day of May 1970, dealing with the application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to remove agents, Hon. Mr. Paulley, Railway Commissioner, explained the problems involved and referred to interviews he had with the officials of the Company in connection with the application, and suggested that no decision be taken on this matter until after a meeting be held in Brandon. At this meeting the C.P.R. employees were to present their own case.

Your Committee was supplied by our Minister of Finance with Ontario proposals and analysis with respect to matters of fiscal policies and the Alberta and Quebec proposals on tax reform, also several releases of Canada's Department of Finance.

The Minister of Industry and Commerce submitted to the Committee "The Ten Year Review of the Manitoba Economy". The Committee was also provided by the Minister of Finance with a breakdown of the main sources of Provincial revenue for the current fiscal year.

The Committee discussed extensively the matter of unemployment in the Province. Reports were given by the Minister of Industry and Commerce on the subject, also by Dr. J.A. Weldon. The Minister referred to the cause of unemployment, the projects undertaken by the Government, that is public works, public housing, assistance to municipalities. Dr. J.A. Weldon explained the basic principles of unemployment tied to inflation.

Hon. Mr. Evans gave a detailed report on the personnel and production of Churchill Forest Industries and other companies in the complex as prepared by Mr. L.J. Hallgrimson, Q.C., Receiver appointed by the Court of Queen's Bench.

Members of the Committee took an active part in the discussions dealing with the above mentioned matters.

Your Committee did not meet to approve a final Report.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister Without Portfolio.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, that the report of the committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the length of the report and because members, certain members couldn't hear the report and receive the full intent of it, I move that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie -- seconded by who?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Seconded by the Member for Assiniboia.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister Without Portfolio.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I beg to present a second report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Economic Development beg leave to present the following as their First Report:

Your Committee met for organization on Thursday, June 10, 1971, and appointed Hon. Mr. Doern as Chairman.

Your Committee recommended that the Quorum of this Committee shall consist of ten (10) members.

Hon. Mr. Evans, Minister of Industry and Commerce, invited Dr. B.H. Kristjanson to present the Report of the Economic Advisory Board.

Dr. Kristjanson presented the report and questions were put by members of the Committee to Dr. Kristjanson.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister Without Portfolio.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest and recommend to the government that if it is their intention to go through this farce every year, that they dispense with the Standing Committee on Economic Development--along with other standing committees. Mr. Speaker, this procedure is a farce. The government knows it. There is absolutely no purpose or point to having a standing committee that is meaningless...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if Mr. Flintstone from Thompson would please keep his mouth shut. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, this procedure is a farce. The procedure is a farce; the report of the committee is a farce; the object of having a Standing Committee on Economic Development is a farce; and it is much better for us to dispense with this than go through this charade.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps the Minister of Transportation wasn't entirely wrong when he suggested that the Leader of the Opposition may be the farce in this exercise.

I don't particularly care whether or not the Leader of the Opposition finds the exercise to be a farce in his opinion. We don't. The committee has been established; meetings were convened; discussions took place at the meetings. We assume that the discussions were helpful to honourable members. If they didn't find them helpful, that's their fault and we intend to carry on as we have last year in this respect.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the First Minister entertain a question? Does the First Minister think that the reports should be discussed in a reasonable, measured and rational way?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of opportunities during the normal course of the Legislative Session when the same subject matter as comes before the standing committee can be discussed here in this House. During the estimates of the Department of Industry and Commerce, for instance, is one example, and many of the subject matters that were discussed in the Standing Committee on Economic Development were discussed here during the estimates of the Department of Industry and Commerce. There's been useful discussion, for example, with respect to problems involved and desirability of establishing a regional bank. That's one example of the useful things dealt with in that committee.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the First Minister answer my question? Should the report of the committee be discussed in the House in a reasonable, rational manner and not at this hour on the last night, supposedly?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the report is as much for information as it is for debate. I don't feel that anything of public policy at this stage turns on discussion or debate of the report, and if the Member for Portage la Prairie is really that interested as to the extent to which reports of committees are debated, I will make it a point to go over with him some of the reports, the motions to receive reports that are moved in the House of Commons where his colleagues form the government, the Liberal Government at the federal level, and he will see how much time is spent on debate upon motions to receive reports.

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

MR. FROESE: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that 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, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Seconded...?

MR. JENKINS: Seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: The report has to be recorded.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources beg leave to present the following as their First Report:

Your Committee met on Thursday, May 20th, 1971, and appointed Mr. TURNBULL as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that the quorum of this Committee shall consist of ten (10) members.

The Committee agreed to record the proceedings of the meetings.

Your Committee met on: Thursday, May 20th, 1971; Tuesday, May 25th, 1971; Tuesday, June 1st, 1971; Thursday, June 3rd, 1971; Monday, June 7th, 1971; Thursday, June 17th, 1971; and Thursday, June 8th, 1971.

Your Committee agreed to examine the 19th Annual Report of the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board for the year ending March 31st, 1970.

Accordingly the Chairman of the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board was called before the Committee to present the Annual Report, including the program for Hydro Electric Development.

The Committee agreed, by a majority vote, that the Chairman of the Committee leave the Chair to allow the Committee to hear a presentation by Mr. D. L. Campbell.

After this informal meeting the Committee reconvened. The Chairman of Manitoba Hydro continued with his presentation and answered questions from members of the Committee.

On July 8th, 1971, the Chairman of the Manitoba Telephone System Board was called before the Committee to present the Annual Report of the Telephone System.

Your Committee examined the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1970. After addressing questions to the Chairman of the Manitoba Telephone Board, your Committee passed the Annual Report of the Telephone System.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that the report of the committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, another farce. The people of Manitoba have been had.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can repeat what I just said a few minutes ago with respect to the Leader of the Opposition. That goes by way of ditto as well. May I say further that if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wants to continue the pretense that there will be no public hearings, then I suppose that no one can stop him although everyone else will know, as the Minister of Mines and Resources has said many times, that public hearings will be held under the aegis of the Water Commission. In the meantime, all those people who have any knowledge of Lake Winnipeg know whether or not it is in a flood state when it's under 715 feet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, now that the report of the committee is before the House, would the First Minister entertain a question? Would the First Minister consider re-inviting Mr. Douglas Campbell to reappear before the committee on the basis of the information contained in the letter that he wrote on the 28th of June from his residence to members of the committee?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Member for Fort Garry knows very well, there is nothing in the world to prevent him or anyone else on that side, or on this side, from meeting with Mr. Campbell for purposes of more detailed discussion of his views on Hydro development, and I just assumed that such meetings will take place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the presentation of this report at this date does little more than make the Machiavellian plot complete, and this is a damn shame that this has to be done in this fashion.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to lengthen the evening. I think that everybody knows exactly what has occurred. The Opposition started debating committee reports

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . and using up time with regard to government business. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that in most Houses a motion to receive a report is not a debatable motion and we will try to get the Rules Committee to adopt such a recommendation this summer. There is no doubt that the matters that are contained in the report have full scope of debate in other areas, in other departments and at other courses in the House, but the question of whether a report should be received, that question was open for debate and last year we found out that on that motion anything could be debated. There wasn't a way of ruling anything out of order on a motion to receive a report. My understanding is, Mr. Speaker, that in most places such a report is not debatable and therefore, Mr. Speaker, any suggestion that the citizens of Manitoba have been had or that this is a farce, is a suggestion that is being made to try to strengthen a pitifully weak position on the part of the Opposition.

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

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish you would call the adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, on motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I already put my Order Paper away. I didn't realize or didn't think that the Minister would be calling it. Some time ago he said that if I was going to discuss it or debate it he would not call it. This is what he said to me and therefore I didn't expect that this resolution would be called tonight. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think we have had one of the greatest schmozzles ever in the record regarding the rules of this House over the years.

When the committee's report came in, certainly I had a number of disagreements and I still feel that those disagreements are valid. I do not have my notes before me so that I can point these out and I don't think members are inclined to discuss them tonight or hear a discussion on them and therefore I don't want to go into detail. But certainly the way the reports of committees in connection with bills have been dealt with I don't agree with and I don't think that it is a good one, that when bills are referred back from the various standing committees, such as Law Amendments and the Utilities and so on, that if there is no amendment made there will be no debate in the House. I don't feel this is proper; I feel that all bills should come back to Committee of the Whole House. I don't think that the amendments or the clause by clause discussion should take place in the standing committees. I think the committees should hear representation but the clause-by-clause consideration should take place in the Committee of the Whole so that all members could participate and that we need not give notice of motion as we have to do at present when we want to bring in amendments, especially those members who are not members of a standing committee. I do take strong exception to that. This is why I just have some doubts as to what will happen. . . . (Interjection)--Sure.

MR. FROESE: For once I was able to stop proceedings - we'll keep the Lieutenant-Governor out for a little while yet before we agree on this particular resolution before us.

I doubt whether the committee that is supposed to function in between sessions on this matter will bring in the recommendations that will be to my liking. In fact, I think in most cases whenever we have standing committees of this type bring in reports, they generally just take away privileges rather than give new privileges or retain the ones that are on the rule book at the present time. I know honourable members are anxious to get out so--(Interjection) should I carry on? I think I still have thirty minutes to go but I don't intend to carry on any further - I won't keep the Lieutenant-Governor waiting any longer.

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

#### ROYAL ASSENT

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly, at its present session, passed several Bills which in the name of the Assembly I present to Your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

MR. DEPUTY CLERK:

- No. 8 - An Act to amend The Brandon Charter.
- No. 12 - An Act to amend An Act to amend The Transcona Charter.
- No. 19 - An Act to amend The Winter Employment Act.
- No. 24 - An Act to incorporate Strathcona Curling Club.
- No. 25 - An Act to repeal Certain Acts relating to Certain Corporations.

- No. 26 - The Hearing Aid Act.
- No. 27 - The Personal Investigations Act.
- No. 28 - An Act to amend The St. James-Assinibola Charter.
- No. 29 - An Act to validate By-law No. 28-1970 of The Town of Killarney and By-law No. 17-1970 of The Rural Municipality of Turtle Mountain and to add a portion of the South East Quarter of Section Three (3) in Township Three (3) and Range Seventeen (17) West of the Principal Meridian in the Province of Manitoba to the Town of Killarney.
- No. 31 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (1).
- No. 32 - An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act.
- No. 33 - The Mortgage Brokers and Mortgage Dealers Act.
- No. 34 - An Act to authorize The City of St. James-Assinibola to pay a pension to Mary Hoban.
- No. 35 - An Act to amend an Act respecting "The Midland Railway Company of Manitoba".
- No. 36 - The City of Winnipeg Act.
- No. 37 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act.
- No. 38 - An Act to amend The Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.
- No. 39 - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956.
- No. 40 - The Statistics Act.
- No. 41 - An Act to amend The Flin Flon Charter.
- No. 42 - An Act to amend The Election Act.
- No. 43 - The Occupational Therapists Act.
- No. 45 - An Act to amend The Securities Act.
- No. 46 - An Act to amend The Jury Act.
- No. 47 - An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act.
- No. 48 - An Act to amend The Snowmobile Act.
- No. 49 - An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act.
- No. 50 - An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act.
- No. 51 - An Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act.
- No. 52 - An Act to amend The Automobile Insurance Act.
- No. 53 - The Health and Social Development Advisory Council Act.
- No. 54 - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act (2).
- No. 55 - The St. John's Cathedral Chapter Act.
- No. 56 - An Act to provide for the Merger of Credit Union League of Manitoba 1967 Limited and Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited.
- No. 57 - An Act to amend The Remembrance Day Act.
- MR. CLERK:
- No. 59 - An Act to amend The Corrections Act.
- No. 60 - An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Act.
- No. 61 - The Dental Association Act.
- No. 62 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (3).
- No. 63 - An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.
- No. 64 - An Act to Validate By-laws Nos. 70-22 and 71-15 of The Rural Municipality of East St. Paul.
- No. 65 - The Manitoba Mental Health Research Foundation Act.
- No. 66 - The Public Trustee Act.
- No. 67 - An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.
- No. 68 - An Act to amend The Wheat Board Money Trust Act.
- No. 69 - The Co-operative Associations Loans and Loans Guarantee Act.
- No. 70 - An Act to permit The City of Flin Flon to make a Grant to the Flin Flon Elderly and Infirm Housing Inc.
- No. 71 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (4).
- No. 72 - An Act to amend The Public Servants Insurance Act.
- No. 73 - An Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act.
- No. 74 - An Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act.
- No. 75 - An Act to amend The Local Authorities Election Act.
- No. 76 - An Act to amend The Executions Act.
- No. 77 - An Act to amend The Mental Health Act.
- No. 79 - An Act respecting The Town of Morris.

No. 80 - An Act to amend The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act.  
 No. 81 - An Act to amend "An Act to authorize the Town of Dauphin to construct and operate a system or systems of Waterworks, Main Trunk Sewer and Outlet and Sewage Disposal Works in said Town".

- No. 82 - An Act to amend The Charities Endorsement Act.  
 No. 83 - An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.  
 No. 84 - An Act to amend The Fires Prevention Act.  
 No. 85 - An Act to amend The Equal Pay Act.  
 No. 86 - An Act to amend The Payment of Wages Act.  
 No. 87 - An Act to amend An Act respecting The Town of The Pas.  
 No. 88 - An Act respecting The City of Brandon.  
 No. 90 - An Act to amend The Companies Act.  
 No. 91 - An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.  
 No. 92 - An Act to amend The Law of Property Act.  
 No. 93 - An Act respecting The Town of Dauphin.  
 No. 94 - An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act.  
 No. 96 - An Act to amend The Small Debts Recovery Act.  
 No. 97 - The Change of Name Act.  
 No. 98 - An Act to amend The Manitoba Evidence Act.  
 No. 99 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2).

MR. DEPUTY CLERK:

- No. 100 - An Act to amend The White Cane Act.  
 No. 101 - An Act to amend The Teachers' Society Act.  
 No. 102 - An Act to amend The Taxicab Act.  
 No. 103 - An Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act.  
 No. 104 - The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Act.  
 No. 105 - An Act to amend The County Courts Act (3).  
 No. 107 - An Act respecting The City of Brandon and Certain Neighbouring Municipalities.  
 No. 108 - An Act to amend The Milk and Dairy Products Control Act.  
 No. 109 - An Act to amend The Expropriation Act.  
 No. 110 - An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act (2).  
 No. 111 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act (3).  
 No. 112 - The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1971.  
 No. 113 - The Farm Machinery and Equipment Act.  
 No. 114 - The Communities Economic Development Fund Act.  
 No. 115 - An Act to amend The Provincial Police Act.  
 No. 116 - An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act (2).  
 No. 117 - An Act to validate By-law No. 559 of The City of Thompson.  
 No. 118 - The School Tax Reduction Act.  
 No. 119 - An Act to amend The Insurance Act.  
 No. 120 - An Act to amend The Animal Husbandry Act.

MR. CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these Bills.

HONOURABLE W. J. McKEAG (Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba): Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly: The work of the Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature has now been completed. I wish to commend the Members for their faithful attention to their duties including many hours devoted to consideration of Bills and Estimates, both in the House and in Committee. I convey to you my appreciation of your concern for the public interest and for the general welfare of our Province.

I thank you for providing the necessary sums of money for carrying on the public business. It will be the intention of my Ministers to ensure that these sums will be expended with both efficiency and economy by all departments of the government.

In relieving you now of your present duties and declaring the Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature prorogued, I give you my best wishes and pray that under the guidance of Divine Providence, our Province may continue to provide the things which are necessary for the health, the happiness and the well-being of all our people.

MR. MACKLING: It is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it shall please His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.