

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, April 25th, 1963.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department XIII. Item 3 -- passed. Item 4 -- passed. Item 5 -- passed.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, if we are so interested in obtaining work for the unemployed, latest figures show that January 31st, '63, from National Employment Service, registered for employment: Winnipeg 28,784; Manitoba, 36,664. We should see that the money is allocated so to give more work to the unemployed. Out of a figure of 36,664 for Manitoba the number employed on winter works was a round figure of 5,000. I heard today the Acting Minister say we should take a minimum rate to create more work, or words to that effect. Now I didn't quite catch him right. I'm sorry if I made a mistake in that but maybe I haven't got it down right. But anyway here's what I have in mind. Looking over the figures for the winter works program certain features become startlingly apparent. When the general public cry out to protest the cost of government projects, the blame is invariably laid on the high cost of labour and materials. No mention is made of the high profits made by the contractors who have undertaken the work on these projects. The total payroll cost for the municipal winter works incentive program from the 15th of October, '62 to 31st of March '63 was \$3,042,317.00. The total project cost for the same period was \$20,961,861.00. This means that the cost of the project was seven times higher than the cost of labour. To break these figures down further, the total work force of 4,292 men for the winter works program in Manitoba, worked an average of 50 days, each for the sum of \$700.00, or \$14.00 a day. The contractors, on the other hand, collectively made the sum of \$359,149 a day for these 50 days, exclusive of labour costs. We have no knowledge of the cost of materials for the winter works program but on construction, labour and material costs are generally presumed to be about the same. Assuming that such is the case, in this instance, this would give the contractors collectively a clear profit of \$299,061 a day; even if the material costs were twice those of labour the contractor's profits would still be \$238,973 a day. So at the very latest, at the very least I should say, the contractors collectively made a clear profit of \$238,973 per day, exclusive of labour and material costs. The total work force of 4,292 men involved in the winter works program on the other hand earned only a total of \$60,088 a day. On studying these figures and comparing the profits made by the contractors with the earnings of the work force, the need for adjustment in wages to reconcile to some extent, the glaring discrepancy becomes immediately apparent. How much of this winter works program is actually public works involving little or no material costs, and therefore making even more profit for the contractors. I would like to know the number of contractors used in this program. With these facts and figures before us it is a slur on the fair name of the Province of Manitoba that such conditions should be allowed to exist.

Now I would say, Mr. Chairman, this program is put out to help relieve unemployment. The labour force, as you see by this report, gets about \$14.00 a day. Now as I have said before in this House, if we are to do something for our people, we all have to put our backs to the wheel, or shoulders as you might say, and push. Now I don't like to see one man getting all the cream and the other one getting the skimmed milk. Let's shake the bottle up and give a little to everybody. I think if we do this and do it rightly, we should be able to get along here in Manitoba and have no unemployment at all. That is if we look after our moneys; that is if we look after the things that we ought to do -- our citizens of Manitoba. Thank you.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, there are a few comments that I would like to make under The Labour Relations Division. The provision that deals with the attitudes of both management-employer and employee and union during the time when negotiations are taking place for the recognition of a union as a bargaining agent or during negotiations themselves, provides that there shall be nothing done by either party to worsen the position of the other. There are occasions when a union is attempting to organize an employer's business at a time when the employee is in a position where he could be intimidated into a union or intimidated to stay out of a union, and there are provisions for it, and if an employer should dismiss an employee during that occasion the employer is liable to be charged under the Act.

Now it is my impression that under our Act the onus is on the discharged employee to prove that he was fired because of his membership or activity in a union. We in this province have

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) recognized in other legislation the onus provision as being one that could be put on a defendant because of the fact that sometimes the defendant is in sole knowledge of the facts, and I need only cite The Highway Traffic Act and The Liquor Act as being examples of a prima facie case being made out, and then the onus shifts on to the defendant to disprove all allegation. Now it seems to me that under The Labour Relations Act when there is a firing that takes place, it would be proper to suggest that the employer should have the onus placed on him to justify the firing, so that he would be able to show that the reason for the firing was anything other than a form of intimidation.

I understand that the Province of Quebec and the Province of Saskatchewan, an interesting combination of provinces, both have provisions for placing the onus on the employer in these circumstances. I understand that the legislation of the Province of Ontario has stronger powers given to the Department of Labour in making the investigation and that there is no cost to the employee. I would suggest strongly to the government that this type of legislation would be the kind that I spoke of yesterday in suggesting that the present legislation is helpful to the employer and harmful to organized labour.

Then when an employer is found to have improperly fired or otherwise disciplined an employee -- and I say improperly because of contravention of the Act -- there is no provision that I'm aware of to force retroactive reinstatement without loss of pay. I believe that the trend has been in recent years that an employer will be fined maybe a hundred dollars, maybe two hundred dollars, but the employee affected is still without a job and the union itself, which has attempted to organize, finds that its strength has been dissipated in a manner not contemplated by the Act, because the Act does not agree that a union's organizational efforts should be weakened and destroyed due to improper acts of the employer. I'm suggesting that because of the lack of retroactive reinstatement provisions with teeth in it, and because of the fact that the tendency has been to fine an employer a sum which an employer can easily afford to pay, the attempts for proper labour-management relationship is destroyed.

Further, I'd like to suggest that by the time certification takes place, because of these delays the bargaining position has been harmed to the effect that many times no agreement is completed even after a union is certified. I'm wondering if the Honourable Minister could give us information as to the number of cases when a union has been certified as a bargaining agent and no agreement has resulted from negotiations.

I would also like to ask, in line with what he said earlier this afternoon dealing with the effectiveness of the conciliation officers, how many occasions there have been when conciliation officers have been appointed and have succeeded in bringing about an agreement without the next step of going to a conciliation board, as compared to the number of times it was necessary to go to a conciliation board and effect an agreement.

The few other matters I'd like to mention, Mr. Chairman, is what I consider a rather peculiar law that we have now dealing with the strike vote. As I understand it, the law provides that in order for a bargaining agent to be recognized -- I don't mean a strike vote, I'm sorry, I mean a vote on a bargaining agent -- that the employees must vote in excess of 50 percent in favour of a union -- in excess of 50 percent of the total working force. Then the result is -- the result which took place in the Manitoba Hydro vote where there were two unions involved, and in one case, one union received 715 votes, the other union received 520 votes out of a total work force of 1,576 employees. The result was that 1,235 out of 1,576 employees voted in favour of a union, but since neither union succeeded in getting 50 percent of the total employees, neither was recognized. What it means in effect is that those who did not vote were considered by the law to have voted against a union. It would be a fine state of affairs if that was applied in the elections to this Legislature, because I would guess that under those circumstances this room would be bare of all persons but the Clerk and other members of the staff. If 400 or if any number of employees are not interested enough to exercise their ballot either way, it is just nonsense to count their ballot one way or the other, but apparently that is the way our Act reads. I call this a retrogressive approach to the needs of recognition of trade unions in spite of what is said about how wonderful they are by both of the larger, older parties.

Another matter I'd like to comment on is the recommendations made by Judge Lindal in the conclusions which he arrived at in an enquiry conducted under Section 39 of The Labour Relations Act in the matter of the United Steel Workers of America and Canadian Brown Steel Tank. Now

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) I know that there is an action involved in that and I don't intend to deal with any part of that, but there are two recommendations made by the judge who has had a great deal of experience in conciliation and arbitration work and I'd like to read them into the record, Mr. Chairman.

His recommendation 4 reads: "Section 4, Subsection (2) (a) sets out what an employer may not do in regard to individual persons if it is done because that person is a member of a trade union. Sections 14 and 15 set up what an employer may not do during the period of negotiation, if it is done for the purpose of impairing the bargaining position of a certified bargaining agent. An employer should not be allowed at any time to do anything for the purpose of impairing the bargaining position or dissipating the strength of a trade union. It is recommended that Section 4, Subsection (2) be amended to include dissipating the strength of a trade union and derogating from its bargaining position" I'd like to hear the Honourable Minister comment on this recommendation and tell me whether or not the government has brought in effect or is planning to do anything along these lines.

"Recommendation 5. That because of the six months' statutory limitation for instituting summary convictions proceedings, necessary amendments be made to The Labour Relations' Act so that in cases of industrial enquiries under Section 39 of the Act the six months' time does not begin to run until after the enquiry has been completed and the report made." Now I had occasion in this committee, I believe it was on some other occasion, to point out that in this case the violation was alleged to have occurred on November 17th, 1961. The Industrial Enquiry Commission was appointed May 18th, 1962 and the report is dated December 18th, 1962, which is a year and a day after the violation was alleged to have occurred. I'd like to hear whether the government has considered the fact that six months and one year are obviously insufficient to bring about the effect desired under the Act.

Now something removed from what I've already said, and briefly, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Minister mentioned today that he is hoping that conciliation boards will not be needed as much as they have been in the past and that the budget has been somewhat reduced, and that would be 5 (d) (1) I presume, for payment of Board fees. Well if good employer-employee relations are accomplished without the need of a conciliation board, that is desirable, but I want to bring to the Honourable Minister's attention the fact that I, for one, and others that I know of, have had considerable difficulty in obtaining people to act as conciliation board members because of a fee of \$15.00 a session. To find people who are trained and able to do the work and who command the respect of the people who want to appoint them has become extremely difficult in my experience, and I have had this experience both as a solicitor for one or the other side of a labour dispute and also as one of the conciliation board members appointed by one or the other side on an occasion when I had to find a chairman, and I will tell the Minister that I have had considerable difficulty to get a person who was so public-spirited as to be prepared to do a job at that rate of pay.

Now if I might digress but still on point, we will be considering an amendment to The Public Schools Act where the board of arbitration will be increased in its fees from I think \$7.00 or \$8.00 to \$15.00 -- I think that's the amount -- per day it reads -- and if it means per full day, then I can only say that people who will agree to sit on that board are indeed people who are prepared to sacrifice quite a bit. But in conciliation proceedings where a great deal of important decisions must be made and where the attention of a person must be captured, and it must be a person acceptable in the case of the Chairman to both sides, I would suggest that a fee of \$15.00 is inadequate. I don't suggest it, I assert that it is inadequate, and has resulted in difficulty in obtaining a person on that board. I can compare that with the need to obtain people to sit on an arbitration board where the fees are paid by the contesting parties and the fees then are substantially higher than \$15.00 per session, and there is much less difficulty in obtaining people to sit on those boards.

So I would strongly urge this government to recognize the value of the people that are required to sit on conciliation boards and to pay them substantially more than what it has been paying in the past, in order to ensure having people who are most competent and most acceptable to sit on that job.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, maybe I should deal with some of the questions which have been raised. I must confess I missed the opening remarks of the member for Logan and really

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) can't comment on it because of that. There was some suggestion about some reference I made to the minimum wage. In any case, I didn't hear it so I really can't comment on it, but I will look it up in Hansard tomorrow.

Then he made some comments about the winter work projects in Manitoba, and I believe he was talking about Manitoba, where he said that the costs of the projects were seven times higher than the labour costs involved. Is that correct? Yes. Well I have the latest reports on winter works. It's a press release dated April 18th, in which the total cost of winter works projects in Manitoba were \$11,500,000 and the total payroll costs in relation to that were \$5,300,000.00. In other words, the payroll costs were just about 50 percent of the total cost of the winter works projects. Frankly, I am a little at a loss to understand where he gets his information about contractors' profits unless he has been consulting with the member for St. George, who seems to have some special knowledge of the kinds of profits that contractors make. I frankly have no information myself about the profits which may or may not be made on these winter works projects, but would rather doubt that the profits are in any way excessive. In most cases, I would suspect that these projects would be under the direct supervision and be contracted directly by the municipalities involved rather than put out to private tender or for private work of that kind.

The member for St. John's is suggesting that the onus should be on the employer to prove himself innocent during the period of time in which organization is taking place for a company. Now if I'm wrong, I would like you to

MR. CHERNIACK: I was suggesting that he be put in the position where he must explain and satisfy as to the reason for firing, because he knows the reasons better than anybody else does.

MR. CARROLL: Presumably, if he doesn't have an adequate reason he is judged to be guilty. You shake your head -- you nod in approval -- so in other words an employer who discharges an employee at any time when organization is taking place is automatically guilty unless he can satisfy a judge that he is innocent of that particular charge. I really think that this is a most onerous responsibility and one that I wouldn't want really to have anything to do with. I think we in Manitoba have gone further than any other province in Canada. Last year we brought in an amendment to the Act and suggested that we as a province would be prepared to take action in the case of unfair labour practices where it appeared to be a case in which the province should act. Now there may be cases where there is insufficient evidence to justify the province taking action, but we have gone further, as I say, than any other province that I know of in the Dominion of Canada with this particular amendment.

He suggests that the fine, of course, is really inadequate. I quite agree that a fine does very little for most companies, but I think the real penalty is any adverse publicity which attaches to an unfair labour practice charge or anything of that kind. You don't agree? I think it's a very real consideration and I think this is certainly something to be feared much worse than any monetary fine that could be levied.

I really don't know how many unions have become certified and subsequently were not able to arrive at an agreement. However, if we did know that number I really don't think it would prove anything at all except that they were unable to arrive at an agreement, and frankly I think you can draw no conclusions from the fact that two people were not able to settle on terms.

I believe if you care to refer to page 114 of the Department of Labour report you will find statistics there about the Conciliation Officers' services and the success which they have had in settling disputes. It appears that there were 61 cases under review; some pending at year-end; and new cases that came up during the year. Of those, agreements were reached in 31. There were 21 cases where there was no settlement reached and presumably many of those would go on to conciliation boards. Conciliation services were withdrawn in four cases and cases still under development at year-end were eight. Then it goes on to tell about the Conciliation Board itself. I understand that normally the settlement of disputes by conciliation officers runs between 60 and 70 percent of the total number that they take on.

With respect to the voting for a bargaining agent, I think one must remember that when you are selecting a bargaining agent, that once the bargaining agent has been selected, he doesn't only represent those people who may have voted for them. The other people in effect lose their bargaining rights because from there on the union which is selected is their sole representative and speaks with the voice of all of the employees, so that it's a very important vote and one in which the union should have a very substantial vote in its favour, otherwise they're not representing

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) the employees of the company. I think that you'll find that most provinces have this same provision that it must be 50 percent of those eligible to vote because the other employees then lose any further bargaining rights which they may have had once the union has been certified.

I think you'll find that we are making some amendments to our Labour Relations Act to take care of at least one of the recommendations of Judge Lindal. The other one seemed to hinge on a very fine legal point and I think that it was not sufficiently strong to have convinced our department that it's something we should be doing at this particular time. However, we are extending the six months' limitation period in a statute that I believe had second reading now and will be going to committee tomorrow morning for further consideration.

We've already as I recall, and I'm not positive of this, but I'm quite sure that we have changed the fees for conciliation boards at the present time. I don't know whether any boards have operated under the increased fee because we haven't established a conciliation board, as I recall, since early December, but there has been some change in fees. Now I'm not sure that it applies to members. It may apply only to the board chairman and this is something I can confirm and let the honourable member know in the near future. But the fee is \$15.00 per meeting for members, as I recall it, and \$25.00 for the chairman. That means you can have a meeting in the morning, a meeting in the afternoon and a meeting in the evening, which would give the chairman \$75.00 for one day's work, which I'm quite sure members of the House would agree is not too bad, unless you happen to be a lawyer, in which case they sometimes feel that their services command a higher return. For the board members, the fee would be \$45.00 for the day as it has been in the past.

MR. WRIGHT: We've heard of winter employment projects and I wanted to mention briefly something about a need that I think exists. In the United States at the present time there are organizations called YES - Youth Employment Service. This organization is devoted to finding summer work for students. During my fourteen years of municipal experience, one of the problems that worried me most was students coming to me trying to find work for the summer. I make this appeal to the Minister because I think perhaps the Department of Labour could perform a service here outside of the National Employment Service, because I don't think that's filling the bill. I was just wondering whether the Department of Labour couldn't study this movement in the States to find out whether or not we in Manitoba here could make it a lot easier for our students, because after all, Mr. Chairman, we are trying to keep them in school, and it's most frustrating for these young people to find themselves with time on their hands in the summer and the necessity to make a few dollars and to find that they do not know which way to turn for employment. I make an appeal to the Department of Labour to study this movement in the south.

MR. CARROLL: I think that's a very constructive suggestion and I know that I have often thought that we could be a great deal more help to some of our high school students leaving school in not only seeking employment but in vocational guidance and training and things of that kind. I really think that this is probably a matter though that should be handled by the National Selective Service because of their special responsibilities in this field, and possibly they might be prepared to set up a special youth service which could provide temporary employment and possibly they could even provide the kind of guidance service that I think is probably pretty desirable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I notice that the allocation made to the winter works program is being cut by almost one-third. Does that mean that we'll have that less effort in this matter or what accounts for the reduction in this item?

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, considerable help is being hired by the province during the summer months, either substitutes for those taking holidays and other extra summer work. How is this being handled?

MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I just missed that question of the member for Inkster. Was it summer relief for provincial service?

MR. GRAY: Yes.

MR. CARROLL: I think that there is a great deal of hiring for the Department of Public Works and others who do a great deal more work during summer months than winter. I think,

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) generally speaking, there's no replacement of staff to any large extent during the summer months although there is some temporary relief, but generally speaking when government employees go on holidays, it's a question of other members of the department sharing the work, although as I say there is some temporary holiday relief brought in. Not very many positions I think can be filled by students because most of them require some special skills which students generally don't have. There is a great deal of hiring for survey parties, for road construction work and things of that kind.

With respect to the question from the member for Rhineland regarding our winter work appropriation, I think our experience has been sufficient now with this program that we have put in a more realistic figure. We've had a figure in here for a number of years, since the program was implemented I believe in 1958, and we pretty well know how to judge the pattern at the present time and we think that this will be a more realistic figure than what we've had in past years, because we never have spent as much as was allocated under this particular vote.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister told us a few moments ago that the total value of the winter works projects amounted to nearly \$11 million, of which approximately 50 percent would be taken up in labour costs. Now following up on the same subject as mentioned by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, does this mean that the cost to the province of the \$5 million -- assuming that \$5 million was the value of the labour on the winter works projects -- the cost to this province then was around \$200,000 or about four percent, four or five percent, of the total value of labour?

Then, Mr. Chairman, I refer you to Paragraph 2 of Page 26 of the Annual Report. It does seem that the paragraphs are numbered in the annual report, which comes in handy. I would like to know whether or not there has been any changes in the Act, that is The Winter Employment Act of 1958. Is it still necessary to qualify under the Act for persons who have no unemployment insurance benefits and they must be in receipt of social assistance from the municipality? Is that still a fact?

Then too, Mr. Chairman, I would like the Honourable Minister to comment on Paragraph 5 on Page 80 of the Annual Report, in which it is reported that for the first time since the great depression of the 30's, Manitoba is facing a substantial unemployment problem. Is that a fact I wonder?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that these reports are drawn up by various division heads and they are allowed quite wide latitude in putting down what they feel should be included in their annual report as they happen to see things, and there's no attempt made by -- in fact this report has been handed to me; we don't edit it in advance and I must confess there are quite a few things in it which, had I been writing the report, would have been worded quite differently. I really think this is one of those items that I certainly would have questioned myself and would likely have edited.

Now with respect to the cost to Manitoba of winter works projects, the federal government to begin with pay 50 percent of the payroll costs on approved projects. You asked if there were any changes in the Act since it was brought in. There have been one or two minor amendments but none of which affect our cost-sharing because our policy has been spelled out by regulation and the regulation is not changed this year. We will add to the 50 percent federal contribution another 50 percent if those employed on the project are in receipt of social assistance and have been for a period of 30 days. Now that assistance can either be provincial assistance or municipal assistance. That means 100 percent of the labour bill then would be paid by the federal government and by Manitoba.

In the case of those who are hired on the project who do not have Unemployment Insurance benefits due them, which would include farmers and many others whose unemployment insurance benefits have expired, then we will pay 25 percent of this cost, which means the total cost of those people so employed would be 75 percent, 25 being paid by Manitoba and 50 percent being paid by Ottawa; but in the case of all others, the municipality pays the other 50 percent share. The reason for this is of course to try to encourage the employment of those people whose needs are the greatest and we feel that there is an incentive here that will encourage municipalities to take on those people whose need is the greatest, and that has been a policy that we've carried through now for two years.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my honourable friend could give us the cost

(Mr. Shoemaker cont'd) of the various projects to the province and the cost to the federal government. What did each government pay towards the wages of the various winter works projects. Have you got the figures in front of you there?

MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry, we don't know those figures until the projects have been completed to begin with, which means I guess the end of May, and then there's quite a period of time in which the municipalities have to assemble their material and send it in to Winnipeg to be assembled, audited and paid. It's usually not until late August, September, until we know exactly how we've come out at the end of a winter works year. I believe probably the annual report will tell us something about what was paid out last year. I haven't checked it, but I'm sure that the honourable member could probably find it and check on that for himself.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Minister to say that the only time that anybody got paid for labour costs on the winter works program is if their benefits for unemployment insurance had run out. Is that correct?

MR. CARROLL: These agreements, these winter works agreements are made by the municipality with ourselves, approved by Ottawa. Fifty percent of the payroll costs were paid by Ottawa to begin with. We will pay the other 50 percent if they use people who are on some kind of assistance and have been for a period of thirty days. We pay 25 percent of that labour bill if the people have exhausted or are not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits; and we pay nothing if they employ just ordinary people who may have insurance benefits and are employed on that project.

MR. PETERS: But if they are entitled to unemployment insurance benefits, they do not come under the winter works program. I think this is wrong.

MR. CARROLL: They come under, but the municipality pays the bill. This was a means by which we could encourage municipalities to hire people who needed employment the most, which are people who require assistance either from the municipality or the province, or those people who do not have any unemployment insurance benefits to fall back on. These are the two categories which we're trying to encourage municipalities to hire. Thirdly are the people who have unemployment insurance benefits but they are unemployed. The municipality hires them anyway and they pay the other 50 percent of the wage bill. But in any case the municipality, the most they can pay is 50 percent of the labour cost and the least they can pay is nothing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 5 -- passed.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I'm rising on Item (6) if that is all right. I'd like to direct the Minister's attention to an article that appeared on the front page of the Winnipeg Free Press today. Now perhaps I'm stealing the thunder of the NDP so to speak, because when the word "Big Business" is mentioned usually they fly into action and all kinds of -- (interjection) -- Thank you, thank you. I don't think you had anything. Anyway, I'd like to draw the Minister's attention to this small headline, where it says: "Big Business Blamed", and it says here: "Winnipeg Fire Department Chief D.S. Dunnett charged Thursday that big business is blocking the efforts of Manitoba Fire Chiefs to regulate the sale of fireworks throughout the Province of Manitoba." Further down it says: "The Manitoba Fire Commissioner disclosed that the Manitoba Fire Chiefs had been trying for the past three years to get a fireworks control law enacted. He said in an interview a law would prohibit the sale of firecrackers and other fireworks to anyone except an organized group which would present a written permit from the Fire Chief in its area for purchase."

Now in this same article it mentioned that two boys have already been hurt this year in Winnipeg using firecrackers. They threw a firecracker down a man-hole and the sewer gas exploded and blew the man-hole cover up. Now in about the centre of the article there's quite a serious statement made, and I'm wondering if this government is prepared to accept it. It says here that there is no law for regulating the sale of fireworks to anyone in the province, young or old, and Chief Dunnett said that the province had been plumping for such a law but that big business was blocking it. Chief Dunnett said that he had letters from businessmen criticizing him for suggesting that a provincial law be enacted. However, it has been learned that the Winnipeg Junior Chamber of Commerce is backing such a law, and the Chief further goes on to say that he is hoping that there will be some action come from the Legislature this year.

Now I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister and other members of the front bench if this is true, that big business is blocking such a law. The past has shown that there's been a lot of

(Mr. Johnston cont'd) accidents to the young people where young children can go to the store and buy dangerous fireworks and make use of them and consequently hurt themselves.

MR. CARROLL: In answer to your question, Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that I really don't know of any attempt by big business to block the sale of firecrackers.

MR. JOHNSTON: Is your government prepared to enact some legislation along the lines of the thinking of these people?

MR. CARROLL: As I recall it now -- and I wish the Attorney-General were here to freshen my memory -- as I recall it, I think this is within the control of the local municipal governments at the present time. That's as I understand it . . . However, I would like to check on that point and possibly provide the information to you privately later. But I do think there is something in the Municipal Act now or some other place that does give the municipalities the authority to do this at the present time.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I think that -- I'm sorry to break in with -- (interjection) -- yes, I apologize to the member for Portage, but on this very point which I had wanted to raise too, I think that the Minister's answer is really evasive. The point here is whether or not the province has so far attempted to pass any necessary legislation or whether it has succumbed to some kind of pressure, and I'm not suggesting that they have, but that in essence is the question.

Now in the article that appears on the front page of the papers today, it seems to be implicit that the local authorities, the municipalities may pass a by-law restricting the use of firecrackers, but it seems implicit that they do not have the authority to pass a by-law restricting the sale; and on that point I think rests the entire query regarding the dangers, the responsibility of fire arising out of the use of firecrackers by young people who use them carelessly. I think that though one at first glance might tend to think this is really not all that important, it certainly is important in that firecrackers are used by young people, and often -- well, not often -- but disproportionately high are the number of injuries, because these young people simply are careless. I can recall that when I was starting high school, a couple of my schoolmates were pretty severely injured. For example, one had a firecracker thrown into his pocket where he had other firecrackers, and so on and so forth. There's many of these stories. So if the province is at all able to act up to its responsibility here, it should do so; and I rather suspect that the whole point is whether municipalities have the authority to restrict the sale and not just the use.

MR. GRAY: I'm not inclined to discuss yesterday, what happened yesterday and whose fault it is and who is to blame. I fully agree with the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie that the situation became more serious now unless there's something from today on. I was young myself at one time and I liked to play with these fireworks, but at that time the manufacturing of those firecrackers were more or less innocent and they could not have done any damage. It has now been improved, so to speak, for the play of the children, and I think it's dangerous; it's not a great sport; and we cannot let it go further when we've found out that considerable damage is being done here and everywhere.

So I think let's forget of yesterday. I would respectfully suggest that the department in charge of this should try and do something now; try to prevent the sale of it entirely or examine those firecrackers who create so much damage. We cannot afford to have accidents and to have injuries of human life because some kids want to have their fun. I hate to take it away from them because we were all children at one time, but when a thing goes out of control, I think it is time to do it. I very much support the contention of the last speakers and particularly the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie on this subject.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, just to follow this up, and that's all for me then. But a responsible person like Chief Dunnett of the Winnipeg Fire Department, and Mr. Humphries, this is what they say in the article: "that fireworks-controlled legislation must be a provincial law or it wouldn't serve any purpose. If for instance the open sale of firecrackers and fireworks were banned in Winnipeg alone, a person could merely go to St. James or North Kildonan and buy them there." So that what I'm suggesting is that it cannot be passed back now to the municipalities for action. This is something that requires action on the provincial level.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid I didn't catch the first part of the debate on this subject, but I can perhaps shed some light on the present legal situation by referring members

(Mr. Lyon cont'd) of the committee to Section 907, Clause (b) of The Municipal Act, which sets forth the relevant powers of the municipality at the present time for control over fireworks. It says: "any municipality or any municipal corporation may pass by-laws for presenting or regulating the firing of guns or other firearms and the firing or setting off of fireballs, squids, crackers or fireworks, and for the preventing of shivarees and other like disturbances of the peace." I don't know how "shivarees" got in there but

MR. CHERNIACK: Isn't that the point, that the municipalities are given the authority to prevent or to pass regulations against the firing of them but nothing to do with the sale of them. Might I also suggest to the Honourable the Attorney-General that it seems to me that somebody has suggested that there are values in setting up the Metropolitan Corporation, and I think that was done by this House -- I think the Attorney-General had something to do with it -- recognizing that there were certain matters which could be better dealt with on an over-all basis than leaving it to the municipalities.

Now it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is obvious that a regulation which must be passed by each municipality separately doesn't work very well in an area like Greater Winnipeg where it would be possible to purchase these goods in one municipality and fire them in another. I don't know; I don't know if the Attorney-General knows whether there are by-laws in each of the municipalities to prevent the doing of those things which the municipality has a right to prevent like firing off firecrackers and shivarees. One doesn't fire shivarees; one holds them.

But in any event, the point here is that all that the municipalities have a right to do is to pass by-laws prohibiting the firing of them. That isn't the answer because it is only after the damage is done that it is discovered, and when you hear a loud bang I suppose police converge from all sides to find out what caused the bang, but by that time those little boys are gone far away and can't be found. So the problem still rests with the province and I think it still rests with the Cabinet and with the Honourable Minister who spoke, who, I think, should do something about it in spite of the suggestion that big business has prevented him from doing it.

MR. LYON: I heard on television and saw in the newspaper, which the Honourable Member for Brokenhead quite kindly sent over to me, the allegations by Chief Dunnett, I have had no communication with the chief myself although I do have, or have had in the department some correspondence with different groups who have been advocating some method of control beyond that which appears in The Municipal Act. I must say -- and I'm speaking now only from recollection and I'm sorry I don't have the full details of the file in front of me -- there were various measures suggested, and as I recall not all of the organizations who were in favour of control wanted a prohibition of fireworks. The degrees of control suggested, as I recall, were that they must be purchased and exploded by senior adult groups such as community clubs and so on who annually in our various communities in Greater Winnipeg have 24th of May celebrations. I go to one every year. This is the type of thing that some of the -- shall I say some of the more moderate approaches that have been made. The others, of course, have demanded complete prohibition, so I haven't been able to detect from my own correspondence and from discussions I've had with the former Minister of Labour any unanimity of opinion on the subject except that there was concern from time to time expressed by one or more different groups.

But certainly any suggestions from the City of Winnipeg or from the Metropolitan Corporation or the Union of Municipalities and the Urban Association that they were desirous of having some further control, some super-control over and above what they already have, would be given very careful consideration by the departments concerned. I am speaking now as an old firecracker boy myself, one who bears a scar from having had a pocketful of firecrackers go off when I dropped some punk into my right pocket once, so I speak as a scarred veteran in this battle and know whereof I speak.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand why the Provincial Fire Department wouldn't take the initiative in proposing some sensible legislation along these lines if the City of Winnipeg chief can do it. I notice the Department of Labour Report, the major part of it is devoted to fire prevention and much is made of it, and I am surprised that the Provincial Fire Department don't take the initiative.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that if you let these fire people have their whole way they would prevent you people from smoking in the Legislature or any other place. Now they want to cut out all fun altogether, because I think their latest suggestion was to

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) cut out smoking in bed, and Heaven knows what the next move will be. You can't be 100 percent safe in this business, and I think that's what they'd like to be.

MR. PETERS: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Attorney-General is in a very embarrassing position. We all are because although I would like to see a stop to these fire-crackers being exploded at certain times, my kids will knock the heck out of me if I tell them that they can't explode one on May 24th. It's a very ticklish problem and I think we should just forget about it right now and let's all get back to the business of the House.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not a battle-scarred veteran of the fire-cracker days or a battle-scarred veteran of the shivaree days, but to point out how serious that this situation is I refer you to Page 102 of the Annual Report. They report on that page 28 causes of fires, and of course the big ones -- 903 fires were caused by careless smokers and matches. But a little further down the page you will find 153 fires that were started by children playing with matches and fireworks, etcetera. In addition to the 153 there, at the bottom of the page, unknown causes of fire is 851 more, and it is quite possible that some of the 851 unknown fires were caused by children playing with matches, firecrackers and the like. So it does seem that when you have roughly 4,000 fires reported in the province and about five percent of them caused by children playing with matches and firecrackers, that it's something we should recognize.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when I am on my feet I would refer my honourable friend to The Tribune of February 19th

A MEMBER: Which friend are you referring to?

MR. SHOEMAKER: All of them. They're all my friends. There's an article there headed: "Group Plans Fire Brigade Co-operative". I can recall, or I think I can, where the Honourable the First Minister on radio or TV one night mentioned what the province intended to do in this regard. Now I don't know whether my honourable friend has raised this subject or whether he has given the House notice of it, but it refers to a co-operative stand-by system of fire protection for groups of rural Manitoba towns, a new project that is to be started in 1963. The purpose, I understand, is that in areas where -- take Neepawa if you like for instance, where we are very proud of our fire brigade, and in fact they are often called out as far away as 30 or 40 miles to fight fires in other towns and villages. I wonder if my honourable friend can tell us any more about this new project. The article says, "Labour Minister, J. B. Carroll, said that the scheme could materially help to cut Manitoba's annual total of 20 fatal fires and property losses of more than 5 million."

MR. CARROLL: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, I really can't add anything to what has been said in that particular news release. This is a voluntary program which the department is trying to promote among rural fire departments whereby a group of communities living close to one another would share in the use of fire equipment and would respond on certain calls to fires, and others would stand by in readiness to take care of any fires that might take place in a municipality which had responded to the other one. It is just a joint co-operation, joint use of equipment. It's not in operation at the present time; it's in the discussion stages. We certainly see great value in it and would hope that possibly by estimate time next year we might be able to report some success in this field.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, before this item passes, we have been talking an awful lot about the banning of sale of firearms and everything else, but it all boils down to one item, one fact, that the people who send their children out to buy firearms shouldn't send them out by themselves -- (interjection) -- firecrackers, fire bombs, whatever you want. The thing is this, that you've got to educate your children how to handle them. You go out with them; you fire them with them. You take them out in the backyard when it gets dark -- it's only one day a year that you do this -- May 24th. The problem here is this, that you educate your children how to handle them safely, and if the parents can't do it the government can't do it. You can legislate as much as you want; you will never do it by legislation. It's like everything else. We talk here about education. We should educate people for this; we should educate them about this; labour problems, everything else. This is the crux of the matter. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface is not here to listen to me tonight, but this is the crux of the matter, Mr. Chairman, that we can pass this item now and take a lesson from this discussion that we've had that the parents have to educate their children how to handle those firecrackers, firearms or whatever

(Mr. Peters cont'd) it is, to handle them safely, and until that happens we can legislate till Hades freezes over, we'll never get anything done proper.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I think that the member for Elmwood and I have found occasion to disagree at other times and I do so at this point. I realize that the debate, or the discussion regarding the sale of firecrackers, etcetera, has taken on a bantering turn this evening and I don't suppose we've really reached much of a consensus of agreement on that point, but I want to say that while it's true that really the people that are charged with the responsibility regarding the safe use of firecrackers, etcetera are the parents -- I agree -- but at the same time there have been a substantial number of accidents involving firecrackers in past years and it is with regard to that margin, or to that area that I suggest that the province, if the municipalities are not either by law or for other reasons not able to effectively deal with or provide for the restriction of the sale of firecrackers, that the province should look into the matter. It's a small point perhaps and my only suggestion at the outset was that the Department of Labour, the Fire Commissioner, should look into it, charge themselves with that responsibility and see whether or not it wouldn't be feasible, advisable and desirable that the province pass some legislation providing for the restricted sale of firecrackers to responsible adults or community groups, etcetera.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 6 -- passed. That completes the estimates for Department XIII, the Department of Labour. One Department left, Department XVI, the Salary Increases.

MR. ROBLIN: If I can touch very briefly, Mr. Chairman, this represents a one increment boost in the salaries of the civil service across-the-board. I think everybody will realize that the civil service get an annual increment in their salaries as a general rule and that has taken place this year. That's worth roughly half a million dollars, and in addition to that, we are raising the whole level of the salary schedule one increment, which will give them really two increment increase at this particular time and the extra money required for this purpose is three-quarters of a million dollars as shown here.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his explanation on this. I take it then that there's really no great changes taking place in the schedule that is. I realize that the department is I think constantly reviewing, is it not, but from what the Minister says the main change involved here then is a normal increment increase plus an additional increment.

MR. PETERS: This extra increment that the government is proposing, that is for everyone under the civil service? That's just all that I want to make clear.

MR. ROBLIN: That is correct. I imagine it doesn't affect Deputy Ministers or people in that category, but everybody else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item passed.

..... continued on next page

MR. ROBLIN: Now, Mr. Chairman, if the committee is willing I'd like to suggest you call the Capital Estimates. There are four resolutions there that were distributed last night to members, and we'll try and supply any explanations that may be required in dealing with those.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Manitoba Telephone System, \$7 million.

MR. ROBLIN: Just very briefly, Mr. Chairman, members I think are used to this annual appropriation for the Telephone System, and although I have before me a list of the details for which this money is required, generally speaking it is for the usual annual expansion of the service and it covers things like conduits and cables and aerial cable and exchange lines in the central office in Winnipeg and in the provincial substations, microwave relay equipment for the inter-provincial system, radio-telephone equipment, exchange plant, provincial rural lines, buildings and land and all that general line of capital expansion that the Telephone System requires each year. They have a total expansion program for the coming year of \$16,500,000.00. There is a transfer from Surpluses in Reserve as is usual each year of some \$9 1/2 million, leaving \$7 million that have to be required by way of new money, and that is what we are asking for at the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, last year the requirements of the same were \$18,500.00. There was a transfer and a much smaller carry-over -- \$18,500,000, I should say. This year I notice that the reserve or the unused is much greater. We ended up apparently at the end of the year with 9.5 million that we did not use last year?

MR. ROBLIN: That is not quite correct, Mr. Chairman. There's 3 million, the carry-over of unused authorizations from last year. The balance of 6.5 million is a transfer from the Surpluses and Reserves. It has been the policy of the Telephone System for many years to invest its surpluses and reserves in its own plant and equipment. This represents nothing new but it does give a sum of \$6 1/2 millions that the System generates itself for its Capital investment program and which we do not need to go to the capital market for. We only ask for the net on the capital market, which is 7 million.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the First Minister could give us a sheet with all the unused authorizations similar to what I got last year on an Order of Return.

MR. ROBLIN: Well I can't give that to my honourable friend at the moment but I can give him the information as we come to the items. I have the information here and will be glad to give it.

MR. MOLGAT: Well I was actually going to go on to another one of the utilities which is not listed and that's the Hydro. There has been no appropriation now for some years because there was a very large one some years ago, and I would appreciate if the Minister could give us a break-down as to where we stand now in "unused" in that category.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, there is, I think, an amount of some 40 millions unused from previous appropriations for Manitoba Hydro. I think that figure is about what it is; I must admit I'm relying on my memory. That money was appropriated by the Legislature I think three years ago, and represents the balance of the sum of \$135 million that was appropriated then. This \$40 million will in general see the Hydro through their investment program for this current fiscal year, but that represents the last of that money and it's quite likely that we will have to ask for further appropriations for Hydro next year when we meet here. We think, however, there's enough in the unused appropriation that was granted three years ago to see us through until the next time the House meets.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to go into details because I don't think that this Public Debt is debatable entirely because we cannot reduce and we cannot add at the moment, but nevertheless we are paying out \$11 million in interest on behalf of -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Nevertheless it's \$11 million to be paid out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the small population of this province, and I don't think we can do anything about it, and whatever I suggest doesn't mean anything, but don't you think that the time has come when we should try, if at all possible, to reduce this uncontrollable large amount of paying to people who are not laboring too hard in getting this \$11 million?

MR. ROBLIN: I refer you to the Honourable Member for Rhineland. He's got a patented arrangement for doing this.

MR. GRAY: Well I may agree with him -- I don't know how to do it. I'm not a financier,

(Mr. Gray, cont'd) but to me personally it looks a lot of money for a tax for the 800,000 taxpayers in this province to pay out, and I was just wondering -- I haven't got a remedy for it at the moment, except be in default, which probably is not the best thing -- I don't know. But at the same time I just want to express my pain and suffering for people receiving \$11 million for something they don't work for.

MR. ROBLIN: actually on this point at the moment but if the committee will allow me I'll just make a brief comment because I can cut my honourable friend's pain and suffering at least in half because, of the amount that's shown, the sum that we pay for interest and amortization, which is the real cost of debt, is something under \$6 million. The remaining amount of the sum required is the repayment of the principal which I think is in quite a different category. I do, however, expect to elaborate on my views on this subject perhaps tomorrow night if the Budget comes down at that time.

MR. MOLGAT: on the Hydro reply that the Minister gave. He gave me an unused authorization of 40 million. Last year when we met the unused was \$106,900,000, which would indicate that we spent some \$66 million in the course of 1962. Now with the approaching of the completion of the Grand Rapids project I would think that the capital requirements would be very heavy, and I would doubt in that case if the \$40 million would be sufficient, would it, to carry through?

MR. ROBLIN: I must say to my honourable friend that I can't guarantee my figure of \$40 million. It might be the other way around -- it might be forty millions at sixty. All I'm really saying to him is that we think there is enough money in the present appropriation to pay the bills that we'll have to meet in this coming year. When the original appropriation was put through it was required not only for the Grand Rapids project but also for the unpaid balances on the Selkirk steam plant which amounted to some 20 or 30 millions as well I think at the time; so that it is not restricted to the one project. All I can really vouch for this evening is that we think we have enough money in Capital Supply, unspent at the moment, to pay this year's bills.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 passed 2 passed

MR. ROBLIN: Let me see, what item are we on now -- Water Supply Board. The unexpended appropriations carried over from the previous period is \$1 1/2 million. The program for the year is expected to be \$1,870,000 so we're asking for \$370,000 additional money for that purpose. I'll be glad to give the committee the list of the towns for which provision is being made in this amount, and some of these are unfinished projects or projects against which money is still required even though they are in place at the moment because Altona heads the list, but that's just a small annual payment that we have in respect to that, but the towns are as follows: Altona, Hartney, Erickson, Cartwright, Holland, Deloraine, Hamiota, Reston, MacGregor, Russell, Kelwood, Ste. Rose du Lac, Rossburn, Gilbert Plains, Manitou, Pilot Mound and Souris. All of these places have requested an offer from the Water Supply Board and offers either have been made or will be made in the course of the fiscal year to these particular localities. It might very well be that some of them won't accept the offer, and if they don't other towns may take their place in the list, but those are the ones that we have in mind at the present moment.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I notice that Winkler wasn't mentioned and they voted on an Offer for Sale and the vote went through it quite heavily, and I wonder, is this project not going to be taken on this year since it's not included in the list?

Secondly, I would like to mention the Town of Plum Coulee here, because originally when Winkler voted on a proposal some years earlier -- I think a year ago or so -- the proposal also included the Town or Village of Plum Coulee and it was rejected at that time. Now they had another proposal which concerned the Town of Winkler only and it was accepted, but the Town of Plum Coulee now is left out and they fear that they will be shelved indefinitely and they would like to have some assurance that they will be able to get an offer for sale in the near future, because they were one of the originals that applied quite early. They were declared an area on November 9, 1959, and they applied for an offer of sale on February 9, 1960, so that they were one of the very first -- in fact they were the fourth on the list -- and they would like to have some assurance that they would not be shelved too far back.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, my friend brings up a good point and I thank him for it. This list was prepared before the vote in the Town of Winkler, because we had one refusal there,

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) as my honourable friend would know, but we are prepared to proceed with Winkler and that can be added to the list. As I say, it's a flexible list because some of these towns turn us down -- we never know who it's going to be -- but you can usually -- if someone misses, someone else fills in. With respect to Plum Coulee, I think that will have to be looked at on its own as a separate proposition, and as far as I'm aware, we have no current proposition from the people of Plum Coulee in respect to their water supply problem. As the honourable member said, they rejected it on one occasion and if they want to have it looked at again they're perfectly at liberty to come back and reopen discussions with the department. But we will be including Winkler in the program.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, this program now has been in operation for some three or four years, and as it's based on, I think, 35-year terms in annual repayment, there must be capital repayments and in fact some interest repayments as well coming back into the fund. How are these handled when they re-enter? How do they show up in the estimates and how do we know the amounts?

MR. ROBLIN: The fund itself is operated as a separate entity just like the Telephone, and all the money that the Legislature appropriates is given to them and they spend it and they have their income and expenditure accounts just as the Telephone do, for example, for the telephone bills. And they are continually receiving monies in from the utilities that they are financing, and that money revolves insofar as it is capable of doing so. But you have to bear this point in mind, that the term is 35 years, and there is a consideration there that has to be looked at, and that is the consumption of water, and when you work out a table to show what the rate will be, you estimate what the consumption of water will be over a 35-year period, and it starts out at one figure and ends up with a figure much higher. But then you average that cost, and in the early years of any particular utility it's never making its expenses. It's always operating in the red. You have to wait, say, to perhaps the 21st or the 22nd year before it gets into the black and starts paying back the money that it has spent but not earned during the initial period of the operation of the utility. That is tied in to the very important estimate as to the consumption of water over that long period of time. The result of that is that any particular utility, say the Altona one, will operate at a loss for many years, and that loss has to be financed by the Water Supply Board through the money that we put into it. At a certain period in that 35-year period -- and it's calculated out by the experts -- it breaks even and starts to pay the Water Board back the losses that it has earned in the past, so that at the end of the 35 years, it's "even-Steven". At the present time it's in the loss position and will be for some time. Now this is what you might call a normal situation in utility operations of this kind.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, what relationship is there made between the decision of the Water Supply Board to advance money to towns who make requests and investigations conducted by the Department of Industry and Commerce insofar as the future of some of our rural towns? As we know, with branch line abandonment, with the economic changes that are occurring, with farms getting larger, some of our rural towns are in fact in danger of shrinking and being absorbed by some of the more populated centres. This has happened already in certain parts of the province. What relationship is there between the department to ensure that there's no encouragement, or at least no money advanced for an area that may turn out to be no longer economic, say, in ten years' time?

MR. ROBLIN: That, of course, is a very important point and is one of the prime considerations that has to be looked at when these various plans or offers are made to localities. The Water Supply Board make a very careful study of population trends. That's what it boils down to. How many people are there going to be there and the amount of water is keyed into people as the basic factor. Industrial consumption of water is something that it's very hard to be certain about, but you can make reasonably accurate estimates of the number of people, so you get your minimum situation, and it is on that minimum situation forecasted into the future that the Water Supply Board rates are set. If they run into a situation where there seems to be a very strong possibility the best estimates that can be made indicate that the population is a sadly declining one, then of course you get a very -- you get to the point where the Water Board doesn't make an offer to a community. As far as I'm aware, however -- I'd like to be able to modify this later on, because there are many things that go on in a department that one hasn't at one's fingertips -- but as far as I'm aware, the communities that are interested in water are

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) really the growing ones or the ones that have a reasonable prospect of stability, if not growth. And I think I can say that that has been the case with all the communities that have applied for water under this plan. But it is an important factor, and the rate of growth of the population and the rate of consumption of water per capita during the period, are the two essential facts you have to try and establish when you start on a proposition of this sort, and are basic to the offers that are made to the communities. But as I have said, the ones that we have in hand now are all what we think are growth communities.

MR. MOLGAT: Have there been any refusals to date to any towns?

MR. ROBLIN: None that I'm aware of, Mr. Chairman. Some towns have turned it down, but I don't think we've turned any town down yet. Wait a minute now -- is that right? -- (Interjection) -- That's about it. Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: passed. Schedule (b) (1). I think there's a shortage of these sheets, and whether I should just mention it and you would make the explanation

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I'll call them out, Mr. Chairman. Under Schedule (b), the first item is Provincial Buildings -- land, construction, alterations, renovations, furnishings and ground improvements, \$4,339,000.00. This is just what it says, and includes the following provincial buildings and grounds: The Institute of Technology being built requires a further appropriation of \$700,000 to complete the construction of that. There's an item in here of \$1,000,000 for two new trade schools, one to be constructed at The Pas, and one to be constructed in Brandon. The one in The Pas will be scheduled first, and one of the things that we hope to do is to orient that school toward the problems of the Indian and Metis population in northern Manitoba who will have what really are substandard educational backgrounds and will require probably some special type of school to try and fit them into trade training. We want to orient it toward that particular question. So the one in The Pas comes first, and then the one in Brandon follows.

There's an addition to the Selkirk Mental Institute of a new laundry, \$525,000; alterations to the Manitoba School for the Mentally Defective at Portage la Prairie, \$334,000 -- that is the new cottage type institute that the Minister spoke of when his estimates were up -- and renovations and alterations to the MTI building on Portage Avenue, the old Ford Plant, half a million dollars -- this will be occupied by other government departments when the trade training people move out and substantial done to provide In addition the government is purchasing from the Manitoba Hydro Board the former Power Commission Building on Portage Avenue near the Mounted Police Barracks. The exact price of that has not been set because we're getting valuations from competent valuers and there's a negotiation going on, but the amount we have estimated for that purpose is \$1,300,000.00. That covers the total of \$4,300,000 that we asked for.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that the \$700,000 will complete the Institute of Technology. Now, the deadline that was established originally on these for the 75-25 federal grants was the 31st of March, 1963. For the balance that was not completed, has the government an undertaking from the Federal Government that they will extend the 75 percent?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes we have, Mr. Chairman. The 75 percent is being extended for a further period, but we want -- I must say to the committee that we want it extended further and we are asking the new authorities in Ottawa if they'll consider a further extension of this. As a matter of policy, we think it would be justifiable, but with respect to this particular project it has been extended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: passed.

MR. MOLGAT: So far as the two trade schools, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister give us the breakdown in cost of the two? I think he said a million for the two. Could he give me how much for each? And what are the planned starting dates of construction and planned completion date?

MR. ROBLIN: We expect them to be roughly equal in cost, but I should tell the committee that the architects have just been given the authority to start on the design of the one at The Pas. The authority to start on the design of the Brandon school will follow in due course, so we can't be sure that our figures are accurate. This is the money that we think will be ample for the purpose, but we'll have to wait and see when the bids are in and all that kind of thing.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) I can't give the committee any great breakdown on that because we simply haven't got it yet. We're going to have to wait and see what the architects and the contractors come up with.

MR. MOLGAT: The proposed dates of construction and completion?

MR. ROBLIN: The same answer -- The Pas as soon as possible, Brandon to follow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: passed.

MR. MOLGAT: I take it then, on the Institute of Technology, the \$700,000, we have a firm commitment there for the Federal Government to continue their 75 percent share. Now the trade school in The Pas was first mentioned by the Premier, as I recall it, during our trip north last year. Speaking in The Pas then, he promised that they would build a technical school there. Subsequently, during the course of the provincial election, in a moment of exuberance in Brandon, he promised the same situation in Brandon. At that time he had no guarantees, I take it, that the Federal Government would contribute beyond the 31st of March, or did he have a commitment from them to go on at 75 percent?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the regular federal policy is 50-50 and that pertains for these schools at the present time. The 75-25 policy was brought in as a special program some little while ago with a termination date on it of, I think, September 30th of this year or thereabouts. We think the 75-25 policy should continue indefinitely and we're taking that stand. But our position is simply this, that while it is true that the announcements were made at the time my honourable friend says, our intention to build these schools was formed some time ago, because it was obvious that one school -- and as a matter of fact I think it was stated in the House, that there would be more than one school but we did not give the location -- over a year ago at least with respect to this matter. But the fact is that we can't do all these things at once. We simply have to schedule them and do them as our resources permit, and our problem is not only in this field but in so many others dealing with federal programs, to try and get the two of them to mesh, so that what is possible for us is on their agenda, and any members of the House that have had any experience -- one or two here who have -- of trying to mesh provincial programs with federal policies that are announced from time to time usually without much consultation with the provinces, understand that this is a continuing problem. It's one that we certainly have raised before with Ottawa and we certainly intend to raise it again at a suitable opportunity. The standing policy then is a 50-50 operation which persists today. We are hoping to get it modified permanently to a 75-25 percent basis in view of the importance of this kind of operation.

MR. MOLGAT: Then it's correct to say, though, that when the statements were made by the First Minister he did not have a commitment for 75 percent on these two.

MR. ROBLIN: I've never had it, as far as I know.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, at the time that we're discussing the same item, I had encouraged the Minister of Education then to consider a school in Brandon, and he at that time was not prepared to give me an undertaking that this would be done. I notice the First Minister now says that it had been planned for some time previously; well certainly when I asked the Minister a year ago he did not give me a reply and I had specifically at that time mentioned Brandon.

I would like to check, Mr. Chairman, on the last item, 1,300,000. I'm sorry, I did not get what it was for. And also if the Minister could give me what is the unused appropriation under this item.

MR. ROBLIN: There is no unused appropriation here, Mr. Chairman. The 1,300,000 is for the purchase of the former Manitoba Power Commission building on Portage Avenue next to the RCMP barracks. The price is being negotiated; we think this is about it.

MR. MOLGAT: We are in effect buying from ourselves. We are buying it from the utility. It's a transfer of funds from the government proper to the utility.

MR. ROBLIN: You try and tell that to them. This inefficient and unco-ordinated body that we have over there insists on getting paid for its assets, and I would have liked to have had it for nothing, but I couldn't make the grade.

The next item, Mr. Chairman, is 2. Acquisition of Land, Land Settlement Projects, Natural Resource Projects and Recreational Development. There are two main items here: Community Pastures, about \$80,000 -- a little less. The Minister dealt with those, I think,

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) pretty fully in his statement to the House on Current Estimates, and we have in here Appropriation for Recreational Development Land; this for \$25,000.00. This is more or less to have some money in hand to make it possible to buy up recreational lands when they become available. They are always coming available and we like to obtain them and put them into the public domain if we can, and this is the money we would like for that purpose this year.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under this item last year I asked the Minister about the Lord Selkirk Park in connection with the 150th anniversary of the arrival of the Selkirk Settlers. At that time he asked me not to pursue the matter any further as there were some negotiations going on with private interests. I wonder if the Minister is now in a position to report on this project.

MR. ROBLIN: I think my friend is talking about the Lower Fort, is he not? Yes. Well, as he knows, the Federal Government has now recaptured the Lower Fort for public purposes and it is being extensively improved for that reason. We have been successful, last year, in obtaining possession of the property -- most of it on the south, a little on the north -- that was owned by the Manitoba Motor Club, and was operated as a golf course as part of their total facility there. When their lease was terminated on the Fort itself they had this property available and we were successful in getting them to sell it to us. I know I'm going to be asked how much and I am trying to think of what it is. I think it's about \$90,000 -- something in that neighborhood -- and money was provided last year. But we now have that land -- what is it? 25 acres? I am sorry I haven't got that information, but members will know the piece of property I'm thinking about. And it is our intention to make that available as an adjunct to the Lower Fort facilities there, and this year I think that we will be able to make it available for general park purposes, picnics, what not, access to the river bank and all that kind of thing, on the old golf course portion. The portion on the north end will probably be used for parking for people who are coming to the Fort. But the plan is to start the development of the southern portion, which is the largest, as a public park for the use of the people in the province, in conjunction with the Lower Fort, and I think that's the point that my honourable friend raised last year.

MR. MOLGAT: It is not the intention then to operate it as a golf course? I wonder if the Minister could obtain for us -- and I appreciate he may not have it now -- the exact amount of money paid for the property.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes. I don't know whether my usual advisors are around but if they are they might look that up and maybe we'll get the information tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Item No. 3 then, Mr. Chairman, is the Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement. There is a sum of \$414,500 there, and this is the net amount that will be used in a number of land acquisition and drainage and floodway projects that will be embarked upon this year as part of the ARDA program. And I will give the committee the list of the projects that are involved here. I rather think that the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation did it when his estimates were up but I have it and I'll give it again.

The projects are: The Norquay Floodway, Hespeler Floodway, Grassmere Drain Reconstruction, the Oak Lake project, the Bottle Creek improvement project, and Land Acquisition. One will recognize that land acquisition is an important part of ARDA, in taking submarginal lands out of their present use and devoting them to a higher use. And these include forest land acquisition in southeast Manitoba; west lands acquisition in the Birch River area; marginal and sub-marginal lands generally -- there's a lump sum put in for that; we just don't know where they will occur. It develops during the year -- and for wildlife and pasture lands as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3 -- passed. 4 . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Agricultural Research. This is an amount of money we are asking for to complete or -- maybe not finally complete, but anyway to continue development of the new farm that the university has purchased south of St. Norbert. As members will probably know, the academic side of the university has been encroaching upon the Faculty of Agriculture at a great rate these last few years. I think that's a happy thing, in a sense, but it's meant that the agricultural people have had a hard time finding sufficient land to continue their livestock

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . and crop experimental program. So we arranged to secure a thousand acres, I believe it is -- if my memory is correct it's at least a thousand acres -- farmland, south of St. Norbert where they are putting up their operational buildings and have this land available to take the place of the land they've lost. There's a little crosslands there -- I'm trying to remember the name -- is it Glenlea? At Glenlea, that's where it is. And this new experimental farm has been turned over to the Faculty of Agriculture at the university and this sum of money of 462,000 is required for the purchase of the land and also for the erection of the operating structures that they will require to use this property.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, it was with interest that I listened to the First Minister mention about the land that they want to acquire for research; and this afternoon while I was waiting to see him, I read a magazine in his office about the research that can be done on hog production, and how much the farmer could realize per acre. It said something about -- well I don't remember the exact figure, but I think that this is a very good suggestion and the Minister should even spend more money on this part.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think the government purchased some of the choicest land in Manitoba. I know the land there and I think they made a very good choice in purchasing the type they did.

MR. MOLGAT: I note, Mr. Chairman, and I made the same observation last year, I believe, that my honourable friend the First Minister who used to speak a great deal to us about agricultural research -- and rightly so; I agree that it's an important aspect -- has been reducing his investment rather drastically. In 1960 he was prepared to put up 1.7 million; in 1961 he was only prepared to put up a million; in 1962 he dropped that down to 600,000; and in 1963 he's down to 462,000. At that rate I assume that the figure will disappear totally next year, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could tell us the price paid for the land in the St. Norbert area. I think his purchase is now complete. I appreciate that while it's going on it's not information that he would want to divulge but I think it's now complete. And also, whether it's intended to have a fair amount of buildings put out there or strictly operational matters for the livestock or who may be there.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend is perfectly right about the amounts that he has quoted and I am looking forward with some hope that maybe it will be nothing next year. My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, tells me that unfortunately that won't be the case; he will be requiring more. But I think there's a perfectly reasonable explanation. When we came in we developed with the university authorities a \$5 million program for investment in facilities -- plants, equipment, machinery -- all the apparatus and everything that was required, to give this province a thoroughly first class agricultural research base, and we have invested to date almost our \$5 million. I think it's about 4 1/2 or 4 3/4 million have been investment in buildings, in lands, in apparatus and equipment and other capital requirements for the faculty of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba. I regard that as an enormous sum and I regard it as a very big contribution toward the development of the kind of agricultural research base that we have been looking for here in the Province of Manitoba. I hope that next year will complete that program of \$5 million and that once the investment is made it is obvious that it is not required to be repeated every year. There may be new changes and new developments undoubtedly will take place, but the basic plant will be in place and in operation. I am always mindful of the fact, though, that a plant of that sort is only as good as the men that are using it, and I am so happy to feel that in our agricultural faculty at the University of Manitoba we have a very fine staff indeed. They require no praise from me because their reputation, I think, now is nationwide, and a very splendid job of work is being done there and I am glad to have an opportunity to pay my respects to them. But my honourable friend is right. We hope soon to have completed that massive investment and will not be calling upon the people of the province to approve those large sums indefinitely.

Now as for the details about Glenlea, I'm sorry I haven't that information. I will get the price of the land for him, and if the Minister of Agriculture were here he could give the program for the buildings but I am afraid it is not in my possession at the moment.

CHAIRMAN: Item 5.

MR. ROBLIN: Item 5, Mr. Chairman, we have Urban Renewal. There is a carry-forward here of 1.1 million, and an additional requirement of \$700,000 is required.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) Members will recall that last year we passed the Urban Renewal Act which enabled us to co-operate with the City of Winnipeg and the federal government in subsidized urban rehabilitation and housing in Winnipeg. And we had a special deal on that subject and this \$700,000 is what is required to continue to pay our share of that -- or our estimated share of that -- for this current year.

MR. MOLGAT: Well there was nothing paid at all -- out last year, I take it then, because the total amount last year was 1.1 million and if it's the unused then we have not so far invested any money.

MR. ROBLIN:any money. The project is now just getting to the point where they're calling for cash.

MR. CHAIRMAN:passed. No. 2 of Schedule B, Highways.

MR. ROBLIN: This is the capital appropriation for highways. We always have a brisk discussion as a rule about carry forward in highways. I'll give the information on that. The carry forward of authority as of March 31st, 1963, is \$24 1/2 million, together with our appropriation of \$15 million gives us an authority of around \$39 million available for the coming year, and that will just about maintain -- it will give us an advance appropriation on '64-65 of some \$17 million as opposed to the \$24 million we had in the previous year. I don't know whether the members got all those figures down but it's the same kind of thing that we've been talking about for a number of Sessions.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm not going to repeat the argument that we've had every year on it, Mr. Chairman. I still think that the amount that we carry forward every year is not needed. The proof is there that the government doesn't use it. Every year it reappears. The purpose that the government tells us is to permit long-range planning. I wonder if the Minister could tell us at this stage how much he has let in contracts last fall and during the course of the winter in preparation and in order to use up this

MR. ROBLIN: I can, Mr. Chairman. I would say that if you add the program carry forward -- and there's always some of that each year, apart from the cash carry forward -- and the contracts that were let during the fall and winter, I think the total will come to something like \$11 million. I believe that's about it -- I think it's \$7 million or so on the contracts that were let during the winter-summer period and about \$4 million of uncompleted last year's work that is part of this carry forward as well. I have the information here on the Motor Country Club -- 45 acres at \$97,500 -- 45 acres -- \$97,500.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 2, Highways, passed. Schedule C (1).

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, there are two items here -- one is the University of Manitoba, \$3,441,160. This is our usual appropriation for the University and it provides money for the following kinds of things: -- alterations of the old Science building, the Arts college, the addition to the library, the new Medical building, the Fine Arts building, the Athletic facilities, the Residence, and the miscellaneous. Some of these particular projects have been mentioned before because they usually take more than one year to build, and we appropriate what we need on an annual basis, so in some instances it may be the final payment or the first payment for the building, but they are the ones that are covered by this appropriation.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman \$10 million item. Is this just a guess or is it based on a definite program? On definite program?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, definite.

MR. GRAY: Thank you.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on this item I wonder if we could have the distinction between grants and loans. Is this all grants or is part of that loans?

MR. ROBLIN: The term is very broad but this money is a grant to the University of Manitoba. We don't expect them to pay it back.

The second item is hospitals for the homes of the aged. This is the usual item we have here and it provides the money that we think we'll need for this kind of construction during the coming year. There's a very small carry-over of about \$30,000.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, in last year's Estimates and again in I think -- well the year before as well -- there were some of the affiliated colleges. I think Brandon has appeared every year pretty well, and then the others, St. Boniface, St. John's United, and St.

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) Paul's. Is there no construction program at all in the books for any of the affiliated colleges?

MR. ROBLIN: Not this year, Mr. Chairman. As members will realize, they build their building and then that's that for awhile until they build a new one. Well it so happens that in this particular year we've had no requests or advance intimations from any of the affiliated colleges, or Brandon, that they are planning any building program this year to which they will expect us to contribute, but we may certainly expect to see this in subsequent years.

MR. MOLGAT: The policy is still there and available -- 25 percent of construction costs for those who are affiliated and want these?

MR. ROBLIN: Right.

MR. PETERS: Under Item 2, Mr. Chairman, does this include such items as the Canadian Legion Building?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item C passed.

MR. MOLGAT: this cover the Lion's Club residence, on the location of the old Welfare building, I think it was? When is this likely to go ahead? I have seen the signs there for some time now and

MR. ROBLIN: any time; we're waiting for them. The next item, Mr. Chairman, is the capital sum for the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation of \$4 1/2 million. That is in addition to the \$18 million that has already been appropriated for this purpose. One can see that there are very large sums at stake. I think the Minister has given a pretty complete explanation of the present financial status of the Agricultural Credit Corporation which I'm glad to say is pretty good.

Members will notice that there is no appropriation here for the Manitoba Development Fund, and they may say why. The reason is because during the next year the Development Fund is going to try a new method of financing on a short term basis to be sure, by means of bank credit. They feel that they would like to try this for a period of time and see how it fits in with their regular program, bearing in mind that at some stage they'll have to come back to the Legislature to refund these bank loans on a long term basis no doubt, and will be asking for money at that time; but they have decided that they can get along with what they have in mind this year, which is about \$3 million, by using bank credit and they're going to see how that works out and use that resource. I fully expect that they'll be back one of these days when they come to the stage where they wish to refund this to get a credit from us.

MR. MOLGAT: Insofar as the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, last year the schedule called for 6.8 million. We have a fallback for four million. This year we're dropping it to 4.5 million and yet the government is introducing a bill expanding the loaning facilities of the Credit Corporation because the bill which was introduced by resolution this afternoon will now permit loaning on the value of livestock and chattels. This would logically lead one to believe that there will be an increase in demand on the Fund and yet the government is appropriating less to the Fund than it did in the past year. This doesn't seem to tie in with their ideas of expanding the program.

MR. ROBLIN: There is an explanation which is not obvious at first glance here, because last year the sum that was appropriated represented two amounts -- first, the amount that the Agricultural Credit intended to lend the new borrowers, which I think, going from memory, was \$4 million of that total. The balance of the sum was money that had previously been appropriated from the Post-War Reserve Fund. Members will remember that when the Agricultural Credit Fund was brought in, authority was given to use the Post-War Reserve Fund instead of coming to the Legislature for specific amounts of money as we do now. We did that in the first year. I think some two or three million dollars were borrowed from the Post-War Reserve Fund for that purpose at that time. It was then decided that the Agricultural Credit Fund should pay that back so that that money could be made liquid again and available for any other purpose that might be required, so last year we asked for the extra authority so that we could pay back the Post-War Reserve Fund. That didn't mean that money was being lent to borrowers for that amount. It had already been lent; we were simply transferring it from one set of books to the other. So that is the reason why the sum was larger last year and I can quite understand the apparent inconsistency in the amounts, but I assure my honourable friend

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) it's not

MR. FROESE: I just want to make one more check. On the Development Fund the first year we appropriated \$1 1/2 million, the second year \$7.8 million and I'm just wondering did I hear the Minister correctly when he said that there was \$3 million left?

MR. ROBLIN: No, what I said was that the Fund think they may wish to spend -- they may wish to invest \$3 million this year. If they do, it will be by bank credit rather borrowing it the way we've done in the past.

Just for the information of the committee I suggest that when we rise that we report the resolutions the second time and move concurrence.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, before we do, just one word. I realize that our children and grandchildren coming will have to assume certain responsibilities for the sins of the fathers who will have to leave to them very big responsibilities to meet the obligations that we are spending money now, but I feel that they should not have it too heavy, other-wise they will be disappointed in our actions, and if anything possibly can be done to leave them a lesser burden I think it should be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that the report of the committee be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

..... Continued on next page

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: 1. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$66,505 for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1964.

2. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$326,915 for Legislation.

3. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$44,300, Legislative Printing and Binding.

4. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$60,570 for Administration, Executive Council.

5. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,000, Executive Council, Federal-Provincial Conference.

6. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$90,000 for Executive Council, Grants and Miscellaneous.

7. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$172,905, Executive Council, Libraries and Historical Research.

8. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$25,000 for Executive Council, Expenses in Connection with The Royal Commission on Local Government Organization and Finance and the Preparation of Material for the Royal Commission on Taxation.

9. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$293,725, Treasury, Administration.

10. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$99,445, Treasury, Taxation Branch.

11. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$39,070 for Treasury, Insurance Branch.

12. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$12,000 for Treasury, Fidelity, Burglary, etcetera.

13. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$126,000, Miscellaneous for Treasury.

14. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,730,000 for Treasury, Grants under the

MR. L. A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that while concurring in Resolution No. 14, this House regrets that Unconditional Grants to Municipalities have not been increased in proportion to the increase in municipal taxes.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Jeannotte, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 15; Nays, 29.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 15. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$78,455 for Administration, Provincial Secretary.

16. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,200, Queen's Printer, Provincial Secretary.

17. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$32,720, Manitoba Gazette, Provincial Secretary.

(Mr. Clerk, cont'd)

18. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$215,685, Civil Service Commission, Provincial Secretary.

19. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$264,000, Civil Service Superannuation, Provincial Secretary.

20. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$53,000, Civil Service Group Life Insurance, Provincial Secretary.

21. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$69,070, Purchasing Bureau, Provincial Secretary.

22. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$110,000, Workmen's Compensation Board, Provincial Secretary.

23. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$30,035, Information Services, Provincial Secretary.

24. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$53,200, Civil Defence, the Provincial Secretary.

25. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$20,000, Housing Administration and Rent Subsidies, Provincial Secretary.

26. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$452,420, Education, Administration.

27. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding . . .

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that while concurring in Resolution No. 27, this House regrets that the government has failed to assume its promised share of the cost of education and has left too large a portion to be borne by the municipal taxpayer.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Peters, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 14; Nays, 30.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that while concurring in Resolution No. 27, this House regrets that the government has failed to take steps to ease the load of the real property taxpayer by not paying for all education costs out of Consolidated Funds.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the question is put, I just want to state that I will not be voting in favour of this Resolution. I agree with some of the ideas behind the Resolution, that is reducing the load on the municipal taxpayer. I think the resolution that my colleague the Member for Emerson just moved indicates our feelings in this regard. I cannot say, however, that I would agree with having all of the costs of education coming out of the Consolidated Fund, because the results of that action would mean that the provincial government would become the sole controller of education in the province, a philosophy to which I do not subscribe. Therefore, I cannot support this Resolution in this way. I agree that we have to lighten the load on the municipal taxpayer. I agree that we should take all the steps that we can in this senior jurisdiction to do so. I don't think that the proper step is to remove all the education costs. I think it is by leaving some of the costs with them, taking a larger share, that we will have the best education system in the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PETERS: Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Gray, Harris, Peters, and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harrison, Hryhorczuk, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Roblin, Seaborn, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 5; Nays, 39.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, you may have noticed I was talking to the Whip of the Liberal Party. I was not trying to convince him to vote our way; I was just having a conversation with him.

MR. CLERK: 27. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$35,132,575, Education Grants, Education.

28. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$566,510, Teacher Training, Education.

29. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,534,864, Education, Student Instruction.

30. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$101,875, Administration, Agriculture and Conservation.

31. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,416,306, Agriculture, Agriculture and Conservation.

32. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$102,885, Agriculture and Conservation, Publications, Statistics, etcetera.

33. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$557,280, Agricultural Development for Agriculture and Conservation.

34. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$182,300, Agricultural and Horticultural Societies, Agriculture and Conservation.

35. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$70,645, Co-operative Services, Agriculture and Conservation.

36. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$562,534, Economic Research, Agriculture and Conservation.

37. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,000, Assistance Re Seed, Agriculture and Conservation.

38. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$129,200, for Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation, Agriculture and Conservation.

39. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$470,125, Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, Agriculture and Conservation.

40. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$67,500, Predator Control and Grasshopper Control, Agriculture and Conservation.

41. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,617,750, Water Control and Conservation, Agriculture and Conservation.

42. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$301,500, Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement - Chargeable to Capital Division, Agriculture and Conservation.

43. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,000,000, Red River Valley, Assiniboine River, Seine River, etcetera, Agriculture and Conservation.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, it's not my intention to move motion at this stage, but I do wish to take the opportunity while this vote is before us for concurrence to place on the official record of the House the fact, which I know the government is already aware, that both the Council of the City of Portage la Prairie and the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie have passed resolutions asking that the question of the so-called Portage la Prairie Diversion be given further study. These are identical resolutions, as I have read them from the two Councils, and I shall not take the time of the Committee of the House to read the whole Resolution, but I have certified copies of both resolutions here. I note that one at least, and I would think both, have been sent to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation, and I wish merely to read the operative part and to ask once again that the government

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) give consideration to the suggestion that is made herein.

In both cases the operative part is as follows: "Now therefore be it resolved that the Council of the" -- in this case -- "the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie respectfully requests the Province of Manitoba, namely the Water Control and Conservation Branch of the Department of Agriculture, to appoint an Economic Advisory Committee to further study the whole diversion matter at or near Portage la Prairie, with special emphasis given first to the cost of the Holland Dam. Copies of this resolution be forwarded to all respective levels of government and a copy be forwarded Mr. D.L. Campbell, M.L.A., Mr. Gordon Johnston, M.L.A., Mr. S.J. Enns, M.P." This happens to be the Rural Portage la Prairie resolution. There's an identical one from the City of Portage la Prairie, and I would ask in placing them on record that the government give consideration to the request contained herein.

MR. CLERK: 44. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$253,690, Administration, Attorney-General.

45. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$500,175, Land Titles, Attorney-General.

46. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$380,490, Law Courts, Attorney-General.

47. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$38,340, Legislative Counsel, Attorney-General.

48. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,688,632, Administration of Justice, Attorney-General.

49. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,885, Miscellaneous, Attorney-General.

50. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$347,602, Juvenile and Family Courts, Probation and Parole, Attorney-General.

51. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$736,270, Detention Homes, Attorney-General.

52. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$97,935, Administration of Estates of the Mentally Incompetent, Attorney-General.

53. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,000, Provincial Buildings and other Projects, etcetera, Attorney-General.

54. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$699,326, Executive Division, Health.

55. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$20,655,413, Health Division, Health Department.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that while concurring in Resolution No. 55, this House regrets that the government has failed to take the steps to promote and initiate a universal and comprehensive Health Scheme in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Once again I find myself in a position where I cannot agree with the wording of the Resolution as such. While I agree with the need for a Health Plan for the Province of Manitoba, I cannot agree to one that would be similar to the one that was passed in Saskatchewan, which I think has not been the desirable type of plan. It seems to me that the Federal Government has a commitment in this field which I'm sure it will live up to, and that the plans of the province can be fitted in to those of an over-all national scheme better than to set up a plan like Saskatchewan did.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, we will await with interest the federal plan.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PETERS: Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Gray, Harris, Peters and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Guttormson, Harrison, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat,

(Nays, cont'd) Roblin, Seaborn, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 5; Nays, 38.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 56. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$103,600, Provincial Buildings and Other Projects, etcetera, Health.

57. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$188,795, Administration, Mines and Natural Resources.

58. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,313,785, Forestry Branch, Administration, Mines and Natural Resources.

59. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$271,675, Mines and Natural Resources, Games Branch, Administration.

60. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$315,185, Mines and Natural Resources, Fisheries Branch, Administration.

61. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,161,540, Field Operations, Mines and Natural Resources.

62. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$250,615, Surveys Branch, Mines and Natural Resources.

63. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$555,955, Mines Branch, Mines and Natural Resources.

64. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$261,090, Air Service, Mines and Natural Resources.

65. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$213,465, Lands Branch, Mines and Natural Resources.

66. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$330,500, Acquisition of Land, Land Settlement Projects, Natural Resources Projects and Recreational Projects, etcetera, Mines and Natural Resources.

67. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$55,800, Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement - Chargeable to Capital Division, Mines and Natural Resources.

68. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$55,720, Administration, Public Utilities.

69. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$97,685, Public Utilities Board, Public Utilities.

70. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$23,210, Censor Board of Manitoba, Public Utilities.

71. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$989,291, Motor Vehicle Branch, Public Utilities.

72. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$823,530, Administration, Public Works.

73. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,378,020, Operation and Maintenance of Government Buildings, Public Works.

74. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,964,720, Highways-Planning, Design and Administration, Public Works.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that while concurring in the Resolution 74, this House regrets that the government has failed to produce a satisfactory long-term policy for the equitable construction of highways.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Peters, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean,

(Nays, cont'd) Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 16; Nays, 29.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: No. 75. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,321,500, Public Works, Highway Maintenance, Aids to Municipalities, etcetera.

76. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$193,500, Provincial Buildings and Other Projects, etcetera, Public Works.

77. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$108,160, Municipal Affairs, Administration.

78. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$104,015, Municipal Board, Municipal Affairs.

79. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$22,500, Local Government Districts, Municipal Affairs.

80. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$195,929, Municipal Assessments, Municipal Affairs.

81. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$125,450, Administration, Labour.

82. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$166,870, Mechanical and Engineering Division, Labour Department.

83. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$154,400, Employment Standards Division, Labour.

84. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$52,995, Apprenticeship and Industrial Training Division, Labour.

85. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$231,805, Labour Relations Division, Labour.

86. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$208,815, Administration, Industry and Commerce.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that while concurring in Resolution No. 86, this House regrets that the government has made use of public funds for the distribution of Conservative Party propaganda.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. M.N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, for the enlightenment of the House, this is a verbatim copy of a similar resolution passed by the First Minister when he was the Leader of the Opposition on this side of the House.

MR. ROBLIN: I think I had better continue debate, Madam Speaker, that on that occasion I had some grounds for moving it.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Harris, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Peters, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 10; Nays, 35.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 87. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$89,460, Business Development Branch, Industry and Commerce.

88. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$90,225, Trade Development and Marketing Branch, Industry and Commerce.

89. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$67,835, Engineering and Technical Services Branch, Industry and Commerce.

(Mr. Clerk, cont'd)

90. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$183,280, Industry and Commerce, Economic and Business Research Branch.

91. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$186,875, Regional Development and Community Services Branch, Industry and Commerce.

92. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$377,640, Tourist Development Branch, Industry and Commerce.

93. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$27,795, Agent General, Industry and Commerce.

94. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$14,540, Manitoba Research Council, Industry and Commerce.

95. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$273,125, Manitoba Development Fund, Industry and Commerce.

96. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$293,599, Executive Division, Welfare.

97. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$14,250,281, Welfare Division, Welfare.

98. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,900,430, Welfare, for the Old Age Pension Assistance, etcetera.

99. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$100,000, Fitness and Amateur Sport, Welfare.

100. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$750,000, Salary Increases.

Capital Supply. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding for Capital Expenditures, \$7,370,000.00.

Capital Supply. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum for Capital Expenditures, \$21,039,660.00.

Capital Supply. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty for Capital Expenditure, \$4,202,160.00.

Capital Supply. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty for Capital Expenditure, \$4,500,000, Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, we seemed to have timed this conclusion very appropriately. It's almost 11 o'clock, and I imagine that members will not be anxious to proceed with the rest of the Order Paper tonight. I'm now in a position to bring down the budget which I would like to do tomorrow afternoon if I may. Tomorrow afternoon is Private Members Day, but in view of the state of our Order Paper there'll be plenty of time on Friday I'm sure to cover all items on the Order Paper, and if it is agreeable, I think it would be convenient to give the budget during the course of tomorrow afternoon, probably after the Orders of the Day or something like that. If there's no objection to that, I would propose to do that and then we can get on with the rest of the Order Paper following the budget statement.

Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Friday afternoon.