

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, December 12, 1966

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might address the house on a point of order before proceeding with this item. At our last meeting the House rose before the Votes and Proceedings were actually distributed, and I think we find ourselves in a technical difficulty that items appearing on the Orders of the Day today were not perhaps quite correctly given notice. I wonder if it would suit the House if we proceeded by leave in the cases of each of the first four items on the orders today.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): We have no objection, Mr. Speaker. It appears to us that the matters are fairly routine and I presume the Minister will explain them. We have no objection to proceeding.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): We have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 3, an Act to amend The Insurance Act.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: The general purpose of the Bill is to --(Interjection)-- it's first reading, but I thought my honourable friend asked for some explanation.

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

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 17, an Act to amend The Crown Lands Act.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Resolutions standing on the Order Paper.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolutions recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee proceed.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if I could have the leave of the committee to leave the first item in committee today. This matter has been the subject of technical discussion in Toronto and finishing only last Friday. The people who are advising me arrived back in the city only this morning and I would be in a much better position to explain the various provisions if I could have another day.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may, the resolution deals with the question that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the registration and regulation of certain pension plans, and providing, among other matters, for the costs incurred.

Now it appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that this gives to the members of the Assembly an opportunity of dealing with all pension plans at the present time in the Province of Manitoba. It seems to me that it also brings into effect the pension plans which are invoked insofar as the Government of Manitoba is concerned, such pension plans as the pension plan at the present time payable to members of the civil service.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I would just like to explain that this particular motion is, of course, to discuss the financial implications of a certain type of pension that is under review here and that it would not in my opinion be appropriate to discuss all pension matters under that heading. I think what we should discuss are the financial implications of this particular measure which is related purely to private pensions - it has to do with portable pensions only - and that if we were to take advantage of this committee to discuss every aspect of pensions, this committee loses its prime purpose, the purpose of the committee being to inform the House of the financial aspects of the measures that his Honour has recommended, and that we can't really discuss the whole gamut of pension matters any more than we could on

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) second reading of this Bill depart from the principle of the Bill. But I would urge my honourable friend not to take advantage of this opportunity. Undoubtedly there will be others, certainly on the estimates if he wishes to have them, but I would urge him not to use this committee for that purpose because I think it is not really what the committee is intended for.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I bow to the knowledge of my honourable friend the First Minister. He may have, Mr. Chairman, full knowledge of what is going to happen. He may have --(Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend the leader of the government says let the Minister explain, but the Minister has already explained, and I say to my honourable friend the Premier no explanation has been given.

MR. EVANS: my request, and that is that it merely be allowed to stand until the next day, at which point I'll be pleased to offer an explanation from which we can start.

MR. PAULLEY: O. K., Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to allow my honourable friend to have this matter stand, but, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the government, I want to say to my honourable friend the Provincial-Treasurer, I want to say to the First Minister, that if they are going to be introducing "nilly pandy" resolutions of this nature, I'm concerned with the pension situation insofar as the civil servants of the Province of Manitoba are concerned.

We are here dealing with this resolution: providing, among other matters, the costs incurred in the administration of the act to be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund, insofar as pensions are concerned. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and I say to the government, that if they don't know the implications of pension funds and pension plans insofar as employees present and past of the civil service of Manitoba, if they don't know the implications of legislation of this nature, it is time they faced up to it. My plea, Mr. Chairman, is that when we are dealing with such an important matter as pension funds and pension plans within the Province of Manitoba, that if they won't face up to their responsibility as to the adequacy or inadequacy of pension plans at the present time in respect of their employees, then I intend to as a member of the opposition.

I defer to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer that the point that I am raising at the present time is valid. The resolution that we have before us states that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the registration and regulation of certain pension plans. I say, Mr. Chairman, that the pension plans which we have in respect of our civil servants here in the Province of Manitoba are inadequate, and unless -- Oh, the Honourable the Attorney-General there is shaking his head -- I didn't hear it rattling on this side of the House.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I was merely shaking my head at the honourable gentleman to indicate that he, in my opinion, was out of order in that he is purporting to discuss under this resolution, as the Honourable the First Minister attempted to point out to him unsuccessfully, something that is not in order at the present time. Possibly he didn't hear what my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer said, namely, that his request today was that the House give him the privilege of not explaining this until tomorrow.

Now I realize how my honourable friend is anxious to get on with this matter, but could he perhaps extend the courtesy to the Provincial Treasurer of not speaking on the matter until tomorrow, when, after it has been explained to him, possibly he will be in a position to give intelligent comment on it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to receive at any time any intelligent approach from the government opposite. In the absence however of any intelligent approach, then I feel that I am perfectly in order, and if my honourable friend the Attorney-General -- who I understand is going to be the next Premier of Manitoba if things go well -- chastises me for the position that I am taking, in his opinion, --(Interjection) -- pardon? No, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I think that it would be a good thing for Manitoba if it was to be me, then we could advance.

But anyway, Mr. Chairman, all I want to say to the government of the Province of Manitoba is that with a "nilly wamby" proposition such as they have produced for us today, I warn them that I am not going to be satisfied with this type of resolution; that the recipients of pensions in the Province of Manitoba are not being taken care of adequately; and if my honourable friend the Minister of the Treasury, tomorrow or some other day, is prepared to introduce measures which may alleviate the situation insofar as our civil servants in Manitoba, I'm prepared to listen to him. However, if the purpose of this resolution is simply to introduce different methodology insofar as pensions in Manitoba are concerned, I'm likewise prepared to listen to it at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The second resolution - Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Income Tax Act (Manitoba), 1962, by providing for the imposition of an income tax for the 1967 taxation year and subsequent taxation years.

MR. EVANS: I would like to offer a brief word of explanation of this resolution. The principle behind the resolution and any legislation to be based on it is simply and technical only. Ottawa collects for the Province of Manitoba the income taxes that are levied under The Manitoba Income Tax Act of 1962. The authority under the Act expires on December 31st of this year. If we had not had a session of this type, it would have been necessary to hold a special session as they did in Saskatchewan and other provinces. So the authority under the Act must be renewed before December 31st of this year.

The other provision in the Act has to do with the division of the tax revenue between the Federal Government and the Manitoba Government. This Act has no effect on the weight of taxation or the amount of taxation to be paid by any taxpayer. It doesn't affect that matter at all. It affects only the division of the tax revenue as between the Federal Government and the Manitoba Government. The Ottawa Government must have a definite assurance of the rates to be applied, that is to say the division that is to exist, before December 31st in order that they can start their machinery for collecting the tax under the tax agreement. The rates have been established in the Bill at 33% of personal Income Tax, which is the amount of abatement that is made available by the Federal Government of 28% plus the 5% levied directly by the Province of Manitoba and collected for us by the Federal Government. There is no change whatever with respect to the 5%, that is Manitoba's own tax.

So these two items of principle explain the necessity for the bill and the necessity for putting it through now and accomplishing all three readings and the proclamation of the Bill -- the establishment of the Bill before the end of the current year.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his explanation of this Bill. It's not the first time that this Bill of course has appeared before us. I think it is the same one that we have had in the past. I would like to ask of the Minister though, for how long is this Bill applicable, because it seems to me that if we are to be faced with recurring Bills of this type then we should make up our minds as to when we would pass them through this House, because had we not had this Session called at this time then we would have presumably been forced to call a special session for it which would seem to me to be an ineffective manner of proceeding. I wonder would it not be possible to have this done in advance, for example we could have passed this at our last session and proceeded at that time. I presume the answer for that is there has been some change in rates since then. There may be some very valid explanation, but I would think that we should be able to establish our arrangements with Ottawa on this particular Act so that we don't have to call special sessions for the House itself.

I wonder if the Minister could tell me now exactly what the arrangements are going to be insofar as the rates. He said 33%. In other words, on the income tax payment by Manitoba taxpayers on personal income tax, he will deduct 28% from his Federal Tax and add 33% to his Provincial Tax. Now is this the same procedure then as previously where year by year there will be an increment of one further point, that is next year 34 and 35, or is this now going to be established at the set rate.

Secondly, what about the corporations? Are these involved in this Bill at all, and if so, what is the situation there and are there any changes proposed in the corporation tax?

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, just one question. Through this Bill that is going to come forward, are succession duties affected in any way?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the difficulty in which we find ourselves this year will be removed. In the Bill is provided that authority be granted to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to enter into a tax collection agreement with the Federal Government, but no terminal date is given as it is given in the present tax act. Our present difficulty arises from the fact that the tax Act says our authority lapses the 31st of December this year. There is a provision in the Bill to extend that period for 1967 and subsequent years, so we won't be caught in this present difficulty.

I should have told my honourable friend that the provision with regard to collecting the corporation income tax is also contemplated in the Bill and the percentage in that case is 11%, but there's no change in the incidence of the taxation -- of the rate, or the weight of taxation on the person.

There is no present agreement or undertaking between the Federal Government and the Provincial for annual increases in the abatement as there was under a previous agreement.

(MR. EVANS cont'd). . . . There is no set increase year by year into the future already established or announced to us by Ottawa. These things are not really technically the subject of an agreement. It's really an announcement by the federal authorities as to the amount of tax they are willing to abate at a given time. Their present announcement in this connection are for the coming year only; we have no understanding as to the years beyond that.

In regard to the question by my honourable friend from Rhineland, there is no effect in the Bill of which I speak concerning succession duties.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the motion before us, then would I be correct in saying that all that we have to deal with at the present time is a resolution calling upon the Province of Manitoba to enter into an agreement with the Government of Canada as to the methodology of collection of tax agreements. At the present time then, if that is correct, Mr. Chairman, no debate as to whether or not Ottawa is acting in a proper manner insofar as Manitoba is concerned or whether or not my honourable friend the First Minister was able to persuade the authorities at Ottawa into the need for additional revenues to the Province of Manitoba is concerned, that all we are dealing with insofar as this particular resolution is concerned is methodology, not the fact that the Government of Canada has let Manitoba down. That comes later, is that correct?

So then, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, I am prepared on behalf of my group to allow this resolution to pass, regretfully, that this outfit to my right has let Manitoba down, but there will be time and occasion when we can debate this particular aspect as to the further growth of Manitoba is concerned. But, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, am I correct then in saying that all we're dealing with at the present time is the methodology of the entering into a tax collection agreement, not the adequacy or inadequacy, and I'm sure that Manitobans generally will agree with the inadequacy of the deal that we have received from Ottawa.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, I understood the Honourable Minister to say that the federal authorities require that the provincial rate of taxation both on individual income tax and corporate income tax have to be fixed before December 31st. Would that mean, Mr. Chairman, that when this House is discussing additional revenue, which the Speech from the Throne indicates that we will have to discuss, that at that time with the passing of this Bill the provincial rate of income tax and corporate income tax will be fixed by the resolution that we are now passing?

MR. EVANS: If there are no further questions, Mr. Chairman, at this time. I nodded I think on each occasion on which my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party put forward a question, but so that my nods can be recorded upon Hansard, I say that I agree with him that the Bill deals solely with something generally termed methodology. If that means the means by which an agreement is to be carried out between the Province and the Federal Government with respect to the collection of taxes, that is entirely correct and does not affect the provisions of the present Federal-Provincial fiscal arrangements.

I would not be able to comment at this time with respect to my honourable friend's question from Inkster.

MR. GREEN: at some future date, Mr. Minister?

MR. EVANS: It is a subject for a budget -- that is a subject that comes under the Budget debate. I think my honourable friend the Leader of the N.D. P's question would come under the Budget Debate. My only concern, Mr. Chairman, is that if this resolution is passed, does that then fix -- during the course of the Budget Debate, will we have the leeway to change the rates of personal and corporate income tax, because if my learned friend -- if the Minister says that this comes under the Budget Debate and this resolution fixes those two rates, then indeed we won't have a chance to debate it during the Budget Debate. All I'm concerned with is whether or not the passing of this resolution will mean that the question of increased income or corporate taxes will be foreclosed during the Budget Debate.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, no. Certainly there will be the fullest opportunity to discuss all of the matters concerning the revenues, particularly of the Province and also the total expenditures and their relation.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer if it is not a fact that the Federal Government agree to make these tax collections without any charge to the Province.

MR. EVANS: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. There is no cost to the Province for the collection of income taxes, part of which are collected on our behalf.

MR. CAMPBELL: Consequently, Mr. Chairman, I would think that the resolution is unnecessary in the committee stage because it doesn't propose any cost on the province. Is that not correct?

MR. EVANS: It may well be, and I wonder if this is a super-abundance of caution. My honourable friend has so often risen on the other side of that matter, that is to say that we sometimes proposed a matter which appeared possibly to have expenses and he so often reminds us that it should be done, but it's a shadowy territory. It does affect the revenues of the Province in some kind of way, and whether it is called taxes or revenue or not, I don't know. Nevertheless, we expect to get some money from somebody. We thought maybe we'd better be sure that this was on side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted?

MR. MOLGAT: Whether or not the matter is in order, I wonder if I could ask the Minister some further questions at this time seeing we have had some discussion. The present rate I take it then of abatement, or the new rate of abatement, is going to be 28%. That is what the Federal Government will release to the Provinces. This compares to the last previous rate of what?

MR. EVANS: Twenty-four percent plus additional amounts made available by Ottawa during the discussion of educational financing. They agreed to a further abatement of 4% in that connection, 1% in connection with the corporations. At the new rate of 33%, that then represents the 24% plus 4 plus 5.

MR. MOLGAT: Then we'll be 4% better off than we were previously will we not?

MR. EVANS: Well I think that when you say better off, larger revenue to that extent, but we have yet to consider the expenditure side and I think there we enter into this larger field my honourable friend over here was talking about and perhaps we shouldn't get too close to that discussion now.

MR. MOLGAT: On this particular bill though that is before us, there will be four percentage points available to us which were previously strictly Federal Government. Now, could the Minister indicate how much that means in dollars and cents?

MR. EVANS: Not without entering into the broad picture, because in certain respects the money is offered to replace grants or financial responsibilities formerly assumed by the Federal Government. I think you will have to see things in balance, that is to say, how much additional expenditure is imposed upon the province at the same time the revenues are made available, until we see whether or not we are going to be better off. My suggestion would be that the details of that can be examined very closely under the education estimates and certainly on the budget. That's really the purpose of the budget, I assume, would be to gather together all of these factors of revenue because there are other revenues intended to help even with the education picture which are not under the 4% of personal income tax and one of corporation that are mentioned in this bill. It's a big, broad and somewhat complicated matter and I'll be prepared to enter into the full discussion at budget time or to help as I can on education estimates.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to pursue the same question if I may, Mr. Chairman. I realize that there are other considerations and there have been some changes in the overall relationships, but I wonder if the Minister was in a position to tell us in dollars and cents at this time what this means in revenue to the province. In other words, previously we were getting 24% plus 5; now we will be getting 28 plus 5. How many more dollars will that mean? Is he in a position to tell us that? It's entirely apart I realize from the other changes.

MR. EVANS: MR. Chairman, I think I'm not in a position to give estimates of revenue at this time. Certainly the figures of last year are known, but partly for the reason my honourable friend mentioned, how much this means in gross dollars I really think is a part of the budget, which even though it's only one item of the budget is a budget item, and I suggest that our final estimates should be presented at that time. I think that's the proper time to present it.

The second is that the education financing is still subject to clarification between the provincial authorities and the Ottawa authorities, largely as to what constitutes education before the university level and education after the university level, and it is literally true that the technicians have not yet come to an understanding between the two governments. It will make some difference to the total money that is given to us for education. I know that I am straying a little from the point that my honourable friend asked. You asked for the gross amount that might arise through the additional four points on the personal income tax and the one percent on the corporation tax. I haven't got the information at the present stage. I'd rather present it on the budget.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think that it would be correct to say that notwithstanding whether the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer has the figures or not, that the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) Dillingers of Ottawa apparently are going to make sure that the Province of Manitoba will not receive the amount of revenue necessary to enhance the people of the Province of Manitoba, and as much as my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition may at this particular time inveigle the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer into a firm statement, notwithstanding this, that the authorities in power at the present time at Ottawa are not going to enhance the furtherance of the destiny and prosperity of the people of Manitoba. With that I desist from further comment

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, if the information that was sought by the Leader of the Official Opposition is not available at this time, I think it should be given to us at the time of the second reading of the Bill so that we can vote on it intelligently, and I think also we would be approving it in principle at that time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have no further part to take in this debate, but I do want to suggest to my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP Party that if he wants to see the House transact its business in a regular and orderly way, and I'm sure that this is his intention, that he should refrain from suggestions such as he made a short time ago, because any time that any of us start referring to one another, or colleagues, even though they be far removed and therefore unable to be here to defend themselves, under terms such as Dillingers or something of that kind, then I think that we'd better be pretty careful of the level of debate here. I want to counsel my honourable friend to be more careful because he has already been getting away with a little bit of transgression of the rules today and if he continues, why somebody - it won't likely be me - but somebody will likely take a rap at him.

MR. PAULLEY: I agree with my honourable friend and I apologize that the position of Ottawa is indefensible.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted certain resolutions and directs me to report the same.

IN SESSION

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Springfield, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. EVANS introduced bill No. 5, an Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba), 1962.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps my honourable friend would yield to me. I thank my honourable friend because I want this afternoon to remind the House that it has been our custom for many years at an early date in our proceedings to bring into remembrance the name and career of men and women who have sat in this House in days gone by and who have passed to their reward since our last meeting, and it seems to me appropriate that on this Monday afternoon I should again undertake this task.

There are three men whom we wish to remember on this occasion. One of them is well known to many of us here; the others perhaps are no so intimately connected with our own personal experience. The first of these names is that of the late Richard W. Craig, Mr. R. W. Craig was a member of this House from August, 1922, to April, 1927, and I think there is only one member who sat with him in this Chamber and that is the Honourable Member for Lakeside whose name will be coupled with mine in proposing this resolution.

Mr. Craig had the distinction of living to a very ripe old age. He was 89 years old when he died in Victoria during the past twelve months and he had the further distinction of being at all times a Minister when in this House. In fact he was appointed to the Ministry before he was elected and that is not the usual way of going about things, but it indicates no doubt something of the esteem and regard that was held for him by those with whom he was later associated in the Cabinet and in the House.

He was Attorney-General of this province during the entire term of his tenure here and also for part of the time he was Minister of Telegraphs and of Telephones, and when he left this House

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd)in 1927 he did so because he was retiring of his own free will from the political arena. Nevertheless, we remember him as a very distinguished member of the legal profession for many many years and a distinguished public servant in the Executive Council of this province as well as in the Legislative Assembly.

I'm sure we would particularly want to be remembered in this connection to his son, Hector Craig, who many of us knew personally and who was a resident of this city for some time, although he now lives elsewhere.

I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that this House convey to the family of the late Richard W. Craig, who served as a Member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable the First Minister has said, it is the custom of the House to pause for a short time in its work near the beginning of a session to pay tribute to those former members of the House who have passed away since the House last met, and for the benefit of the new members of the House I might mention what I have called attention to before in the House, that we in this House have followed for many years the custom, so there will be no hint of partisanship or matters appertaining thereto in any of these resolutions, that the formal resolution itself is always moved by the First Minister, and then in addition to that, it has been the custom also that the seconding is done by either the member who occupies the seat, or the nearest seat to it, of the deceased member in question, or by someone who was either a personal friend or a relative or had some other connection.

It's probably interesting to note as well, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution that is moved is moved in identical terms each year. There is no embellishment in any single case. It's a formal resolution and in identical terms each year. I think this is a good custom. I think it's worthwhile, even though we get in quite a hurry about the work here at times, that we do take this time to pause and pay tribute to former members.

The First Minister has mentioned that I am the only one that is left that sat with Dick Craig, as he was popularly known. As a matter of fact, Mr. Craig and I came here on the same day. As the First Minister has mentioned, his election was delayed a little longer than some of the rest of us, because although the elections all took place the same day, July 18, 1922, yet at that time Winnipeg City had the proportional representation system and ten members who were then elected from that seat were candidates across the whole of the city, and the counting used to occupy a considerable time. As a matter of fact, it has happened at times that a candidate was elected without ever achieving the quota that was set under that system, but when nine members had been elected, or eight as the case might be, the others who were high were simply counted in. So Mr. Craig and I arrived here on the same day officially and the session was held in the early part of 1923.

I know that comparisons are odious although they're often made in the House here - probably bear out that old axiom - but I'm sure that I have never sat with a more capable man than Dick Craig. That's not only because I was young and impressionable at that time in contrast to my present position, but I think any objective report on his performance in this House would bear that out. The Premier of that day so considered him because he chose him as one of his desk-mates and he continued through his five years here to carry a great deal of the work of the government both administratively and in the Chamber.

And those were rather interesting days, Mr. Speaker, because the government of that day when they had elected a Speaker from their own midst, as is still done, they were exactly even in numbers to the combined opposition, and the combined opposition had in it many experienced parliamentarians, including the immediately past Premier of the province and others with a lot of experience, whereas I think only two who sat on the front row of the government had sat previously in the House. So they were rather interesting and strenuous days and Mr. Craig, beyond anyone on the government side of the House, carried the brunt of the work for the government. It was a distinct disappointment to me, and I know it was to many others on the government side of the House, that day when Mr. Craig decided that he would no longer stay in politics and decided to return to the practice of law.

As the First Minister has said, it's worthy of comment when somebody retires from this Chamber voluntarily. Usually we retire compulsorily, or as it's often phrased, with the full consent of the electorate, but Mr. Craig didn't wait for that state to overtake him. I fear that

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd). . . . the amount of work that he was called upon to do, both administratively and in the Chamber itself, had a lot to do with his early retirement. He served after that time in public capacities however. His service before coming into this House had been great. He had been a school teacher; he had been a school board member; he had been Chairman of the Winnipeg School Board - I believe he did not serve on the Council as far as I can remember - he was Chairman of the School Board; and after his retirement from this House he continued to give wide public service and sat on one of the commissions - I'm sorry that I can't recall the name of it, I frequently hear different ones mentioned - I think one of them has been the Fautoux with regard to penal institutions. Whether that was the one or another of the commissions, Mr. Craig sat on it and again rendered valuable service.

So altogether I think we can say without any qualifications Mr. Craig, as the language of the resolution implies, rendered distinguished service in this House and in the community. And speaking of one who was a particular friend and very greatly admired by me, I am pleased to associate myself with the tributes that have been paid to Mr. Craig and the condolences that are extended to his family.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the New Democratic Party of Manitoba, may I extend our appreciation for the services that were rendered to the Province of Manitoba by our late colleague here in the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. I did not have the privilege of knowing our deceased member intimately, but, Mr. Speaker, may I say in all due respect, that any member of the community who has been granted the privilege of sitting in this Assembly is justifiably due of recognition. And may I again, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of members of my group, extend to those who are left, who are descendants of the late Richard Craig, our appreciation of the service that he has rendered to the Province of Manitoba, and in rendering to our province the benefits of his knowledge, has indeed rendered a service to humanity at large. We appreciate very much this opportunity of extending to him our thanks for the past, our thanks for the future of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I should now like to make reference to the name of Major Henry Robson Richardson, who was a member of this Legislature representing the constituency of Roblin for the years 1920 to 1922. I think it could be said of Mr. Richardson that whether or not he ever sat in this Chamber that he would have been regarded by all who knew him as a good citizen in the highest sense of that word. It's interesting to recall that he came to this province 68 years ago and lived a very full and active life in the farming community in Roblin in government service and for the two years that I have mentioned as a member of this Legislature. There's no one here that sat with Mr. Richardson, but the Honourable Member for Roblin has agreed to associate himself with me in the presentation of this motion.

Mr. Richardson can be called a real pioneer of this province. His life span in Manitoba covers the most active and interesting and challenging period in our history, and it certainly is remarkable that he was able to look back on such a long period of time and to reflect on the contribution that he himself made, not in the Legislature alone but in so many different aspects of the activity of a citizen of the community and in the state. I know that the House would wish to be remembered to his widow and to his family who are still with us here in this province.

So Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that this House convey to the family of the late Henry Robson Richardson, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has expressed my thoughts in a most clear and capable manner with reference to the late Bob Richardson who farmed in the Cromarty district approximately four to five miles west of Roblin, and his record is one that is of distinction to Manitoba and to Canada. I join the other members of the House to pay tribute to this fine man and extend the sympathy to the bereaved family on behalf of Roblin constituency and the Province of Manitoba.

I find it very interesting reviewing this man's history. First of all, he was elected in 1920 with eleven others to form the Farmers' Party, which is I am sure of interest to most here today. Another note of interest to me is the fact that he won over one, the late F. Y. Newton who sat in this House, and the career of these two gentlemen politically speaking was one of a great challenge to themselves and also to the people that they represented. The facts go on to state that in 1922 election, I believe, Mr. Newton defeated the late Bob Richardson by

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)some eleven votes. He was educated in Oxford; a World War veteran who served with great distinction, having been mentioned in dispatches by the late Sir Winston Churchill; and was taken prisoner in 1916. I join the First Minister in support of this resolution.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, it was not my pleasure to sit in the House with Major Richardson but I came to know him intimately in the years that followed. The Honourable Member for Roblin has mentioned some of the highlights of a really distinguished career and I agree with him that Major Richardson was really a story-book figure, because he had come here as a very young man; gone back to the Old Land at the time of World War I; had a distinguished career in the Army; came back here; was elected; sat for a short time and was not returned to the House; and immediately went into public service in different fields. For some considerable time he was an employee of the Department of Agriculture here, and later on an employee of the Federal Government.

During the time that he was with Agriculture here he headed the Farm Help Bureau, and it was just characteristic of Major Richardson that when we were in World War II here, making use of the Polish soldiers who were quartered in Canada, that on one occasion when I was to meet with the Lieutenant of the Polish group who was making arrangements regarding their working on the farms, the man of course who was bringing the Lieutenant in was Major Richardson. I said to the Major, "Robert, does this Lieutenant speak English," and he said, "no, not at all." And I said, "Well, you know that I don't speak Polish, How is this interview going to go?" And the Major said, "Oh, I speak a little French and he speaks French - we'll get along all right," and he proceeded to speak French to the Polish Lieutenant just I'm sure as well, although not as volubly, as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface would have done.

He was an extremely accomplished gentleman, and he was a gentleman. The First Minister has mentioned he had a very long life in this province even though he wasn't born here, and he certainly contributed a full weight and measure to the community and the political life of the province. I join with the others who have spoken in expressing appreciation of a very distinguished career and condolences to the family who are left.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I join on behalf of the New Democratic Party in recognition of the service of the late Mr. Richardson in his service to the Province of Manitoba. I was most interested to hear the report of the Honourable Member for Roblin of the fact that the late Major Richardson held a seat in this Assembly in the years 1920 to 1922. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as the New Democratic Party is concerned, and its predecessors the CCF Party and the Independent Labour Party of the Province of Manitoba, that the years 1920 onwards was very vital insofar as Manitoba was concerned, that it was in the 1920s and 1922s that many members of this Legislature of the old I. L. T. Party of Manitoba served in this Legislature with distinction, and I am sure that the late member, Major Richardson, also served in this august Assembly with distinction and honour.

May I, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the group that is here today, almost the same number as was the group back in 1920 and 1922, extend our appreciation and our recognition of the service to Manitoba and to the community when we recognize the service of the late member for Roblin to this community.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I now speak of a man whom I had the pleasure of knowing personally and with whom I served, and a good many members of this House also served, in the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba. I refer to the late Frank L. Chester. Frank Chester was truly a native son. He was born here, and although he did not live in Winnipeg all his life, I think his heart was always with the life and activity of this province, and the community of Winnipeg in particular, where for so long he occupied many distinguished and important offices. Frank Chester was a councillor in the City of Winnipeg where he made a very distinguished record for himself, and he joined this Chamber on the 10th of November, 1949, the same time that I did myself, so he and I both came into this House as new boys. It rapidly became apparent that Frank Chester was an effective and reasoned debater, and on a number of occasions was given the responsibility of dealing, as sometimes is required of a backbencher to do, with some of the important issues of the day which were of very wide and important public concern.

I found him personally to be a very fair-minded and moderate man. He naturally had his Party views, as who hasn't, but he was always able to transcend any particular opinion that he might have on the subjects that were in debate between us to become a good companion and a warm friend to men on both sides of this Chamber. He left this House to become the Chairman

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) of the Farm Loan Board of Canada where he rendered distinguished service, latterly coming back to the City of Winnipeg.

His interests were not entirely in public affairs. He made a name for himself as an athlete, being particularly interested in playing hockey in various fraternal and community associations such as the Kiwanis, those connected with his own calling, the Retail Merchants Association and the hardware industry, are all places where he made his mark as one the leaders in his chosen way of life and one of those people who is willing to give some of his own time and some of his own personality to the interests of the public and the interest of those with whom he was associated. Altogether a fine man, and one whose passing, at a relatively early age in these days, we regret all the more.

I am glad to say that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition associates himself with the motion that reads as follows: That this House convey to the family of the late Frank L. Chester, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the First Minister in asking me to second this motion. It was not my pleasure to sit in this House with Frank Chester, but it was my good fortune and pleasure to get to know him very well subsequently. I entered the House immediately at the election where he did not return here.

Frank was one of those men who worked at all levels of government, and the First Minister indicated that at the municipal level he had been a devoted servant to the people of Winnipeg. Subsequently he entered this House and did an excellent job here. Later in the federal field, while he was not there as an elected individual, he made a real contribution there as a westerner acting on a board that is of a particular concern to western Canadians. Frank was one of those men who had friends all over. He was not one of those wild partisans who felt that only his views were the right ones. He was a reasonable man at all times. He was the sort of man who encouraged many others to get active in the political life to make their contribution for the betterment of others.

While Frank has left this House for many years now, and now left this earth, we still have in some way an association here with the family in that one of his sons, Ron Chester, who is active in one of the news media in this area, is frequently here in our own gallery and in these buildings, and I believe I could say a personal friend of many members of this House.

And so I associate myself with this motion and ask that the regrets of this House at the loss of a distinguished Manitoban be extended to the family.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, may I add a few words on behalf of the members of our Party in recognizing the contribution made to the citizens of Winnipeg and of the province by the late Frank Chester. I requested my Leader to let me speak on this because Frank Chester in his lifetime represented both in the City of Winnipeg and in this Legislature roughly the same area as I did and do, and as other of my colleagues from North Winnipeg who are present here today did. At all times, whether in his success or in his failure in political life, his contest was usually with members of our Party, and I am able to say that he was respected for his sincerity and for his work on behalf of the people and his contribution should be recognized as it is done today by all of us.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to associate myself with the mover and seconder of this resolution as well as of the previous two. I did not have the opportunity of knowing any of these gentlemen who have served so well and so distinguishable here in this Province, however, I would also like to associate myself with the sympathies that are being bestowed to these families.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in this resolution of condolence, not only as one who sat in this House with Frank but also as one who considered himself a friend of Frank. I knew Frank for a number of years before he came into this House, and as the First Minister has said, his contribution towards his community both in a fraternal sense and in a strictly community sense, and a religious sense, as well as his contribution towards his community as a representative of the City Council, made him a natural to be elected to this Legislature.

I didn't come into the House at the same time as Frank. Frank came in on November, 1949; I didn't come in until the by-election of 1950, but I was a desk-mate of Frank's and during

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) the time that I was here I learned to appreciate Frank, not only for his sincerity, for his dedication, but also for all the human qualities that he possessed. I knew of no man who sat in this House who was more dedicated to the interests of his community and to the interests of Manitoba as Frank Chester, and I join with all members of this House in expressing to his wife and to his son my deepest and sincere sympathy in his passing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. Has the Province of Manitoba any plans for the development of atomic power in the province?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will know, this general topic was discussed I think during the past two sessions in Committee of Natural Resources and Utilities when the Chairman of the Hydro Board was present with the committee, and I would have no information beyond what the chairman gave at that time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, then I would like to ask either the Minister of Public Utilities or the Minister of Agriculture if they can explain to me the statement which was alleged to have been made by the Minister of Agriculture on Friday night in Petersfield. When the matter of the flooding on Lake Winnipeg was being discussed, the following is the statement as reported in the Winnipeg Free Press: "The issue of Hydro dams and their effect on the lake level sparked a lively debate that was finally quelled when Mr. Enns suggested that the proposed controlled dam on the Nelson River, the lake's only outlet, might never be needed because of the development of atomic power in the province." Now, I would assume that if there's some talk of not proceeding with the dam, then the government must have been making some other plans. Could the Minister explain what the plans are?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I would welcome the opportunity to clear up any misunderstanding that any statements I may have made over the week-end brought about. I am personally satisfied, first of all, in respect to something that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition didn't mention, was the question of the purchase of government lands that the sixty-odd farmers that I was speaking to, as well as to members of the House that were present, clearly understood that I wasn't announcing any new government policy. As a matter of fact, the question as put to my honourable colleague the Minister of Highways the other day in the House, that there was no present policy with respect to these flooded lands. I did indicate my genuine concern for the problem that these farmers have, and indeed that it possibly would be a desirable solution to the overall problem, if we think in terms of a long-term solution, that these lands should be returned to the Crown. I am happy to bring that into the record of the House to straighten that out.

With respect to the specific question that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition raised, again I was in no position to change or talk of new policy. The question came up in the course of a discussion as to the timing of the different phases on the Nelson, and I at this moment perhaps should take the opportunity to retract anything that I said in this connection. It was said only in terms of the phasing period and that the economics of the whole Nelson was such that it could indeed be set up at different times. Now this explanation may not suffice but this is all that I can say at this time. Thank you.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a subsequent question then of the Minister of Public Utilities. It is correct then that the government's position has not changed from what it was a year ago, and that is that they are not proceeding with atomic power I presume. The second question, is it proposed then to proceed with the control dam at the north end of Lake Winnipeg with regard to this phase of the Nelson River that is now under construction, that is the Kettle Rapids? Will the control dam be built with reference to that project alone?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this is quite a technical question requiring of course a technical answer, it would seem to me to be more appropriate for the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition to direct that question to the Manitoba Hydro when they are before the committee of this House and dealing with this particular subject matter.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the technical aspects of it, but I think insofar as the decision whether or not the dam will be built is really one in a sense government policy, because there are many other aspects involved here besides the production of power, quite obviously, as the Minister of Agriculture himself has indicated. So I think here is a question of

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) government policy entirely beyond the purely technical aspects and I think this is one where the government should be in a position to reply.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Honourable Minister who is responsible for the Manitoba Development Fund. I'm not sure just now who it is. It was the present Provincial Treasurer - it may still be. I'm interested -- having learned today that the Industrial Development Bank is charging an interest rate of 8-1/2 to 9 percent on loans of over half a million dollars, I wonder if he could clarify what is the interest rate now being charged by the Manitoba Development Fund?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think the only thing that regulates that matter is the provision in the statute that their charge shall be - I think it is at least 1-1/2 percent over the provincial borrowing rate. That would bring it somewhere in the neighbourhood of 7-1/2 to 8 percent.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable the First Minister could clarify for me the problem which arises in my mind, and that is that within the last few weeks there has been a loan approved or registered, or in some way dealt with at 6-1/4 percent interest of \$3-1/2 million to Churchill Forest Products, which is a subsidiary of Monoca AG, which as we know is developing and making use of Manitoba's natural forest products.

MR. ROBLIN: I have no information about that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . then if it's a matter of interest to inquire as to the 6-1/4 percent interest rate for this \$3-1/2 million, which would appear on the surface to be in contravention of the Act as set out by the Honourable Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: I can find out if there are any proceedings in the Fund that are contrary to the Act, but as my honourable friend knows, the government has no information about individual transactions.

MR. PAULLEY: Following this, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the First Minister whether he will undertake to give a full report to this Assembly as to whether or not the Manitoba Development Fund is in effect loaning money at 6-1/4 percent interest to the magnitude of \$3-1/2 million to Monoca AG, when citizens within our province under National Housing Act have to pay 7-1/4 percent interest?

MR. ROBLIN: I doubt that there's been any loan to Monoca AG. I think my honourable friend said it was the Churchill Forest Products, but the two matters in my mind are -- (Interjection)-- perhaps the two matters in my mind are quite separate. I meant to say there are wide varieties of interest rates charged for all kinds of purposes. One might, for example, ask why we are lending money to young farmers at a rate of about 4-1/2 percent. There are all kinds of different interest rates being charged, and as you know, the government will not hold itself responsible because we are not allowed to by the statute to deal with individual transactions of the kind that are mentioned.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, then if I may, may I ask then that the Honourable the First Minister or the Minister of Industry and Commerce or the Provincial Treasurer make a statement to this House in due course as to whether or not public monies are being loaned to outside corporations at a lesser amount of interest than can be obtained insofar as the people of the Province of Manitoba are concerned.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I will ascertain whether or not the statutes of the province are being transgressed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not concerned insofar as the statutes are concerned. I'm merely asking my honourable friend whether he will make a statement to this Assembly as to whether or not public funds are being loaned at a lesser amount of interest than the public can obtain them from other governmental institutions.

MR. HILLHOUSE: May I ask the -- it's on the same subject -- I'd like to ask the Honourable the First Minister a question. I understand from the Honourable First Minister that he is going to give the Member for St. John an answer to the question that he has asked about the Churchill Forest Products. I wonder if, when obtaining an answer to that question, he would also find out whether or no there is any crystal covenants on the mortgage being entered into by Churchill Forest Products and who the covenantors are.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend misunderstands if he thinks that I have undertaken to answer either his question or the one that he refers to, because I don't intend to attempt to answer any question with respect to the individual transactions engaged in by the Manitoba Development Fund. That is contrary to the statute, and was a statute incidentally that was passed by this Chamber at its last session with no protest with respect to that

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) particular point. That is the way the situation stands at the present time, so I would like to be candid with my honourable friend - that's a fashionable word these days - and tell him that I will only undertake to see whether the statute is being lived up to.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question -- (interjection)-- No, this is a different question --(Interjection) -- Oh, that's fine.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker -- on the same subject, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that this . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, this might be the opportunity to bring to the attention of the House the suggestion that was implicit in our rule changes last year, that there be a limit of two supplementary questions on each main question.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on this very point may I suggest to my honourable friend the - as I understand it the heir apparent of the mantle of my honourable friend the Leader of the House - that this only dealt with individual members, but if somebody else wished to raise a question on the same subject then they have the opportunity of raising two more questions, in all deference to my honourable friend the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest deference to my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party, that was not the case. The purpose of the rule - the purpose of the rule was to prevent debate arising on the Orders of the Day on the question period and that is why the two supplementary questions were agreed to.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, we're not debating, we're seeking information, and if this government is not prepared to give it on questions, how else can the people of Manitoba obtain the information so vitally required at the present time.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not addressing myself to my honourable friend's hyperbole, I'm speaking only to the point of order that is before you at the present time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker - on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, to ease the Attorney-General's mind, I'm asking a question on the same subject but it's not a supplementary question, and it's directed to the Honourable the First Minister. The question is that in view of the fact that this particular project is in its infancy, does it concern the government benches and is it a matter of government policy that \$3-1/2 million would be loaned to this corporation and the security which would be advanced - which would be given to guarantee this particular type of loan - in other words, is the government aware that \$3-1/2 million worth of assets have been invested by this company into that particular project at the present time.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, the government does not deal with the details of a loan that is made by the Manitoba Development Fund. The rules under which they work are laid down in the statute and in the regulations, and it was by a very deliberate self-denial that we decided some time ago that we would not undertake to operate that fund as a branch of the government. If my honourable friend would allow me the privilege of making a slightly longer reply than is probably customary, I should say that the Manitoba Development Fund operates on the same basis as every other provincial development fund in Canada and on the same basis as the Industrial Development Bank, all of whom rely upon the officers and officials -- the governments concerned rely upon the officers and officials of those organizations to conduct a proper business. They have found by experience that if the politicians attempt to interfere or to write the rules and regulations here, we get political deals; but that if we don't, if we leave it at arms length from the government, we can expect to have the matter conducted in an orderly and business-like way in keeping with the general policy that is approved by the Legislature from time to time.

Now the Manitoba Development Fund has been in operation for some time, and if you will examine their balance sheet and their profit and loss statement and their report, you will find that our confidence in that system has been well justified because they operate a business-like concern and they have not lost any public funds at all. As a matter of fact, we have been criticized by members opposite because this fund hasn't been more of a risk taker, the implication being made by one gentleman who isn't here any more that this fund should have lost a little money by now if it were taking the kind of risks which are necessary in order to make the most of the industrial possibilities that are placed before this fund. I reserve judgment as to whether he was right or not, but that is the situation that exists and if my honourable friend can look at the report of this fund, then he will observe, I think, that it's being operated in a business-like manner.

MR. CHERNIACK: Might I ask the Honourable the First Minister whether the Government

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) takes any interest in the type of industry which is assisted by the Manitoba Development Fund to the extent that it guides or suggests interest rates such as the example which he gave us of 4-1/2% to young farmers, or is it left entirely to be a business-like proposition of interest rates such as the Industrial Development Bank of the Federal Government seems to be.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I may answer that by saying that the rules under which the Manitoba Development Fund operates are laid down by the statute, not by the government. There is only one area in which the government might conceivably give an order to the Development Fund to do such and such, and that's contained under the famous Part II of the statute, which my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland trailed all around his constituency during the election as being a subversion of the free enterprise system. It so happens that at the present time we have not issued any orders under Part II of the Development Fund Act. Members will recognize that Part II was brought in only to take care of certain conceivable circumstances where it might be in the public interest to do so and where the government does make such a ruling, which we have not done up to the present, we are obliged by the statute in that case to give the full information to the House, but in the Part I of the Act where it operates to all intents and purposes like a bank - although we are not very keen to call it a bank for various reasons - then it operates completely within the terms laid down by the statute and without any interference from the executive branch.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the First Minister would permit one more question. Would the Government of Manitoba condone the awarding of public monies at a lesser rate of interest to industrial development corporations than is presently prevailing insofar as private loans are concerned?

MR. ROBLIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the question is hypothetical but the government policy really goes back to the statute, which lays down the terms and the minimum rates at which money may be lent.

MR. PAULLEY: I have one further supplementary question if I may, Mr. Speaker; has not the government the authority to investigate into the use of public funds in the province of Manitoba?

MR. ROBLIN: Not unless we change that statute we haven't.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that there is some ambiguity in reports on the question of government policy with regard to a solution to the flood problems in Lake Winnipeg or surrounding area, will the Honourable Minister undertake to send a letter to the various groups or committees in order to clear the matter?

MR. ENNS: I believe I made my statement on this very clear, Mr. Speaker, and as indicated in that statement, I don't think that any of the persons that were present at the meeting need any clarification. Thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may . . . the statement of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, at a meeting the other day, it is alleged that the Honourable Minister mentioned that certain lands would be purchased by the province of Manitoba in the flood-stricken area. I wonder if the Honourable Minister would indicate to the House what lands he has in mind and how widespread are the lands that he suggests would be purchased by the Province of Manitoba.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, as the members of the House are well aware, during the course of the summer a great deal of work was done by the Highways Department in protecting certain low-lying lands bordering on Lake Winnipeg, and the land in question was the land on the water side of the dyke and the eventual use of those lands, but I believe I answered the first part of the question in my earlier statement. Thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, will the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture be prepared to present a statement to this House as to the amount of land that he has in mind that may be purchased by the Government of Manitoba in respect of the flood-stricken area?

MR. ENNS: Again I feel the question has been answered, Mr. Speaker. However, there will be further reports coming on the whole problem and our committee is looking into it. Thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: Could the honourable minister also as a further supplementary question indicate to the House the price to be paid for the land to be acquisitioned by the government?

MR. ENNS: No I am sorry. I have nothing further.

MR. LYON: friend's rather poor interpretation of the rule. He is out of order under his own interpretation of it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I leave to your good judgment whether I am out of order or not and not to that of the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Minister has answered the question and I hope to your satisfaction. The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry and Commerce or the First Minister; it is related to industrial development. When either of these two ministers are encouraging or negotiating for a new industry to come to the province do they hold out, either by implication or by agreement, the possibility of a loan from the Manitoba Development Fund?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I think I can answer that question simply by saying that in those cases where information is requested of us we simply suggest that the fund is available, and if they desire any additional information they contact the officials.

MR. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the case of Monoca AG, or Churchill Forest Industries, was this request made?

MR. ROBLIN: The same answer applies, Mr. Speaker. If anyone asks us whether they can get any money from the Manitoba Development Fund, we say, "See them." There are no exceptions to that rule.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, could I have an answer to my question? Was the request made?

MR. ROBLIN: I think my answer is sufficient for my honourable friend.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, could I get an answer to my question? Was the request made?

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): I have a question for the Honourable Minister the Attorney-General. Now that the use of studded tires has been declared legal under the Highway Traffic Act, would the Minister give consideration recommending to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council that regulations be made requiring automobiles using such tires to display a visible marker on the rear of the vehicle in order to lessen the hazard of rear end collisions?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter that can be considered.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Due to the fact that I have only been away from here a few brief five or six years, it has taken me half an hour to get up. The Honourable Member the Leader of the NDP with that red jacket just can't sit still. At last I'm up anyway. Now my question, Mr. Speaker, is this: does the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources have any information as to if and when the potash mine at St. Lazare - the construction or work may begin? The reason for my question is this, that due to the fact that construction on No. 2 Mine at Esterhazy has been completed -- it's a long time since you've heard me say a few words, be patient Mr. First Minister; you'll hear more -- work has been completed on No. 2 mine and many men are being laid off and they are very anxious to know if there is anything that can be done or when this mine may be started at St. Lazare.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have no information on the subject.

MR. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Could he indicate to the House what will happen to the funds of the various school districts when consolidation takes place.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, that anticipatory.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of school trustees concerned about the matter. They have money in the bank, some of them, and they wish to know whether those funds will go into a general fund or whether they can dispose of them in their own district.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, we'll have to wait for the proper time for this when the fiscal considerations are before us. We may have something to say about -- any changes in policy will have to await that budget.

MR. GUTTORMSON: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker then. What is the policy at the present time in areas where consolidation has taken place in the past year, monies that were in reserve funds of school districts?

MR. JOHNSON: As you know, Mr. Speaker, in every consolidation for many years there's an arbitration set up and a board of arbitrators make the awards of the existing liabilities and assets over to the new consolidated district. There has been no change in that policy up until the present time.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Health. How inclusive has the Manitoba Meat Inspection program for meat processors been to date? Specifically (a) how many are Canada Approved (b) how many are not Canada Approved, and (c) what safeguards to the public if any, do those in (b) come under?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the honourable member for giving me notice of this question, but there is some more information I wish to obtain from the Department, however, so I'll take it as notice.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I know not to whom I shall direct this question. Has the government received the report of the Gilson Inquiry on the question of tax-free gasoline for farmers? When will the report be available?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I can tell my honourable friend that the report has been received and will be made available to the members shortly. I expect the contents will be a matter of some interest in connection with the budget debate.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, does the Development Fund of Manitoba make demand loans?

MR. ROBLIN: I have no idea, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: On the matter of the Gilson inquiry, can the Minister indicate when the report was received from Dr. Gilson.

MR. ROBLIN: It was received some little while ago. I can't give the exact date but in view of its implications for the budget I think it would be proper if we tabled it at the time the budget debate is under consideration.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. Will the Minister bring in a full report on the recommendations contained in the recent brief of the Canadian Mental Health Association, and if so, when may we expect some comment?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, we have been considering amendments to the Mental Health Act and the brief from the Canadian Mental Health Association was received subsequent to that, and we are in the position of considering them at the present time.

continued on next page

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wonder if this would not be an appropriate time to get an answer to the question I put to the Honourable Minister of Industry & Commerce on Thursday last, relative to the Friendly Family Farms, because at that time he accepted my question and said, "Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice" which suggests that he intends to answer it.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I took the question as notice and it's my intention to determine whether I have any information to impart to the Honourable Member from Gladstone. As yet, I have not determined this. If I do, I will inform him.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Department of Public Works for the year 1965-1966. This by the way, Mr. Speaker, is the first annual report of the Department of Public Works since the division with Highways some two years ago.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wonder if the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs may be in a position to give to the House, in confidence, her reaction to the situation which is now prevailing insofar as the City of Portage la Prairie is concerned and the appointment of a Commissioner of Finance, or what the dickens you call the particular individual, in respect of Portage la Prairie is concerned. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, if I may, the citizens of Manitoba are quite interested in the recent procedures in respect of Portage la Prairie, and I would like to hear from my adorable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs as to the situation in Portage la Prairie. No speech, I just...

HON. THELMA FORBES, (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the question was; I know he was out of order. However, I do know that the honourable member is interested in the events of the last few days, and if I may be permitted I might say that on Friday of last week I had the Mayor and the council of the City of Portage la Prairie in at which time I gave them our decisions as to the recommendations of the Municipal Board after the Portage enquiry, and I am quite happy to give the Leader of the New Democratic Party the results of that. The City of Portage la Prairie was placed under the supervision of the Municipal Board as of December 1st. The supervision includes the appointment of a Supervisor who will assist the Council in formulating and putting into operation an adequate system of controls in Portage la Prairie. The Supervisor will recommend on all administrations. He will be the certifying authority before any work is undertaken; he will be the signing authority with the Mayor and the Secretary-Treasurer of the city in respect to all by-laws, expenditures and bills of exchange. The Municipal Board have appointed Mr. William Murphy to be the Supervisor effective December 9th.

The council of Portage la Prairie and the Mayor received the results of our decision quite fairly, I would say. The Mayor probably did not agree to the appointment of the Supervisor. However, this is up to the Council and the Mayor of Portage la Prairie. Whenever they are able to satisfy the Board that they do not need the personal supervision of this employee, when the Board is satisfied they may recommend that -- they are at liberty, rather, I should say, to discontinue the services of this supervisor to the city, so it depends on the Council and the Mayor of Portage la Prairie.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs whether or not the people of the City of Portage la Prairie will in the future be enabled to elect their representatives to the Municipal Council?

MRS. FORBES: I think that's a hypothetical question.

MR. PAULLEY: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Should it be a hypothetical question in the process of democracy as we know it in Manitoba at the present time?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Minister, in view of the way in which my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party phrased his question, are we to take it that this information is confidential?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Highways. Does the government contemplate averaging water rates or subsidizing water rates in certain locals under the Water Supply Board?

HON. WALTER WEIR, (Minister of Highways) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I have no change in policy to announce in that field.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. The Saturday papers carried a story about an arrangement being entered into by various Prime Ministers of various provinces in order to defeat progress, and I just wondered whether the First Minister is a party to this arrangement?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, on the 6th of June last, or whenever it was, I felt no need to indulge in such a maneuver.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Orders for Returns. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW, (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, that an Order of this House do issue for a Return showing the amount of money that this Government has paid out to redeem Manitoba Savings Bonds in 1966.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. Number of convictions under Consumers Credit Act listing the reasons; 2. Number of applications for refund of deposit paid within 48 hours of signing agreement.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I would think that it would be advisable if the Honourable Member for Gladstone would specify the time period during which he would like this information.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, the Act became legislation two years ago, was it not? I'm referring from the time that the Act was passed. I believe it was in '65 or '64 - since that time. Pardon?

MR. ROBLIN: Do you want it for all that time or just the last 12 months?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I would think if it's only two years, it wouldn't be a big problem to get the information for the last two years, say, as from the time that the Act became legislation.

MR. ROBLIN: We'll get it if my honourable friend wants it for that full period, but naturally if we can persuade him to take a lesser period of time it cuts down the work, if it doesn't impede, doesn't interfere with the information that he's seeking. We'll get it for him.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. Number of persons convicted for using "purple gas" in their vehicles. 2. Occupation of each. 3. Amount of revenue received from fines. 4. Number of persons convicted to serve jail term. And on this one, Mr. Speaker, I would think that the two-year term would be quite satisfactory.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to accept this order subject to the one indication of information that the honourable member has already given with respect to the time limit involved. He said the same two-year period, I believe, as applied to the previous order; and with respect to question number 2, the only caveat I would attach to that is that we will give the occupation where we have that information. It may well be that the information is not shown on files or anything else.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I take it that you intend to provide the information for the years 1965 and 1966 to date.

MR. LYON: '65 and '66. That's acceptable.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. Number of persons who have entered Manitoba from outside Canada as a direct result of provincial efforts to attract new employees in industry, the professions etc., showing:

A. Trade; B. Craft; C. Profession of each;

2. The costs to the public of Manitoba of such immigration.

3. Are such persons under contract to stay in Manitoba? If so, for what period?

4. Copies of all contracts entered into, between the Province and any industry, group or individual respecting immigration of personnel for which contributions are made in part or whole by the province.

And I may, Mr. Speaker, if I have the approval of the House, restrict this to the period from June 23rd, the date of our recent provincial election, until now when the available information is here.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can have some clarification in connection with the I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPIVAK: The clarification in item number one. I assume that you are referring to the Transportation Assistance Plan.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, to any use of public funds for people coming into the Province of Manitoba as a result of the activities of the Provincial Government.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, as you are aware, the Provincial Government has a program of advertisement for immigrants that will no doubt result in immigrants coming to Manitoba, but I do not know in what way we can measure that. I can file the statistics from the Dominion offices indicating the number of immigrants that will be coming to Manitoba, but there is no way of relating our involvement and our success directly other than total of those who are coming in. There is a transportation assistance program which you are aware of, and in connection with this matter I can fulfil the requirements of point number 1.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I simply ask my honourable friend or the government for an Order for a Return showing the number of persons who have entered Manitoba from outside as the direct result of provincial efforts to attract. Now then, if my honourable friend the Minister of Industry can give me the answer to that, okay. If he wants to not give me the answer because of complications at the federal level that is entirely up to him. All I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, is that the order be accepted or rejected. I will guide myself in accordance with the replies that I get from my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, may I just bring the point of order to the attention of yourself, that this is a debate, not an exchange of views, and that those who have questions to ask on the side of the ministry will have to ask them all at once to get them all on the floor because that's the proper way of doing it, I would suggest; and that those who undertake to answer the question should reserve their reply until they close the debate. Otherwise we are going to find ourselves into a hurly-burly as if this were a committee stage rather than the whole House. Now I know that to some of my friends this is a new arena, so we can expect to see some deviation from the true and tried rule, but there are others who of course would know better.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order that the Honourable the First Minister has raised, is he suggesting that the Minister closes the debate on this? I understood him to say that those who answer the question should refrain until they close the debate.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, but on the point of order, those that ask the questions are not the Ministry. In this particular case, the Ministry is trying to elicit the nature of the question from the questioner. They asked the question; the questioner is the one who provides the answers; and he is the mover and he will speak last. I think the questioner understands that.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour. . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, we must reserve -- because I wouldn't like to give the impression that this order is accepted as it stands. We will do our best to answer it but it is not accepted in the exact precise terms in which it stands.

MR. SPIVAK: I would like to put a caveat on item No. 4, in that I will answer the question subject to certain personal businesses being excepted.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, then as the mover of a substantive motion, if nobody else wants to speak to it - and I hear nobody else - I want to say that I will not accept the reservations of my honourable friend, because all I am asking for, Mr. Speaker, is copies of all contracts entered into between the province and any industry, group or individual respecting immigration of personnel for which contributions are made in whole or in part by the Province of Manitoba.

We are here, Mr. Speaker, as representatives of the public of the Province of Manitoba, and I think we are fully entitled to know where the monies of the Province of Manitoba are going, what they are used for, and it may be due to the newness of the Minister of Industry that he doesn't get the full significance of the question that I am asking and I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if I ask the members of this Assembly where the revenues or the funds of the Province of Manitoba are being used in respect of immigration or any other field of provincial endeavour, then I should be entitled to it, other than privileged information. If my honourable friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, wants to tell me that the information that I am asking or seeking is privileged information, that only the Government of Manitoba is entitled to know, the use of public funds in respect to immigration, then this is subject for debate, but I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend has misconstrued what I am

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . meaning insofar as this particular request of this Order for Return and I'm sure that on reflection he will not agree that this is subject to reflection insofar as he is concerned. So Mr. Speaker, I must frankly say that I cannot accept the reservations of my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce in respect of item No. 4 unless he is prepared on behalf of the government to say that it is privileged information of the Government of Manitoba as to how the dollars and cents of the taxpayers are to be spent insofar as immigration is concerned. I would ask him, Mr. Speaker, to reconsider his reservations.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Leader of the New Democratic Party a question? Will he accept for No. 4 the contracts, the number of firms, the names of the firms and the total amount but not the individual breakdown of each firm?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, for the time being and in the spirit of goodwill toward my honourable friend the new Minister of Industry and Commerce, I would accept that, but only on the basis that this is for the time being.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The List of all Commissions appointed by the Government showing: A. Name and purpose of each Commission. B. Personnel of each Commission. C. Salary or emolument of each person where applicable. D. List of all personnel, not in government service, who act as secretaries, advisors, etc. to each Commission. E. Salaries, emoluments or retainers paid to each person referred to in item (D), and may I say, Mr. Speaker, in order to bring this down to practicability, since 1959 if that's agreeable with the House.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: I wish to ask my honourable friend, when he says that he wants the information since 1959, is he looking for the commission as it was at that date, with all the changes and all the people who have been in and out on staff, and all that kind of thing? It can be provided no doubt but I wonder if this meets his purpose? He has asked the question on previous occasions and we have tried to answer that. I wonder if he wouldn't be satisfied if he asked us where it stood in the last twelve months or any one particular time. If he wants it from 1959 he can certainly have it, but it will be a long time coming.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I appreciate the

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Member closing the debate? I'm asking if you're closing the debate?

MR. PAULLEY: answer to the question without closing the debate, Mr. Speaker. I'm only concerned with recently. I appreciate the fact that the Honourable First Minister -- this information has been obtained in the past. If this is added to it's O.K. by me, but I would suggest that my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface may adjourn the debate if he so desires.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS, (St. Boniface): Thank you very much. I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone-Neepawa, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information:

1. How many separate orders were placed for sandbags for the 1966 Red River flood?
2. With respect to each order placed, give the following information:
 - (a) How was the order placed, i.e. by phone, letter, telegram, verbally, or otherwise; if otherwise, explain.
 - (b) Name and title of individual placing the order.
 - (c) Date the order was placed.
 - (d) Date delivery was taken.
 - (e) Name and address of company supplying the sandbags.
 - (f) The number of sandbags ordered.
 - (g) Price per sandbag, and whether this was F.O.B. Winnipeg.
 - (h) Were there any other or extra charges.
3. What minister was responsible for ordering of sandbags.
4. The date on which the flood crest arrived in Winnipeg.
5. How many unused sandbags were on hand July 1, 1966.

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

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK, (Ethelbert Plains): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. the number of pieces of highway equipment used for the purpose of removal of ice on highways showing: (a) Government owned; (b) Rented by Government; (c) Hired by Government and operated by private persons.

2. the number of pieces of such equipment in use between November 15th and December 6th, 1966?

3. On what highways in period above was such equipment used?

4. What chemicals and/or minerals are used by such equipment?

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, some of the exact questions that are in here may be difficult to provide. I think the intent is clear. If it's all right with the mover and the seconder we'll provide the information in the best way that we can and hopefully it will be what you are looking for.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. Trips made by each Minister of the Crown from June 23, 1966 to December 5, 1966 to places outside Manitoba at public expense showing: A. Destination; B. Duration of absence, C. Purpose of each trip; D. Cost of each trip; E. When.

2. List of personnel in Government employment who accompanied Minister on each occasion showing: 1. Where; 2. When; 3. Cost.

3. List of persons not in Government employment who accompanied Minister on each trip at public expense showing: A. Destination; B. Purpose of trip; C. Duration of trip; D. Cost of trip to treasury for each individual.

MR. ROBLIN:

MR. PAULLEY: I'm asking the questions.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, the question of "Cost of trip to treasury for each individual" may not be possible to answer in all cases. I recall having dinner with one of the gentlemen that accompanied me, and I can't tell who had the Shrimps Supreme, him or me, so its going to be a little difficult to break that down into individual expenses, but we can certainly provide our honourable friend with the gross.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Another stinky question, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that an Order of the House do issue for Return showing:

1. Cost of Highway Safety program "Robin and Batman" showing costs of: A. T. V.; B. Radio; C. Billboards; D. Newspapers:

2. Advertising agent or agencies from whom purchased.

3. Who authorized purchase of series.

4. Where programs are produced.

5. Author or authors of programs and whether origin of programs are local, Canadian or other locality. And I may ask, Mr. Speaker, if I may, since the programs were first introduced by the Government of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Holy question, Mr. Speaker. I have to point out that the question is improperly worded. It's not Robin, or Roblin and Batman, it's Batman and Boy Wonder. I think it's important to make that clear.

MR. PAULLEY: May I say: Holy Safety, I'm amazed if this is the case.

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

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota) by myself, and seconded by the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye, I move THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. The number of self-addressed manilla envelopes purchased annually by the Manitoba Telephone System, the type enclosed with the telephone bills;

2. The cost of these envelopes per thousand.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member for Hamiota would care to indicate the time period. The Telephone System has been in business for quite a long time.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is quite clear, that I asked the cost per thousand annually. --(Interjection) -- Then the last year would be fine.

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

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. How many permits
2. How many letters of authority for incomplete professional training
3. How many letters of authority above grade-teaching entitlement.
4. Fully qualified teachers were there for: (a) elementary schools; (b) secondary schools under the following categories:
 1. one room schools; 2. two to five room schools; 3. six to ten room schools;
 4. over ten room schools for September to December 1966, and for the past five years? -- meaning the entire year for each of the past five years.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading of Bills. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. ENNS presented Bill No. 7, an Act to amend The Department of Agriculture and Conservation Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, in essence, the purpose of the amendment is to provide means that the Municipal Board may distribute some of the grants to both the municipalities involved and the school areas. If I may just read for a moment, under the Department of Agriculture and Conservation Act, 7(a) may pay a grant to a municipality as compensation for serious tax loss in the municipalities due to the acquisition of lands for the purposes of water control, and in accordance a formula was established by the Lieutenant-Government-in-Council. Now Section 7(b) provides that where a municipality receives a grant under Section 7(a), the Municipal Board shall apportion the amount of the grants among the school divisions, school districts and school areas. It's an omission; it leaves out the municipality, and we are attempting with this amendment to make it permissible to include the municipality involved in this adjustment of the taxes returned.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to oppose the bill but we may have some questions once we reach the committee stage. Is there not here some difference where the boundaries of the school district in the municipality are coterminous and where they may not be coterminous? It seems to me that the bill may in fact not be necessary in certain instances. However, be that as it may, we can discuss that further.

But I am concerned about one feature here, Mr. Speaker, and that is the fact that the bill is to be retroactive. Now, in general principles, I am always suspicious when I see retroactive bills introduced into the House. I don't think that by and large it's good practice for us to make laws that apply, in this particular case almost two years back because this goes to April of 1965, a year and eight months back. Now the Minister may have some very good reasons why this is necessary. There's always a danger when we take a step of that sort that while we may be correcting one situation we are in fact adversely affecting someone else. So I presume when we get to the committee stage we can get a full explanation as to why this is necessary. I would ask the Minister in the meantime to make sure we do have that information available to us to ensure that there is in fact an absolute need to make this retroactive and that there can be no adverse effects on others.

MR. ENNS: I'll be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to take notice of the questions raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and will have these questions for him when we bring the bill into committee.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, there is a point of information - I am not taking part in the debate - that I would like to lay before the members, and that is that this bill will be referred, contrary to our usual custom, to the Committee of the Whole House, because we want to pass this also before the Christmas recess. There are one or two bills of this kind. The minister, I am sure, will have the answer for the member at the time but I just wanted to make that point clear so there wouldn't be any misunderstanding later on.

MR. MOLGAT: If I may, Mr. Speaker, on this point now - point of order. If there is a real urgency to pass this I'm not going to say we shouldn't send it into Committee of the Whole House, but my question then would be, have the municipalities been advised of this? Have they been consulted? And is this being done with the agreement of those who are being affected,

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).... because if we are going to deal with the bill here for the committee stage, we obviously will not be able to hear a representation, and I would like to have the assurance that there are no problems that will arise subsequently that have not been considered and where there hasn't been proper consultation with those involved.

MR. ENNS: Again, Mr. Speaker, we'll take advisement of these questions raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and have this information for him.

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

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 9, an Act to amend The Partnership Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, this is a technical matter. The present provisions of The Partnership Act are being interpreted to mean that in the case of what is known as a limited partnership that if there is in addition to a limited partner a general partner that the name, the personal name of the general partner, must be used in the partnership named. This was never intended when the Act was revised some, I believe, two years ago and this is to make it clear that the name of the general partner, if there is one, is not required in the partnership name as carried by the business.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I have no comments with regard to the intent of the bill itself, but I thought I would take this which seems to me to be the first opportunity to compliment the government. I wanted to make sure that no-one had fainted over that. I think that the innovation of the explanatory note is a good one, and it appears for the first time to my recollection here today. I think it's an improvement in what we've had before, the fact that an explanatory note in a case of this kind indicates where words are added and puts in italics words that are deleted is helpful, and we're not rushed at this time with these bills but when we come a little later in the session we'll probably all be very glad that that innovation has been made. I trust that I may give the credit for that innovation to my honourable friend the Minister who has just moved this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, there's one statement made by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer which sort of set me back, and that was his constant reference to "if there is a general partner." Now, I'm under the impression that there has to be and I'm wondering if he is sure of what he said, although that's not really important as far as this section is concerned, but I must tell him that it's my impression that there must be a general partner.

As to the bill itself, I could only approve of it since my own partner indicated to me the difficulties he had with this section as it was and the problem of having a long peculiar name added to a general business name, so that he instructed me to look out to see that it came in and I'm glad it is here before us.

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

MRS. FORBES presented Bill No. 10, an Act to amend The Planning Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MRS. FORBES: The change from the present Section (3) of Schedule B to the proposed section will permit local authorities in preparing a planning scheme to designate and provide for the reservation of lands required for streets and roads and main thoroughfares which are required to provide adequate thoroughfare connection for future development of the community.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I didn't take very great interest in The Planning Act when it was being passed through the House and I realize that to some extent it simply re-enacted and consolidated some previous legislation, but as is the case in bills of that kind, it carries in it some pretty drastic authority, and because of that I was encouraged to pay more attention to this bill than I perhaps would have under other circumstances.

I realize the principle of the bill - this particular bill - as stated by the Honourable the Minister, but one point has occurred to me that I'm definitely not in favour of, though perhaps some evidence will be adduced later on that will make us feel that it's not as bad as I esteem it to be at the moment. If honourable members will look at the explanatory note they will see that it is provided that reserving land for new thoroughfares that it is desired to keep free from buildings - this is the present Act - was by agreement with the owner or owners of the land. It seems to me that this amendment strikes out that agreement between the owner or owners, and, Mr. Speaker, I am generally unfriendly to that method of acquiring land. I realize that under the Act that the provisions of The Expropriations Act apply, but as you are

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)..... aware, Mr. Speaker, I also have a lot of reservations about the existing Expropriation Act, and the one that last year when we were in session was in the course of being reviewed. So I must say that I would not want this bill to pass this stage without me voicing my disagreement with the removing from the section of what appears to me to be at least an indication of the planning authority being willing to try to come to an agreement with the owners of the property as the case may be.

While I'm speaking of this Act I would like to ask the Minister, either when she closes the debate at this time or on some subsequent occasion, to give us some information with regard to what has happened under our recently passed Planning Act up to date. I would suppose, Mr. Speaker, that most of the requests for assistance in planning have come from municipalities. I don't know that that's the case but I would suppose that they had, and I would like to ask the Minister if she would tell us how many municipalities have made application for assistance under this Act and how many agreements have been entered into. I'd be interested to know what cost is being assessed against the municipality in those cases. I'd like to know too, Mr. Speaker, if some of the government departments have availed themselves of the opportunity under that Act to get assistance on planning, and have there been any requests from the Government of Canada, because I believe that even they are entitled to make requests under this Act.

Mr. Speaker, the Act provides, as I read it, for a Director of Planning. I assume that a Director of Planning has been appointed because the Act not only provides for it, it says that "one shall be appointed". Would the Minister tell us who is the Director of Planning? The Act also provides for a Chief Planner. Have we a Chief Planner? I think that one was not made mandatory and I'd be interested to know.

Then the Act also provides for professional planners, draftsmen, assistants, and clerks who apparently are in addition to these. Could we have from the Minister a report as to what the progress has been up to date under this new Act. This would be simply for the purpose of information. But the principle with which I disagree is the one I mentioned earlier, where it would appear to me from this amendment that we're taking away the opportunity of the owner of the land in question to agree with the authority about the possession of the land by the authority. I must say that I do not intend to vote against the Act going to Committee, but I would appreciate it if some reasons could be provided as to why this change is made.

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

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

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 13, An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, in The Real Estate Brokers Act, provision is made for a form of Offer to Purchase which must be used in the event of the sale and purchase of properties, and there was an exception made in the original statute referring to solicitors preparing these documents, and this amendment which is before the members now simply rearranges that particular exception and adds three others. The three added are the case of a sale to the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and this is put forward because the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation have a form of their own which is much more extensive than the one used or provided for under The Real Estate Brokers Act and which the Central Mortgage and Housing people prefer to use. And two further exceptions - one in the case of a new house under construction; second in the case of a house to be built. There are special provisions that apply in the case of the sale of properties of this nature and it has been recommended to us by the Public Utilities Board who have the administration of The Real Estate Brokers Act that these two further exceptions should be made.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with regard to this particular bill, I believe that from time to time we will find that more and more exceptions are going to have to come forth from the government with regard to an attempt to provide a standard form of contract which is intended to establish the relationship of purchaser and vendor as between two private citizens. I know that the intention of the department, of the government, is noteworthy, that is to protect the interest of the citizen, because of the fact that prior to this form being adopted the various different types of contract were prepared by real estate agents and often it was found that a matter which required protection did not in fact provide the protection that the purchaser thought that he was getting.

(MR. GREEN cont'd).....

My only reference which I'd like to make at this time, Mr. Chairman, is that the use of this form in the manner in which it is being used at the present time is having, in my opinion, an adverse effect on the purchaser, because quite often the real estate people now rely on the fact that this is a government form and this protects you insofar as this purchase is concerned, and that this protection somehow relieves the necessity of a purchaser seeing to it that they are legally protected before they enter into this type of contract.

Now I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the government give some consideration to having this contained on this form, some sort of statement which indicates that the form is an entry by the purchaser into a legal relationship, and that if they wish to know what their legal rights are that they should receive legal advice. Mr. Speaker, I hope you will accept my sincerity that I'm doing this not to increase the business of the legal profession but to see to it that the purchaser is adequately protected, because at the present time the real estate agent takes the form and says, "This is a government form, you don't have to worry about it; it fully protects you." That's not so.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I realize of course that the fact that some agency of the Crown requests something is not necessarily a request that must be automatically agreed to, especially when we're dealing with the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation which is apparently asking for an exemption from the Act. I don't quite appreciate the reason for it except the valid reason which would be that their prescribed form is more extensive. I'm not certain that the form now prescribed by the Board must be adhered to exclusively without any opportunity to enlarge on it, and I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that when this matter appears before the committee he ought to have with him samples of these forms which are used by the bodies which want to be exempted.

Now the CMHC is an agency, just like I suppose the Manitoba Development Fund and it certainly charges more interest rate apparently, so I see no reason why it shouldn't be watched carefully and I think that we should see their form, or at least say here, "where the form is an offer to purchase on the standard form of the Central Mortgage and House," or something like that.

Now I don't know just why offers to purchase real estate where there's building under construction should be exempt, unless it is indicated that those forms must include the information set out. I therefore feel that although we can't ask the Minister now to deal in detail with the reasons, I think he should be prepared to either have someone attend at committee to elaborate on the reasons and the protection which is offered under the Act or bring the form themselves so that we can review them and satisfy ourselves that what he has been told is correct.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C., (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 14, An Act to repeal certain Acts relating to certain Corporations, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: The Corporations listed in Bill No. 14 were all incorporated by a private Act of this Legislature. Their incorporation was repealed in each instance by an Order-in-Council but because there is some doubt as to the legality of that procedure, that is to say the cancellation of the incorporation by an Order-in-Council, it has always been the practice to repeal the Acts of incorporation by an Act of the Legislature and from time to time at previous sessions of the Legislature similar bills have been presented to this House. All of the Companies listed are not doing business in the Province of Manitoba. In fact, some of them never have done business and it is considered advisable to have this statute which makes it quite clear that their Acts of incorporation are cancelled.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, when a charter is cancelled by Order-in-Council, then the responsibility rests with the Cabinet and they can make certain that everyone is protected, as well they should. When it comes before us as an Act to repeal their Acts of incorporation then I think it becomes our responsibility to satisfy ourselves that this is proper, and I would like therefore to invite the Honourable Minister to clarify for us the type of information which was received by this government before it agreed to the repeal of the Act. Now we are having a plethora of bankruptcies of companies which have the trust of peoples. Out in the East we have had a great deal of trouble with the Atlantic Finance and now there is the Prudential

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd).... something or other - I'm not sure which Prudential it is, but it's one which has involved loss for a great number of people. We have the North American General Insurance Company which apparently is bankrupt and not going to honour all its obligations, and I'm certainly not suggesting that any of these companies involved are, and I didn't even look carefully at the names of these companies to see if I would recognize them, but I think that we need the assurance of the Minister responsible that certain enquiries have been made, that certain notices have been given to protect either shareholders or creditors both, and that indeed the requirements that are required under our own Companies Act when a company is wound up, have been complied with in the case of these companies, and again I don't know whether that assurance should be given in the House or in committee but I think it should be given in the House for the records so that we all know what information has been brought. It seems a very casual thing to just vote in favor of it but none of us would rest easy if we thought that by repealing an Act and thus winding up a company somebody has been hurt, and I think we are entitled to the assurance that no one was hurt and that, indeed, people who deal with trust companies - and I see there is a trust company mentioned in here - have been fully protected, because the government has a responsibility in seeing to it that once a company has been established, especially a company which involves trust, - and now I see that there are two trust companies involved - that there has been protection not only during its existence, and I'm not sure just what protection the government offers in that respect, but certainly before they are relieved of the responsibility which was given to them when the bills were enacted.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, maybe it's not quite in order what I'm going to ask of the Minister, but maybe he can give us a general explanation. What is involved when certain charters are to lapse and other parties want to take over a certain charter? Can this be transferred quite readily? Then too, the other question I would like to ask is: is it necessary to give notice through the Gazette of any cancellations of this type of private companies, charters lapsing?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, if there are no further questions I'll be glad to

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Speaker, just one question amplifying that which was referred to by my honourable colleague from St. John's. When the Minister closes the debate I want, if he can, to give reassurance to the citizens of Manitoba that here in our province we are not going to be subjected to such circumstances and conditions as prevailed apparently recently in the province of Ontario in respect of, I believe it was Prudential Trust and North American Finance or some such name. I may not, Mr. Speaker, have the names proper but I do hope that the Honourable the Provincial Secretary in replying to the comments of my colleague from St. John's will give to the people of Manitoba assurances that such an event will not happen here.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, may I say that I share the concern expressed by the Honourable the Member for St. John's and the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and took some steps to assure myself when requested to bring this legislation forward that it was proper legislation. I think the explanation which I am able to give with respect to each company will perhaps answer all the questions that have been raised.

The North American Mortgage Company. This Act - now bearing in mind that each one of these came into existence and we are dealing with them because at some time or other there was an Act of this Legislature incorporating them - the North American Mortgage Company: this Act remains on our Statutes although there has been no registration of this company under the Companies Act since it came into existence in 1909. In other words, it's never been authorized to do business and has not done business since 1909. There is no known record of such corporation for the past fifty years and the successor to the Law Firm which incorporated this Company - that's back in 1909 - cannot find any records of this company of any kind. The repeal of this company's Act of Incorporation was somehow omitted from an earlier repeal of Obsolete Enactments passed in 1938 and we are now bringing it forward.

The Security Trust Company Limited of Alberta. This Company was incorporated under the laws of the Province of Alberta and obtained enabling legislation in Manitoba in 1914 authorizing it to carry on business in the province of Manitoba. It's licence to do business under the Companies Act was cancelled by Order-in-Council No. 44741 May 31, 1926, but the company's private Act was not repealed and remains on the statute and we thought it just as well to clear the records on that one as well.

Bethsada Hospital Society. This corporation ceased to operate its hospital in 1957 and has requested - this is a request from the company itself - has requested that its charter be

(MR. McLEAN cont'd)..... cancelled. The corporation was dissolved under Section 189 of The Companies Act on February 26, 1966, and this is by statute just to make sure that it is properly looked after.

Builders Trust Company. This company was incorporated in 1959 - it is a much more recent one - and did not obtain a certificate of registration within the time limit prescribed by Section 258 of the old Companies Act, now Section 321. As the Company has never been authorized to do business as a Trust Company, it is not possible for it to be in business and it was considered advisable to simply repeal the Act of Incorporation, and it has not done business in the province of Manitoba. It has never been authorized to do so, not having obtained a certificate of registration within the time prescribed by statute.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, just on a matter of procedure. Bill No. 12 was read for the first time and printed. It does not appear on the Orders of the Day. Is this just an omission of a routine nature Yes, we have it. Or is there some reason? It's just an omission is it?

MR. McLEAN: I think that was The Companies Act. I'm assuming that it was just inadvertently omitted.

MR. PAULLEY: That's fine, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 p.m.