

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 p.m. Thursday, May 20, 1971

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: 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 following Bills: No. 9, an Act respecting Local Government in Metropolitan Winnipeg; and No. 15, The Lotteries Act.

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 Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my left where we have 20 cadets and 2 officers of the Queen's Own Cameron Highlanders Cadets under the direction of Captain Gutnick and Lieutenant Robinson. On behalf of honourable members I welcome you to your Legislature.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 15, The Lotteries Act. No. 1--passed; 2--

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Chairman, Section 2 as amended. It was amended in Law Amendments Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 2 to 9 (1) were read and passed.) 9 (2) (a) as amended -- The Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Chairman, could we have the 9 as amended?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Consolidated Fund.

9 (1) The proceeds realized by the commission from time to time from its operations after providing the sums required for the purposes of the commission shall be transferred to the Trust and Special Division of the Consolidated Fund to be used and applied as set out in subsection (2).

Method of using Monies Raised.

9 (2) The Monies deposited into this Trust and Special Division of the Consolidated Fund

(a) may, by Order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, be transferred out of that division into the Revenue Division of the Consolidated Fund to offset generally, or specifically, any expenditure that may be made out of an appropriation for cultural or recreational purposes or both;

(b) may be paid out directly to any group, association, society, organization or body as may be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to be used for cultural or recreational purposes or both; or

(c) may, as directed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, be paid to the Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation and the Corporation may pay those monies to any group, association, society, organization or body to be used for cultural or recreational purposes or both.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 9 2 (a) to 10 were read and passed.) The Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I had given notice at Law Amendments Committee that there would be a motion made before the Committee of the Whole House which required a message from His Honour and I have such a message. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of this proposed amendment recommends it to the House. I will now proceed with the amendment. I move, Mr. Chairman, that Section 11 of Bill 15 be amended (a) by numbering the present section as subsection (1) thereof; and (b) by adding thereto immediately after subsection (1) the following subsection:

Advances for Working Capital.

11 (2) The Minister of Finance with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may advance to the Commission from out of the Consolidated Fund such sums as may be required by the Commission for working capital, subject to such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may provide.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 11 to 15 and the Preamble were read and passed.) The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Just prior to the final passing of this Bill let me just acknowledge in a few words the efforts put forward on behalf of this bill with respect to the Opposition and let me congratulate the government in accepting the wisdom of that advice offered by the Opposition in this particular instance in seeing to, on their own volition at committee stage, in bringing about certain amendments to the bill that we had originally voiced at second reading of this bill.

These were of course namely the position put forward fairly forcibly by the Member for Brandon that the monies so collected should be in fact set aside in a very separate and special fund and allocated for the specific purposes mentioned in the bill. The second suggestion that we had expressed concern about was the limitation factor. We had suggested limiting the government controlled lotteries to three; they suggested four; so we compromised and so we have four lotteries, but nonetheless the fact that many spokesmen for the Opposition made -- the point that many spokesmen made was that there was a concern that we place some limitation with respect to the government activity in this field so as not to dampen the efforts on the part of private organizations from running the various monopolies -- or various lotteries of their own.

So with these few words, Mr. Chairman, let me simply say that contrary to an opinion that is all too often abroad that the debates that take place in this House, the contribution that's made by the Opposition is nothing but breast-beating, we at least are satisfied, Mr. Chairman, on this side of the House, that the debates that we entered into with respect to this particular bill did in fact bring about some changes and some amendments that were important to us. These have been acknowledged by, in this particular instance, a responsible government and we allow this bill to proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Title -- passed; bill be reported. Bill No. 9, an Act respecting Local Government in Metropolitan Winnipeg. (Sections 1 to 4 were read and passed.) The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I take it we are following the reprinted bill, is that right?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I believe what you have is the actual bill. I think what has been passed as amended is the same as the bill the Chairman has, but of course he has to deal with the original bill as amended and this I understand is a copy of what he has, but it's more readable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: If I remember, there were a number of deletions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The deletions are made here. (The remainder of Bill No. 9 was read section by section and passed.) The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): I would just like to make some brief comments regarding Bill 9. This was one of the bills that the Opposition asked us to pass in a hurry at the very beginning of the session. I might say the bill is a completely different bill, and if it hadn't been for the Opposition I'm sure many of the changes would not have been made. In fact we pointed out that much of the bill was unnecessary. The Minister has commented on the fact that the bill was presented as a guide for the cities and municipalities to come in with their budgets as they did. I could imagine this was right but I don't really believe that the municipalities wouldn't have done any different than they have done for many years and that is operate their cities to the best of their ability. I can't really see that we have to have a bill come before us every year to make sure that they do it right and then completely change it. Mr. Chairman, the bill is a completely changed bill. There are still some sections to it that are not quite good but the bill is palatable now and I think that's all due to the Opposition examining it the way they did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I too just want to make some final comments, and that is I oppose Section 6 of the bill on second reading and I still maintain that this particular part of the bill, namely the matter of establishing wards by the Lieutenant-Governor, should not be the case. I feel that this should be part of the bill that will be and has already been introduced -- has been introduced. I feel that that should be defined in that bill and that this should not be the prerogative of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill be reported. Committee Rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Rupertsland, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Bill No. 9, an Act respecting Local Government in Metropolitan Winnipeg, be now read a third time and passed.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The bill before the House is Bill No. 9.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Beard, Borowski, Boyce, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uruski and Walding.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Henderson, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McKellar, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak, Watt and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 26; Nays, 17.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The Honourable Attorney-General.

BILL NO. 15, The Lotteries Act, was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Would you call Bill No. 19, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Page?

MR. GREEN: Page 4.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I rise not to oppose the main principles of this bill but to object to the way that this bill and some of the others are proceeded, although I wish to say with this bill, I should perhaps first of all say that I want to compliment both the federal and the provincial government for the action they took during the winter months, or the winter period or perhaps during the year of Bill 19.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question. I'd appreciate understanding just what the Federal Government had to do with the winter employment program.

MR. BARKMAN: I'm sure the Minister of Finance is aware that very often in cases like this the Federal Government in most cases has implored and wished that they would be involved, and perhaps in the winter unemployment deal they were not directly involved, but if they were I think the principle that I was going to be talking of involves regardless, and while we're not discussing housing right now -- (Interjection) -- right - okay. If the Minister's satisfied now that they have been in nearly every project up to now, perhaps this is an exception. However, I then still leave some percentage of compliment to the provincial government for creating perhaps somewhat a higher unemployment or a better employment situation than usual. I think, though, that perhaps we can even learn or take a lesson. While I commend the intentions in Bill 19, in fact I wonder sometimes if the same technique could not be applied in stimulating or setting up or encouraging industry in Manitoba.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I suggested at the start, I intend to vote for this Bill 19 but I want to voice a very strong objection about something that is taking place in this bill as well as the bill that my colleague mentioned earlier, Bill No. 31, and the same thing applies in Bill 9, Bill 13, Bill 15, Bill 18 and also 31, and Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to the retroactive clause or principle applied in these bills and especially now I'm speaking of Bill 19. Somehow I fear that this government is allowing too much legislation to creep in or crawl into this kind of a category. I have never been one to get technical about rules and regulations, perhaps for two reasons: I'm not minded that way I believe; and secondly, I don't know enough of the rules so that I could perhaps intelligently argue them. But I think something is taking place here that

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) has to be mentioned and, regardless how popular it is, I wish to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I might even say kind of sorry to pick on this Minister just because it happens to be Bill 19, because other than the insurance bill I kind of like his efforts and the way he's applying himself in this department. However, that's not the case, this is not a personal matter; it is a matter that all the government Ministers across the aisle must and should take note. I think it is high time something has to be said about these continual proceedings. To me, this is becoming symbolic of arrogance; in fact just about mockery concerning the responsibilities of an individual as an MLA. I believe it deteriorates the position of members of this House, not only members sitting across but also members on the other side. In fact with this kind of retroactive legislation we've had so often in this session, that really very little can be said that isn't already assumed. In fact it's just about getting to the point when we have six bills out of just a few bills that have been presented this session, and six of these bills or seven are retroactive or asking for retroactive passing. I believe this is serious and I don't think we should adopt this kind of method.

I must admit that there are situation conditions, and perhaps Bill 19 is even closer than some of the other bills where an emergency occurs and perhaps things like this have to be considered, but I think this House, or the government opposite is beginning to make a regular use of this situation and I can't really see the reasoning. I could say that impatience perhaps is soon going to run wild if this keeps up. I don't know, but if this kind of legislation is going to be allowed, Mr. Speaker, I thought it was time for me and I'm glad that my colleague - I was not aware that earlier this afternoon that he would speak about it and I'm glad he did - but I thought it was time that this point had to be brought out. I don't think I have to point out the dangers of continually using retroactive legislation but they're there, the dangers are there, and as I said before, I'll go along with the emergencies but not six out of just a few bills.

I wish this government would take notice, this can be serious because the time is coming if we continue to have retroactive legislation, what is really the reason for us sitting on this side or the reason for the backbenchers when you already assume what is going to be set and already assume that the bill will have to be passed, and unless it's a case of emergency, I don't think we should misuse this type of legislation. As I said, I commend the government as far as the intention, the main principle of Bill 19 is concerned - no objection to that - but I do wish that they will take note that we do not continue having so many bills called on to be retroactive legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable Minister will be closing debate. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Would the honourable member agree to a question? Would the honourable member agree with the point of view expressed by the town of Steinbach Council that this was one of the best pieces of legislation that they had seen this government pass? It was reported in the Carillon News about two months ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: . . . the Minister that the town of Steinbach thought this was good legislation, but knowing the council members of the town of Steinbach, I'm sure that if they'd known about this a little bit sooner they could have taken a little better advantage of the situation. And I think the Minister knows, perhaps knows the members of the Steinbach Council personally, and I think he would have to agree that this is the way they would really wish it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, just a few brief comments. I too would like to emphasize what the Member for La Verendrye has said, that we're passing too much legislation that is retroactive. This has gone on on numerous occasions, and especially at this session, and I think this is just a point where Cabinet assumes the role of acting and bringing about measures and spending large amounts of money, although money was allocated at the last session for certain purposes, and I take it Bill 19 is the machinery whereby they're putting some of those allocations to use. I think there was an allocation of something like 32 million passed at the previous session which was to be used if the economy slackened down further and if the need arose, whereby when the economy was going down that they could bring about programs to provide employment. I actually have no quarrel with that aspect of it, but I feel too that we have too many programs initiated by Cabinet or the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council without having the necessary legislation on our books, and I feel that we should restrict this kind of

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) action by the government from here on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Is the honourable member aware of the fact that the Rural Municipality of Rhineland per capita-wise was among the top five municipalities in the sums received under this program, this retroactive program?

MR. FROESE: I wasn't aware to the fullest extent how much those municipalities availed themselves of it and I'm not complaining of the fact that there was monies spent in this way and that employment was provided. I know of certain projects that these municipalities did and I'm not complaining about that, but I think if the government had this in mind at the last session, and they did because they allocated certain amounts of money, that certainly we could have established some ways and means of doing this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to commend the government in taking the action that they did the past year during the time when it was deemed necessary to do so, but I also share the concerns expressed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, and I think that he has a good point and one that should be kept in mind by the members of the government.

I would like to suggest that one point should have been underlined however and was mentioned only slightly, and that was the fact that the monies allocated were allocated very quickly on the basis of requests submitted by the municipalities and with insufficient time, in my view, to provide municipalities with the time required to do the proper planning. If municipalities were aware of this kind of thing as a possibility, even as a possibility, they could have plans prepared earlier in the year, and when the allocation is made that these plans are put into effect.

One other item I'd just like to mention, Mr. Speaker, is that we are by this action taking a little bit of responsibility away from municipalities and placing it in the hands of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council whether we like it or not, because they are the people who will be equipped to make decisions on whether the projects are worthwhile, whether they should be approved or not. I don't say it's all bad because I think that we have to be prepared to meet crises that do arise from time to time, but I think that this is a dangerous course should we proceed with it too far.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Possibly I could close debate. I would like to simply say to my honourable friends across the aisle that they have made some very valid points. I'm sure that it is the intention of all legislators to avoid retroactive legislation as much as possible if feasible. This type of situation that arose in Manitoba, we were faced with increasing unemployment. We certainly had to choose between really doing nothing at all of any major extent, calling a special session of the Legislature to pass this type of legislation, or, as we did do, and I make no apologies for acting in the way we did do.

The Honourable Member for Emerson indicated that there was possibly a lack of notice or opportunity for municipalities to plan. This too of course was because of the emergency situation. But I would like to make one comment to my honourable friend from Emerson and that is that the municipalities within his constituency really demonstrated quite an example on this program with the very short notice, or very short means of planning that he referred to. The municipalities in his constituency, the constituency of Emerson, received more money under this program than any one of the other 57 constituencies in the Province of Manitoba. In fact the constituency of Emerson received \$200,000 under this program; and I believe, speaking to the Honourable Member from Rhineland, that his constituency too was among the very top constituencies with \$122,000; and La Verendrye - \$139,000, among the top five constituencies in the province. I say this so -- (Interjection) -- the honourable member asked about Rock Lake.

I think that this is a clear demonstration that municipalities did take genuine involvement in this program, that the monies were paid out regardless of political favour, and that special congratulations should go to the people in the municipalities contained in the constituencies represented by the three members that spoke this evening -- (Interjection) -- and the staff, that's correct.

MR. SPEAKER: The question has been debated; the Honourable Minister closed the

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) debate. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: I wonder if the Minister would tell us how much money was allocated, and was all the money spent or what portion of the money was spent that was allocated?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: You know, I hope you're not pinning me down to the exact dollar, but I believe all the monies were spent except for several hundred thousand of the total. It was somewhere between the five million and the five -- I'm sorry, the three million and the 3.5 million that was eventually spent that had been allocated.

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

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item - The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, \$15 million -- The Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Has the Minister got the answers that my honourable leader asked last night regarding the Agricultural Credit Corporation?

MR. CHERNIACK: I don't really recall all that his honourable leader asked, but I do have more information. The Capital authority for the previous year not used was \$8.3 million and the amount now requested being \$15 million totals some \$23 million, of which it is anticipated that in this fiscal year there will be some \$17 million used and a carry-over of 6 million. I might indicate that the Corporation finds that it has to make commitments but that these commitments very often are payable in a future time and therefore it's necessary to have a carry-over to make that possible.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to ask the Minister if he could not indicate to us what portion of the \$15 million will be allocated for direct capital input into agriculture.

MR. CHERNIACK: I just have difficulty understanding what he means by direct capital input.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, if I could just follow up on that. I think I mentioned yesterday to the Minister that the Act actually is two separate sections. One is capital input and one is guaranteed loans through the lending institutions. Is there some breakdown on them?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, whether it's a guarantee or whether it's an actual loan, it still is chargeable to the authority, and the authority cannot forecast nor is it particularly concerned with whether it is a guarantee loan or whether it's a cash advance, except that a guarantee loan can sometimes be worked out on easier terms and therefore there is that option. Therefore, I don't have information as to the forecast of what the proportion would be as to guarantee and what would be cash. In any event, the authority is required for either purpose.

I might say that of the \$17 million approximately that I said they expect to disburse, 3.6 million is in process and was in process at the beginning of this fiscal year; 11.5 million was expected - and I'm reading now - "regular farm loans". Now this would have to include guarantees I am told, but it states regular farm loans - 11.5 million; Corporate and Co-operative loans will be in the neighbourhood of 1.8 million. I had forgotten to give that information and it was requested of me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I didn't know I was given special attention by the Minister of Mines. Is the Corporation not also making loans to fishermen and what portion is set aside for loans to fishermen? Then also I asked the question, I think it was yesterday, once monies are allocated to the Agricultural Credit Corporation the funds are lent out and then repayments are made. Do the repayments consist of revolving fund which are re-lent to farmers?

MR. CHERNIACK: I don't have the information as to the proportion that are fishermen's loans and the capital remains as a revolving fund. The interest of course, the Corporation has to pay interest to the government on its money, but you wouldn't say the principal revolves,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) you say the total income on repayment forms part of the total available cash. Interest has to be paid to the government and under the Estimates of Department of Agriculture, which have already been passed, there's a certain amount of subsidy involved and I'm sure the honourable member knows more in detail than I do about the subsidy which I believe is for the young farmers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item--passed. The Manitoba Development Corporation - \$25 million.

MR. McKELLAR: I'd just like to ask a question on the Development Corporation of 25 million. The policy of the government was changed I think since the last session of the Legislature regarding lending money to small businesses and that type. Is there any estimate on the amount of money there will be allocated to small business loans or is it all in one package? And also, is there any carry-over left from the previous year?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Development Corporation has a carry-over of \$27 million in authorized unused capital authority. There are bank loans, bank loan guarantees amounting to 11.584 million, and loans authorized but not yet disbursed amounting to 12.329 million. That roughly totals some \$23 million. The Corporation is projecting additional new loans during the coming year of between 12 to 15 million dollars based on applications on hand and the experience they've had in the last few months. There is large generation, I understand, of small loans as compared to previous years, but of course in total they can't amount to that much.

With the requested authority of 25 million, the total anticipated use of authority during the year amounts to 38 million, being the 23 or 24 million I've already referred to and another 12 to 15 million, which will leave the authority with some \$14 million for which it can make commitments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was wondering, in listening to the Minister, he said they had guaranteed loans, guaranteed loans from the bank. Does this mean that those that do apply get money from the bank with the collateral being put up from the fund? Is that the way it works?

MR. CHERNIACK: The way it works is that there are occasions when on a short-term basis a lower interest rate can be negotiated with a bank and they are encouraged to do so, in which case they give all their collateral to the bank and the fund will then guarantee the loan and be able to stand in place of the bank in the event that the fund is called upon to pay the money. For this the Fund charges an overriding interest for its services, and whether it's a guarantee or whether it's an actual advance, it still has to be authorized under this capital loan.

MR. FROESE: Does the principle still apply that was laid down with the Credit Corporation, and I think also with the Development Corporation, that if you deal with one of these corporations that you can not deal with any other financial organization, that they have to have all their eggs in one basket so to speak?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think at this stage I should refer the Honourable Member for Rhineland to the Act itself because I am not in a position to go into details of policy of the Corporation, but I do know that there are guidelines in the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item--passed. The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: I'm sorry, this may be an ignorant question, but the Minister mentioned there were charges, an overriding amount on --anoverriding amount of interest. Charges to whom, to the loaner or to the borrower?

MR. CHERNIACK: Borrower.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item--passed. The Manitoba School Capital Financing Authority - \$20 million. The Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Is this School Capital Financing financed by Canada Pension money the same as had been in past years?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I think it's the Minister of Finance - no, it's the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council that has the right to allocate the monies that are received from the Canada Pension Plan and I believe the practice has been and has continued that the School Financing Authority has been charged to that. I could answer that question a little more completely when we deal with my own Estimates because I know I'll have the information exactly available, but I believe that the impression that the honourable member has is correct. Yes, and I have that indication.

MR. McKELLAR: . . . rate on the Canada Pension money still 5 percent or does it vary from year to year?

MR. CHERNIACK: I believe it's monthly. When the monies are received within - I think it's two weeks - we are notified of the rate.

MR. McKELLAR: . . . money, is it for a long period of time - 20 years, 30 years or 40 years or what?

MR. CHERNIACK: 40 years. 40 years of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item--passed. Community Colleges and Frontier School Division - \$4,088,000-- The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: When we speak of community colleges, just to what colleges are we designating this money to?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, the largest amount deals with the Frontier School Division. There are lesser amounts for the Red River, Assiniboine, Keewatin.

MR. FROESE: Could we get the amounts from you?

MR. CHERNIACK: For the Frontier School Division there's an estimated requirement of \$3,015,000, and \$1,073,000 divided amongst the Keewatin and the Red River and the Assiniboine broken down into various smaller amounts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item--passed; Universities - \$7,535,000 -- The Member for Brandon West.

MR. McGILL: Mr. Chairman, I think last Friday a question was asked of the Minister of Finance about the portion of the funds which we might normally have expected to find in the current estimate of expenditures that is now in Education. Do you have that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: The amount set aside for current year's payment on capital construction consists of \$9,108,100 in the Estimates that are before the House under Supply, and before us now is an additional 7.535 million, making a total of \$16.643 million for capital works for the University.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon West.

MR. McGILL: Mr. Chairman, does this represent the government's share of real property in construction or in real estate, this 7.5 million?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I don't know what the honourable member means by the government's share. I don't know who else is contributing to it and this is the amount supplied to the University Grants Commission. Actually, I might say that with a carry-over from the previous year there's an additional 5.7 million, making a total of some \$22 million of total authority, of which of course it may not all be used in the current year but it would be authorized.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition

MR. SPIVAK: Just on this point so I can be correct. You are suggesting there is \$9 million in this year's estimates plus the request for Supply, or there's \$9 million carry-over from last year's supply plus this year's supply.

MR. CHERNIACK: Now the honourable member has himself confused me so I'll repeat it. There is a carry-over from the previous year of \$5.788 million. There is in Capital Supply \$7.535 million, and there is included in the item appearing under the Department of Youth and Education of some \$47 million for universities. Of that portion there is \$9,108,126 million in that resolution.

MR. SPIVAK: Then if I understand what the Member from Brandon West wanted, is there any way in which the government arrived at a breakdown between the \$9 million that is carried in the Estimates and the \$7 million that's requested in Supply? Is there any particular breakdown?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: What was done, Mr. Chairman, was that the amounts were of course estimated and broken down, that is required by the University Grants Commission, and from them to supply us. The item that is put into what we would call the current estimates consisted of minor and miscellaneous capital requirements and projects that are considered most firmly committed and immediate. They were provided under what we would call "current". The items before us now in capital are items which are projected but not as firmly committed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item--passed. For a total of \$31,623,000--passed. That's the total of the three items.

(MR. CHERNIACK: All that's required to be passed is -- (Interjection) - Oh, I see, you've added them up. You're right.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item: The Pas Special Area Agreement - \$2,085,000. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: . . . is it in for . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: The estimates are for the Margaret Barbour Collegiate, the balance required to complete it - \$194,000; Kelsey Elementary School - \$234,000; Opasquia Elementary School - \$172,000. If you want it spelled maybe it would be of help to the -- O-p-a-s-q-u-i-a. Then the others are still being negotiated but appear now to be the Keewatin Community College - \$200,000; Mary Duncan Elementary School - \$400,000; the -- it looks like L-e-g-h-t Industrial Park - \$200,000; the Cormorant road - \$390,000; street reconstruction - \$295,000. I make the point that this is still being negotiated but we need the authority in the event that it is agreed upon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Did I hear correctly? Is that to complete the road to Cormorant?

MR. CHERNIACK: No, no, it's not a commitment. We must bear in mind that in capital supply we acquire the authority, but I don't want to mislead anybody and that's why I made the point that it's still under negotiation. And may I say there's also the possibility, and this has to do with the Federal Government and the whole program, that the monies are being asked to be authorized but that there can be variation in the way that they are disbursed. I don't want to mislead anyone into thinking that these are programs that are committed; they're not. Is that clear? -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable Member for Churchill said it's not clear and I want to make sure. We anticipate that we will require this sum of money. We cannot go ahead without federal concurrence and our own final re-evaluation so that there is none of these items - I mean these particular items that I read - that I can say are definitely committed to go ahead, but we do require that we have the authority to go ahead with these projects or other projects that are agreed upon in replacement for them and that is why all I can do is ask for authority to proceed. How it will be spent has yet to be -- the negotiations have yet to be completed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: May I restate it then, Mr. Chairman, in my own words and the Minister can correct me if I'm wrong. The money allocated for the road, would that be -- they're to negotiate with the Federal Government and with the forestry complex to complete that part? It's an economical necessity for Cormorant and I was kind of interested that that could go ahead.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, it has not even passed government, provincial government approval yet, it is still being discussed but the authority is required. Therefore, it's not just a question of waiting for some federal approval, the whole job, the whole program has yet to be planned out and settled upon and that is why I'm -- you know, I want to make sure that if you don't see something up there that I've mentioned that you don't say we thought we were passing that particular item. But the authority is required.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, these authorizations once passed they do not lapse. They carry on indefinitely and the government can at any time in the future make use of these authorizations. -- (Interjection) - They're not necessarily reported. If the item appears on the list, on the sheet before us, naturally the Minister will comment, but I just wonder whether there are not a number of authorizations outstanding probably on other matters which we're not aware of. But the point is this: I would also like to know whether there is any infrastructures covered by these authorizations and, if so, what is the government's policy in connection with infrastructure for other towns in the province that require such services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, this is all part of the DREE Program; it's shared costing at various percentages and various levels. The authority that is granted would be granted for The Pas Special Area Agreement. It may not be spent in this year but it still is designated for The Pas Special Area Agreement. I think that should answer the honourable member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I think the honourable member has brought up a point that is worthy

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) though and it may be that it cannot be completed before we pass this, but I wonder whether it would not be wise to have a presentation of the capital authority that has not been used for the items that have been passed in the past. I realize you might not have it now but I think it's worthy because I think it would at least, along with this, give us some basis on which to make judgment. And I think in addition to this it would be probably worthy to indicate the capital authority that has been used and how it's been used.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition and of course the Member for Rhineland, and we have been working on that list because there is some unused capital authority from years back which we think should be wiped out, but we just haven't had time to deal with it. Of course there is no urgency for this. I agree that it should be done and I expect that it will be done because it was in our plan. So I agree with him as to doing that and in due course - and I use that word advisedly because I don't think there's a rush about it - it is our plan to review all unused capital authority and bring in whatever means we have to in order to eliminate that which will not be used.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verednyre.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister was speaking of the share basis. What percentage of federal and what percentage of provincial, or is this only referring to the provincial share?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: It is mostly either loan or grant and usually you don't get a grant unless you take a loan as well. It's 50-50 I believe. But they have various -- they negotiate and there are different programs that bring in different percentages.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item--passed. Item - Brandon Special Agreement, \$700,000. The Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could have an explanation from the Minister on what project this covers.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes. This again is a special agreement. It's made up of water supply and treatment, water distribution system, sewage treatment and disposal, sewage collection, storm water drainage, all of which totals \$1.4 million. The recovery from the Federal Government will be half of that and that's why the \$700,000 is the amount of the authority requested.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: You have this special agreement with Brandon. Do we receive applications from other towns as well for services of this type that would be entitled to grants from the Federal Government? I know this came up at a meeting of the Development Corporation in Altona for southern Manitoba and this very question came up in connection with assistance of this type. What is the government's policy, and will they consider applications from other smaller areas as well for this purpose?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should know that the Federal Government declares a region for the DREE grants and they're very limited. The fact is that we have difficulty trying to convince them to accept a DREE program in a certain area so the answer is no. In most cases we get applications and we can't deal with them on this shared basis because the Federal Government determines which are DREE areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item--passed. Item - Churchill Townsite Redevelopment, \$760,000. The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I'm rather interested in this, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to know is the \$760,000 the provincial portion? If it is, would there be another 45 added to that through the federal?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government contributes 55 percent on this program. The total program is \$1.685 million, of which the provincial share net cost would be 45 percent totalling \$758,250.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Could you elaborate further on this expenditure? Is this to go on this winter or next summer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh yes, Mr. Chairman, I do make the point. It's been pointed out to me, this is for this year, this is the estimate for this current fiscal year. It's for water

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)supply, land acquisition, pre-engineering, engineering and architectural design and specifications, and the salary and expense for a project manager.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Before we pass this item, the Honourable Minister mentioned that these monies were being advanced under the DREE Agreement if I understood him correctly. I'm just wondering when we have developments take place in proximity of other towns, and we had a number of industries come up, spring up in the Winkler area, and certainly you have to have layouts and have to have infrastructure and so on. Why could they not qualify under such an arrangement? This is what I want to know. I'm sure that the other towns in the neighbouring area are interested as well. I'm interested in how to go about it in order to qualify. Surely when the Provincial Government can get the Federal Government to come across on a \$10 million deal, I think then we should be able to convince the federal authorities to also contribute and join in with some of the smaller communities in southern Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I can easily understand the Honourable Member for Rhineland's solicitude about Winkler and Altona and Gretna and Rosenort and so on, but the fact of the matter is that Churchill and the agreement with respect to Churchill is a very special case and I say so unabashedly. The fact is that for the past 12 years, possibly 14 years -- (Interjection) -- I think the Minister of Transport is probably more accurate. In a real sense the problem goes back decades, but in a very tangible and specific way there have been discussions and negotiations between the Governments of Canada and Manitoba for the past 12 or 14 years and finally it has been brought to resolution, simply because the Federal Government has such a large presence in Churchill they were therefore not hard to convince that they had a major responsibility to come to an agreement and they finally have. But the arrangement with respect to Churchill, the same factors are not existent with respect to other communities and I don't think it's a good analogy for my honourable friend to use. He can maybe think of other examples to use.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before the honourable member proceeds, I have allowed a certain amount of latitude in discussing this particular item and several other items and the arguments aren't really addressed to the particular item before us. Some of the points that the member is raising might better be directed to the Minister of Finance's Estimates, because specifically we're talking about the Churchill Townsite Redevelopment for \$760,000 and not the government's policy pertaining to redevelopment and their agreement with DREE. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, well, Mr. Chairman, I think the remarks I have made are very relevant. They are talking about services applied to these centers, and now we are talking about Churchill but certainly the government, when they propose such ventures, they are setting a precedent, setting a policy, and I wanted to know what the policy is. I certainly want to congratulate them on bringing forward this agreement on Churchill. It's really something worthwhile, and I have been here in this House for 12 years and from time to time we have had propositions made and nothing ever came about. Now for the first time we see action in this regard, and I want to congratulate them. I congratulate you people on this, and I certainly wouldn't want to deny Churchill any part of this because I think it's long overdue, but I feel that we should have a policy in connection with providing infrastructure services to all communities that need it, and that we have a general policy on this, and this is why I asked the Minister before for clarification on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass. Item, Leaf Rapids Townsite Development - \$2,400,000-- passed? General purposes \$21,252,000. The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman, this happens to be of particular interest to me also, and I wonder whether the Minister could explain what's going to take place in this part of the development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this on Leaf Rapids?

MR. BEARD: Leaf Rapids, yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, on this item for this year, for this current year only, the estimate is divided into site preparation - that is Land Acquisition, site planning, subdivision, design and survey plan registration; Administration of project manager and staff; travelling expense, office and living accommodation; planning, architectural design and specification for public buildings. That totals approximately \$400,000. Construction - there's

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) water supply, the water intake, river pumping, heating and chlorination facility and supply lines; water distribution, uninsulated distribution system, insulated service connections; sewage collection system; sewage disposal system; roads and drainage - make up a total of \$2.4 million for this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Would this capital money be reclaimed from taxation at a future time?

MR. CHERNIACK: There has been a public announcement and it's been referred to in the House, that the townsite development will all be charged as a loan to the, I suppose it's the Local Government District, and will be repayable out of taxation in the normal course, and we have announced that the above surface buildings and facilities of the mine will be assessed and taxed in the normal course under municipal assessment.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman, one further point then. As I understand it, at times the Federal Government will come through with monies for installation of water and sewer programs. Would the government be applying to the Federal Government for monies for this type of . . . ?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I appreciate the member's tip. I don't believe we'll succeed because this isn't a DREE project, but if you have any way of suggesting where we can get some more federal input, we'll be glad to do it and certainly we have heard the point made, and if there is any availability we'll find it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: One question in this connection. Is the Water Supply Board doing any of this work in this connection?

MR. CHERNIACK: No, Mr. Chairman, it's not; it's being done under this program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item passed. Item - general purposes \$21,252,000. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well here, Mr. Chairman, I think I would like the Minister to give us a detailed explanation of what is proposed, and in addition I would like to have an explanation of the capital that was allocated in last year for general purpose, and what remains under that authority.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, last year we passed an authority for general purposes totalling \$30.5 million. This money was allocated, I don't know the extent to which, the detail which is required, but I'll give it in categories.

The Agricultural Services Building \$2 1/2 million - I'm speaking in rounded terms.

The Manitoba School for Retardates, Home for Boys, Home for Girls, Home for Boys Headingley program, minor projects in Corrections and Juvenile Correction Centre \$3.1 million.

Brandon Mental and Selkirk Mental, a total of \$3 million.

Portage Cottage residences, Winnipeg Community Health Centre, Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing, and Mental Retardates' facilities, \$2 1/2 million.

Public Works buildings, of which the major one, by far the major one is in Brandon, \$2 1/2 million.

Winnipeg Auditorium, \$1.4 million.

Fish Hatchery, \$350,000.

Highways garage in Brandon, \$930,000.

School at Steadman, \$300,000.

Hecla Island Causeway, \$865,000.

Various items under Campground Development, 2,4,6,8 of them totalling \$2.1 million.

Hecla Island golf course, \$338,000.

Terminal building and airport at Norway House, \$85,000.

Unallocated general purpose capital, \$57,000. If I'm asked what that one is, I haven't got the answer, on the 57,000.

Grants to regional secondary schools, 3 million.

Highway Construction - now, that question was asked earlier as to what was in capital for highway construction. There's \$7 million which I'm sure honourable members will recall was the amount last year set out and is being carried forward, and when I deal with the current authority you will find that there is nothing for highway program in the current authority. The \$7 million was carried forward from last year's Capital Supply, the purpose being that the department should have the authority to commit itself to a program for the following fiscal year

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) during the previous fiscal year, so that the department will be able to take advantage of early spring, early tendering, and the fact that during the winter months the contractors are liable to make a better deal than they are in the height of the season. So that if I may deal -- and that's the end of this list of \$30.5 million - if I may just conclude on the question of highways. The answer to what was said, and the Honourable Member for Riel spoke about it today, the capital authority required for this ongoing program for highways is a carry-forward from the previous year. You will find there is no additional item in the item before us today. So this is the report of last year - that was one question.

The other question was the breakdown for the amount before us today, which totals \$21,252,000. This is a general purpose item and like I've earlier described, this amount is what is estimated or expected and this is the authority to proceed; what is forecast as being the kind of item that would come under general purposes. Under the Attorney-General, the Magistrates Court Building, which has been with us, it seems to me, year after year, \$2.25 million. Again I'm speaking in round terms. Consumer and Corporate Affairs, for equipment in the Queen's Printer, close to \$100,000. The revolving fund for loans to Indian and Metis cooperatives \$400,000. Health and Social Development for a rather expensive list totalling \$10.5 million. Industry and Commerce for Community Economic Development Fund, \$1 million. Mines, Resources and Environmental Management for a logging revolving fund for fisheries redundancy, for airstrip and dock construction, \$1.8 million. Public Works total of \$4.7 million. Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs, roughly a quarter of a million dollars in connection with Hecla Provincial Park. Youth and Education, well, \$37,000. Total: \$21,252,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I think now, in view of the explanation, I think if the Minister would be prepared, I think we should go through them item by item because there are a number that require some explanation before we should be asked to pass this. There obviously are some policy items that we're not aware of that are involved in the capital requirements, and we should have at least some knowledge of their explanation before we are asked to approve them. In addition, I think the \$10 million which is on Health and Welfare requires some more detailed information. But certainly, as an example the Industry and Commerce \$1 million, I don't know what you're referring to and I don't think anybody on this side does, because there has been no explanation given in the House for that kind of a requirement.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I dealt with the Attorney-General and the Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Cooperative Development . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Just on . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Would you like . . . yes?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, just on the Consumer and Corporate Affairs. You mentioned \$100,000, I think, something . . . that's for capital equipment required by the Department, I assume.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, the Queen's Printer - \$91,000.

MR. SPIVAK: Is it normal for the Department to buy capital equipment and to go through a borrowing rather than to charge it as a general expense through the normal expenditures?

MR. CHERNIACK: I don't know whether I can say that it's normal. All I know it came in under Capital Supply and I for one don't object to it. It's obviously for equipment that will last some time. That's the way it came in and certainly there is equipment that does come in to Capital Supply. It's a one time in terms of length of time because it's not replacement equipment, it's new equipment for expansion in the Department.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, may I ask, has this House before passed by way of Capital Supply equipment for the Queen's Printer?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I'm afraid I have to ask the Leader of the Opposition what his recollection is because I'm not aware that I can say that it has or has not.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, it's a matter of \$100,000 in relation to the \$91,000. In relation to the \$20 million it may seem small but my understanding in the normal practice is that equipment requirements are purchased and are considered part of the expense of the operation of the department and are not capitalized, and I find it strange; I really would like to know and it may be that you'll have to get the information from the Minister of the Department whether this has been the past practice or whether this is something new.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I suggest that this item could well be dealt with under the estimates of the Minister for Consumer Affairs. It's \$91,000 and it seems to me this could well

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) be dealt with there and he would probably be in a position to answer the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: There's a principle involved here. These items do not appear in the estimates, do they? So how are we supposed to discuss them? There are some other items that I am interested in because there is \$3.1 million for Headingley institution, I think, or . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: May I interrupt. I agreed with the -- I do agree with the Leader of the Opposition that we could deal with them item by item and we will come to that one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I think that the point of question and obviously the point that has to be raised would be that if in fact in the capital supplies to be presented only this is the first of maybe a series of items that we are going to be questioning, if we were to find in our opinion that there are many items that are normal expenditures that have been capitalized, then it has a direct bearing on the budget that's been presented by the Minister of Finance and for that reason, rather than get involved in a speculation, I would prefer if this information was determined as to whether this is a normal practice to capitalize this equipment, whether this has been done in the past or whether it's followed through as an expenditure.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, in my short term of office in this Department, I have found that normal practice is something that one puts quotation marks around because it changes and has changed from year to year and from time to time, and therefore I don't feel that it's necessary to go back to check on equipment in the Queen's Printer as whether purchases in the past were charged under current or capital. You know, I really think it's sort of academic. There's no question it affects the budget, no question about it, and that's why when I presented the budget to the House, I indicated the total requirement which I think is a much more important figure; nevertheless I quite agree with the honourable member that \$91,000 in this case, I would only assume that either the Department or Management Committee referred this to a capital item and that's where it is.

MR. SPIVAK: Well again, is there a particular item, is this a particular item that can be considered as an item that should be capitalized because of the nature of the particular equipment that's being purchased, or is it a matter of a shift that was determined by Management Committee because of the necessity of trying to balance the budget? And if that's the case, then this is fine but at least we should know that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member must know that one cannot tell him what is in the minds of various people when they make a decision. What I'm informed in this particular case is that this is in payment for equipment which is not replacement but is additional to the existing equipment for a larger requirement and therefore the honourable member knows that it can be considered a proper capital item. It could also be considered, if one wants to look at it, as being payable under current expenditure. He must know that the previous government on occasion called Highways capital and at other times called Highways current, and that's a judgmental decision. In this case, clearly the \$91,000 was considered a capital item.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I must tell the Minister that I think there's a difference between calling the Highways capital and calling a piece of equipment capital if in fact the past practice had been for the equipment to be considered an expenditure. I wonder if the Minister of Finance can tell us what is the nature of the equipment in particular. Surely we're entitled to get that information.

MR. CHERNIACK: I know that the honourable member doesn't think much of my ability to handle my job and, if this is his position, then I suppose it will help him if I tell him that I don't know what the equipment is that is proposed to be purchased for \$91,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman, I'm possibly going to range a little out of line because I realize now that the Department of Agriculture and Cooperative Services has been completed, the estimates. But could the Minister tell me about the \$400,000 that's allocated for Cooperative Services? Would the Treaty Indians have an opportunity to apply for this fund and, if so, would the Chippewyan Band considering moving from Churchill to Duck Lake, would they be able to apply for cooperative monies for this type of a move?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I heard just part of the honourable member's question but the concept involved here with this particular item has to do with the \$100,000 existing Co-op Revolving Loan Fund which has been in existence for quite some time and it relates in turn to an Act of this Legislature passed back, I think, in 1929, the old Wheat Pool Money Trust Act, and the monies from that have been used in the past few years for the encouragement and developmental expenses with respect to cooperatives, especially in northern Manitoba and mid-northern Manitoba and communities of native people, and it's sort of really providing seed money for resource development co-ops, pulpwood co-ops, fish co-ops and so on, and it's being expanded now by a factor of 400 percent simply to give more muscle to an effort to encourage the development of co-ops among native people and in some of the more remote communities of the province.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman, just one point then. Would the Treaty Indians be considered native people under this Act? In other words, while the Federal Government are responsible would they be able to apply?

MR. SCHREYER: That's correct, Mr. Chairman, although in many cases the approach by a Band Council would be to the Department of Indian Affairs. In some instances, in some cases, they have availed themselves, Band Councils have availed themselves, of monies available from this Co-op Revolving Loan Fund, and there's no prohibition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I couldn't get the figures down as the Minister read them out - it was a little too fast - but if I caught the figure correctly there was 1.8 million for fishermen's redundancies - I think there were some other things included in that item. Has the government by now made an assessment as to how much will be required for these redundancies so if they know the . . . ?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition suggests we wait until we get to its areatum and, if the Honourable Member for Rhineland is willing, then we can let it . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we are going through item by item I haven't got a copy of the items that we're proceeding with, so -- \$21,252,000 -- passed?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the next item deals with the \$10.5 million under Health and Social Development, and the Committee would be interested in knowing what monies are being set aside in the expectation that we can start those programs. That's only for this current year. There's a psycho-geriatric centre planned for \$1.7 million; Brandon Hospital for Mental Diseases, some \$600,000; Selkirk Hospital for Mental Diseases - \$400,000; Manitoba School for Retardates at Portage la Prairie - \$960,000; St. Amant Ward - \$1 million; A. R. M. Industries, Brandon - \$150,000; Office and clinical space northern Manitoba - \$45,000; child psychiatric centre - \$100,000; Headingley Correctional Institution - \$1.2 million; Brandon Correctional Institution - \$1.5 million; The Pas Correctional Institution - \$2.5 million; and the others, miscellaneous, a total of about \$200,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman, the Minister was giving these sums a little too fast for us to keep up with him. Could he go back to the child psychiatric centre, please, and start over?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: \$100,000 -- it'll all be in Hansard.

MRS. TRUEMAN: . . . after that, please.

MR. CHERNIACK: Headingley Correctional Institution - \$1.2 million; Brandon Correctional Institution - \$1.5 million; The Pas Correctional Institution - \$2.5 million, and then I said miscellaneous for about \$200,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Finance can explain; he said A. M. R. and then he said space for \$150,000 and space for \$45,000.

MR. CHERNIACK: That item is \$150,000.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Finance will explain what that is.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm trying to remember and I fail.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, possibly the Minister of Health and Social Development could. I think . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: I'll undertake to notify the House of this as soon as I can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I assume that we are going to have that reported to by the Minister but can he indicate -- there is space allocation for \$45,000, is that rental? Is that renovation? -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I see. I'm sorry, I misunderstood that. I didn't realize that. I was referring to A. M. R. and you were referring to both A. M. R. and the space, is that right?

MR. CHERNIACK: A. R. M.

MR. SPIVAK: A. R. M., I'm sorry. While I'm on my feet, I wonder if the Minister could indicate, he has some capital authority from last year for . . . the mentally retarded, and he has requested for an additional authority. Is this the same project, the same effort, the same work, or not?

MR. CHERNIACK: Which item are you referring to?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I think you had \$960,000 prior to the St. Amant in your list. Unfortunately . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: No, the amount that I'm giving is the expected expenditure for the current year.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. Well, then, let me put it this way. Of the \$30.5 million that was asked for for general purposes last year, has all of that been spent?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I indicated, Mr. Chairman, that the \$7 million is being carried forward for highway construction.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, has the \$23 million that was allocated last year been spent?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, it's been set aside for that purpose. Whether it was actually paid out or not, I wouldn't know. All I know, it's committed.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder whether it would be possible to get some explanation of those projects under the general purposes that were approved last year of \$30.5 million, that have commenced, where they stand in the nature of construction; how much in fact of the authority of last year has been used; how much of the authority will have to be used for this year; so that we have some idea of seeing the perspective of this public -- of essentially what was a Public Works program.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I think that the member has misunderstood me. I said that all of the \$30.5 million has been allocated and authorized, and I have capital account numbers opposite all of them. I just didn't want to take the responsibility of saying that the money was actually disbursed, but it is allocated and, as I say, there is the capital account number set opposite it so that it's either disbursed or committed for disbursement -- the full amount except for the carry-forward that I've referred to.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, the question would be whether the Minister of Finance could indicate how much of the amount was actually spent in the fiscal year '70-71, how much of it remains to be spent in this fiscal year notwithstanding the fact it may have been authorized.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes. Well, I don't have that information available at this stage.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if then the Minister then would consider bringing that material for us. I think it's germane; it's germane to the whole question of the Public Works program.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the proper place for that would be under Public Accounts. Then the information would be available. This is monies which was authorized last year that the member is now referring to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, we will deal with the public accounts of this year, this past fiscal year, approximately a year from now. Now my purpose, Mr. Chairman, is to determine whether the general purposes capital account that was authorized last year and which was announced as a total part of the government's program to in fact stimulate the economy, was used in the fiscal year of '70-71. I recognize that many of these projects may have been started but I think it's germane to the discussion of the government's total public works program

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) to know how much of this was actually spent in the fiscal year '70-71, how much of which still must be spent in this year notwithstanding the fact that the authority may have been used or the commencement of the work may have begun.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I fully agree that it's a matter of interest and something which could be reviewed and discussed and reported on, but I don't think that it's relevant to this year's, to what is before us now. May I indicate that I redeemed, in my own mind redeemed my own knowledge or sense of knowledge by giving a breakdown of the \$91,000 for the equipment for the Queen's Printer. There is a web fed press for \$15,000 -- I have a note on that if the honourable member is interested in hearing more about it, but no doubt he knows what that type of equipment is so that he wouldn't want to enlarge on it. There is an automatic colorator for \$20,000. There's a magnetic tape Selectric typesetter - \$6,000. There's capital funds for office machines of \$50,000.

I also have an additional bit of information. The A.R.M. Industries for \$150,000 is under Rehabilitation of the Mentally Ill and Physically Handicapped and is monies required to provide additional workshop area and renovation of existing physical plant.

MR. SPIVAK: Let me just deal with the Queen's Printer's allocation. I wonder if the Minister is aware of what equipment the Queen's Printer now has, how much of it was originally capitalized when it was first purchased, and how much of it or what amount was originally put through as an expenditure. And further, Mr. Chairman, I repeat again, and the Minister of Finance may not think that it is important but I do think it's important, I do not have in front of me the speeches that were made in connection with the \$30.5 million that was requested for general purposes by the government, but I do know that it was part and parcel of a government program which they took great credit for. Now, I would like, and I think it's necessary, for us to make an evaluation at this time of the government's efforts in terms of stimulating the economy, to know specifically how much of the capital that was authorized was actually spent in the fiscal year '70 - 71, and I do not think that we have to wait for next year for that determination. I recognize that the Minister may not have the information in front of him, but surely that information can be made available to us.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. I had no intention of suggesting that it has to wait a year, and when I mentioned public accounts I didn't have in mind the fact that we do run a year late on that. No, I would suggest that under my estimates in Department of Finance would be the proper place and the honourable member no doubt knows that I'm due to deal with my estimates as soon as we complete the Urban estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that now would be an appropriate time because there is obviously in the capital requirements under general purposes, for this year, amounts that have to be added to the amounts of authority asked for last year, which would mean that projects have in fact been either started or in the process of being completed which would combine both amounts, and I think we should have some idea of what they are and I also believe, and I again repeat, Mr. Chairman, that we have a right to know how much of the capital requirements of 30.5 were actually started and how much of it was used in the fiscal year '70 -71.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, we can bat this ball back and forth like ping pong but the fact is that we are now dealing with Capital Supply Bill, and the information which the honourable member feels he should have I agree that he should have it, and I indicated that he would have it when we deal with my estimates when I have that kind of information - that is, monies that were authorized last year. Now, he can say all he wants to say but the fact is that we are now dealing with Capital Supply for this year and I am not required or expected, I think, to have all the information that the honourable member might want that does not relate to this. I do have the information dealing with the matter before us; I'm prepared to give as much as I can. The questions he wants answered I think he's entitled to answers, but I say that the proper place would be under my estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: In respect to the \$2.5 million for the Correctional Institute at The Pas, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know whether this is for additional accommodation and, if so, could we have the numbers that it would accommodate when it's completed, and is it going to be completed this year?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, on that there is a question of getting confirmation from the Federal Government and I can't make a statement that it definitely will be completed

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) this year. We want the authority so that we can continue negotiations with the Federal Government -- and it's for new facilities.

MR. BEARD: Could the Minister indicate -- would he like to indicate at this time how many persons it would accommodate?

MR. CHERNIACK: No, I don't think I can give that information out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't here for the outset of this questioning on this particular item of the Capital Supply, but I was here certainly long enough to express some amazement at the fact that the Honourable Minister doesn't have at his fingertips, at least in round ball park figures which we would be prepared to accept on this side of the House, some of the specifics as to how the \$30 - odd million that was so loudly proclaimed by the government for such a worthwhile business of providing for additional projects last year, winter works projects, etc., that I would think that any number, in fact any members of the back bench could get up and supply us that information. I would think that this surely should be in the arsenal of the government in terms of their general information for the good works that they loudly proclaim that they are doing for the people of Manitoba. And so I find it a rather strange exercise that we're going through when my Leader is attempting to solicit from the person, with the aid of the First Minister and the aid of the Minister of Health and Social Development, the aid of the House Leader, but he can't answer just a few basic and fundamental questions as to what extent the monies so loudly heralded that were asked for last year for capital works projects and how they were spent.

I'm sure the Minister of Transportation could get up and tell me what monies he spent in his Department in aid of unemployment, in aid of native employment and other things, and I would kind of suspect that surely the Minister of Finance, the keeper of the finances of this province, can do the same - can do the same. So I rather, you know, express a little bit of amazement and puzzlement at the kind of ping pong game that's going on at this particular time between the Minister of Finance and the Leader of the Opposition, my Leader, in what appears to become a deliberate refusal on the part of the government to indicate, in fact we're trying our best to give you a platform to tell us the good works that you performed last winter.

Now, you announced the initiation of the works; you announced the dollars that you were prepared to put into the works. Well, I'll sit down right now if you'll answer the questions that the Leader of the Opposition's asked of you not once - twice, three times, and I'll sit down right now and I'll ask my Leader to stand up once again and repeat his questions, once again to repeat his questions and simply ask for some acknowledgement, some breakdown of the 30, 2, I think \$30.2 million, \$30.5 million that was allocated, given into your hands, into your trust, into your stewardship for good reason, and I'm sure, I'm sure that you had good reason and you had the support of the public at large to spend these monies in view of the situations that we faced, and now surely, Mr. Speaker, I need not encourage the government nor this Minister of Finance to get up and tell us how he spent that money.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the Honourable Member for Lakeside spoke as long as he did because it gave me an opportunity to regain the temper which I was about to lose. The pompous manner in which he delivered his protestations just overwhelmed me for a while.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we didn't spend it all and still have the success we did in reducing the unemployment problem and the impact that we were facing in Manitoba, and last year when I asked for permission, for authority for \$30.5 million, I said then I hope we won't have to spend it all but, if we do, we want the authority so that we can go to work. Now the fact is that all of this money has been committed and I don't know whether it all has been disbursed - that's the point I'm making. But in doing what we did, we generated some millions of dollars of work activity in this province of which we have great reason to be proud, and we are proud of that.

Now to make these protestations about answers, I have sat in this House for longer than either of the two Honourable ex-Ministers, and during that time I don't believe any Minister of Finance has been asked to go into as much detail on capital finance as was asked today and the other day, and I don't object. That's your job and you do it and I try to answer you. But for you to make these great protestations of indignation demeans the former Cabinet Ministers who I will say never were consulted - I would guess that the Cabinet Ministers were never consulted in the past when Capital Supply was brought forward. I would guess that this matter of Capital

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) Supply was brought in in a routine way and dealt with in that way. I commend them for asking the questions they did but it ill behooves them, I think, to try to accuse me of not having answers to questions which I have no reason to expect. As a matter of fact, when I spoke to the Honourable Member for Morris the other day and I said I would like to bring in the Capital Supply because it's urgent - I've learned now every time I say something is urgent, then the Opposition feels it's its job to delay as long as possible, and Bill 9 is a good example.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact is, and we accomplished our purpose in spite of the attempts by the Opposition to defeat us, and now, Mr. Chairman, we find that, after having spoken to the Honourable Member for Morris and saying that I thought that we could handle this in half an hour unless there was any particular problem, and was given the definite impression there was no problem, I proceeded without the information which I have today. Now the Leader of the Opposition has cutely come up with a question dealing with last year's Supply Bill and now I get indignant protests that I don't have answers relating to last year's Supply Bill. The fact is I gave a breakdown; I've stated that it's all committed; I've stated that all but the \$7 million, which is being carried forward, is fully committed for specific projects. Now he wants to know how many dollars was expended on any particular item. I said by all means he's entitled to the answer but he should get it at the proper time, which is under my estimates. Now we're dealing with this year's capital authority. If they don't like it, if they object to it after answers are given, then of course they'll vote against it, and that I think would be the proper way that one should deal with this. Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the House is now adjourned and will stay adjourned until 10:00 a. m. tomorrow morning (Friday).