



Third Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

28 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



VOL. XXVII No. 62

2:30 P.M. Wednesday, May 16, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, May 16, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, I should like to announce that the Friday, 10:00 a.m. issue of Hansard, No. 59A is being reproduced. Apparently there was a page missing from it.

I also took under advisement a point that was raised by the Honourable Member for Logan, and I have checked the tapes and the wording that is printed in Hansard is correct, and so there will be no correction made.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Progressive was the word, as applied to this Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery, where we have 25 students of Grade 6 standing from the Robert H. Smith School. This school is under the direction of Mrs. Hanna, and the school is in the constituency of River Heights.

We also have 18 students from Gananoque High School in Ontario. These students are under the direction of Mr. Guy Valentine and Mrs. Kurvitz. These students are the guests of the Honourable First Minister.

We have 11 students from Fisher Branch Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Dan Pona. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George.

We also have some students from the Nellie McClung Collegiate under the direction of Ms. Betty Mueller. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here today.

The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Then I do want to make a correction. What I meant to say was regressive, not progressive.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the 40th Annual Report of The Civil Service Superannuation Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable minister copies?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes I have. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement at this time. It's in relationship to Canadian Bronze Company Limited, and the Stop Work Order.

Lead-in-air surveys carried out over the last several years at Canadian Bronze have demonstrated the ongoing problem with excessive levels. In spite of the company's extensive modifications to the workplace, excessive lead-in-air levels still exist. The Department is deeply concerned over the detrimental effect that this continued exposure to excessive lead levels has had on the health of the workers. Accordingly, a stop-work order has been issued on the foundry operations of Canadian Bronze Ltd., and will be in effect until changes in the working procedures are that which will render the workplace safe for the workers.

The company has been requested to submit proposals that will permanently reduce the lead-in-air levels to presently acceptable standards. Any such changes made to protect the workers' health

must be certified by a physician as being safe and that the safety procedures themselves will not have any harmful side effects on the workers. The stop work order will be withdrawn or discontinued by the Director after the company submits a satisfactory proposal for abatement to the Director. Since worker attitudes and behaviour play a significant role in the absorption of excessive lead, the department has recommended that the company consult with the Safety and Health Committee on the proposed changes. The stop-work order is effective immediately, subject to the time required for a safe, orderly shutdown of the foundry operations. The department will continue to work closely with the company management and the workers to ensure that corrective measures will be implemented, with a minimum disruption to the affected parties.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, in light of the statement by the Minister, Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be somewhat brief. We are pleased to see that affirmative action is finally being taken after numerous occasions in this House, and we've raised this issue, going back to nearly a year ago. During that year, I might add, the workers' health in that foundry has been jeopardized and it is something that we have time and time again told the government, and we are pleased to see that action is finally being taken. We also would like to, at this point, raise a concern as to the economic impact this action will take on the workers involved in working at Canadian Bronze, and would ask the Minister to clarify in detail, probably during the Question Period, what arrangements are being made so as to assure that they will not be the ones that have to pay for the continued abuse and continued pollution of our environment and our work sites by the company called Canadian Bronze Co. Ltd. It's unfortunate that in many instances, when action such as this is taken, that it is the workers that bear the economic brunt of any action taken. So we will be pressing the government, not only to clean up other work sites in the province that have the same problem, but to do so in such a manner as to have the least economic impact on the workers who depend upon those industries for their livelihood.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 30, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act. (Recommended by Lieutenant-Governor)

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, before we embark upon Oral Questions, I rise to move the Motion of Condolence with respect to the late Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, Robert Ashley Steen, who died last week, and whose passing left a great void in the political life of this province.

Many in this House will remember, Mr. Speaker, that Bob Steen sat as a member here from St. Matthews constituency from June of 1966 to June of 1969. I remember him quite well sitting approximately where his brother now sits in this Legislative Chamber. He acted for a while as the Whip of the government party at that time. Many members, such as the Member for Inkster, the Member for St. Johns, the Member for Seven Oaks, the Member for St. Boniface, on the other side of the House, the Member for Kildonan, and many on this side sat in the House at the same time as Bob Steen.

I knew him of course, years before that, because we were associated with the same political party for many many years and he was one of those people of whom I think it could be said that politics was his life. He enjoyed it, he revelled in it, in all aspects of it. On the organization side, he worked as an organizer, he worked as a young man — he started out of course in the Tuxis Parliament — and it seems to me in my recollection of the activities of our political party in this province that I can't remember an occasion since the war when Bob Steen was not active in one way or other with the political party which I have the privilege to lead.

He was one who was destined to get into active politics either at the local, the provincial, or the federal level, and indeed did serve with distinction both in this House and latterly on the City Council and then ultimately, as the Mayor of our city.

First of all he was elected to the pre-Uncity Council in 1969. In 1971, he was elected in the Westminster ward of the amalgamated City Council and re-elected by acclamation in 1974.

He was born, of course as we know, the eldest son of Dr. and Mrs. M.R. Steen, and as we all know his brother sits in this House at the present time as the Member for Crescentwood.

The Mayor is reported to have said that his interest in politics was first aroused at the age of 15, in 1948, when he heard John Diefenbaker give a fiery speech in Winnipeg during the campaign for federal Conservative party leader. I attended some of those meetings, Mr. Speaker, I was not as young as the man to whom we pay honor today, but I attended some of those meetings; I heard some of those fiery speeches, and I can well understand how a person with Bob Steen's interest in politics could have become inflamed to the point where he took up the cudgels of active politics as he did from that day forward.

He served on City Council on the Executive Policy, Environment and Finance Committees, he was president at one time of the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities, an executive member of the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, a former Chairman of the Winnipeg Police Commission. He was a member and chairman of the Misericordia General Hospital Board of Directors, which was a position I know that was very very close to his heart, and of course, he died in that hospital. He was a member of the Board of the Winnipeg Art Gallery, the Winnipeg Convention and Visitors' Bureau, he was a member of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation. He was very active in the Masonic Order, and in the Khartum Temple Shrine, and was also a member of the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews.

He was a past president and honorary life member of the Conservative Club of Greater Winnipeg, a member of DeMolay, and a past master counsellor; and last year he received DeMolay's highest award, the Legion of Honour.

As a youngster, he was the Premier and Speaker of the Manitoba Tuxis and Older Boys' Parliament, and served on the advisory boards to Provincial Education and Municipal Affairs Ministers.

Mr. Speaker, what I am outlining I know is known to many members of this House, and it goes to reinforce what I said at the beginning of my remarks, namely that he was a person whose whole life was given to service to others through the particular arm of public service that each one of us in this House knows so well. He was a dedicated public servant in every sense of that word.

At the time of his death he was only 45 years of age. But one has to recall that in those 45 years, as the Right Honourable John Diefenbaker said the other day, he had packed in more experience, more activities, in political and public life, and in service to others, than many can achieve in a lifetime. I believe Mr. Diefenbaker made mention of the fact that, when he was 45, he still had not been elected to parliament. And so we begin to see that in 45 years, Robert Steen made an uncommonly fine contribution to his fellow men and women in this province, and in particular in his latter year and a half as the First Citizen of our province.

Mr. Speaker, I read from a statement that I gave the other day, following Mayor Steen's death. I said that: "The province was mourning the loss of our capital city's First Citizen. Although a young man, he had served in public offices and a wide variety of community services all of his life. His dedication to his fellow citizens was total, and complete. It was his life.

His last fight was his greatest. The example he gave of faith, strength of will, and concern for others, is the most fitting and lasting testament to his life." And then I went on to express the condolences which we will later move formally in this motion before us.

And I think for those of us who were privileged to meet with him during the last two months of his terminal illness, one could not leave that hospital room without being impressed by the spirit of the man. And he was fighting it to the end, and his spirits were maintained, as God gave him the strength from day to day, to greet visitors and to be with them, to talk about the affairs of the province, and the affairs of the city. He kept his active interest in life right up until the last moment.

And so we do pay tribute today to one of our number, who has served, in an extraordinary way, the people of this province. And we do, of course, say to his wife, and to his two sons, to his parents, to his brothers, that they have the heartfelt sympathy of all of us in this House.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness, but with honour, that I move this Resolution: That this House convey to the family of the late Robert Ashley Steen, 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, the motion is seconded by the honourable, the Member for St. Matthews.

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

MR. LEN DOMINO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I was not one of those fortunate enough

to sit in this House with Bob Steen while he was still a member of this Legislature. However, my association with Bob Steen goes back some fifteen years to the very earliest days of my own political involvement. We first met when I was still a high school student and I certainly was a complete political neophyte at that time. Bob was one of the first politicians that I got to know personally. In the early days of my political involvement he served as a teacher and as a friend.

As a youth it often appeared to myself and my friends that politics was full of old men and that cynicism was all too common. Bob Steen offered an example to us. He never tired of telling us that there was room in the Legislature and there was room in political life for youthful ideas, for youthful people and for a new clean approach. And by his very own actions, the fact that he was a very young man himself when he was first elected to this Legislature, he showed the way for us. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that without doubt that I wouldn't be in this House today if it hadn't been for the guidance and encouragement of Bob Steen during my early years in politics.

He was a good team player; he sat in this House as a member of the Progressive Conservative Party, a member for the same riding that I now represent, St. Matthews. He was a close associate of another fine gentleman who I had the privilege of meeting a few years ago, Dr. W. G. Martin, who is another distinguished Member for St. Matthews. Indeed, Dr. Martin was the minister who married Bob and Irene and Bob served as a campaign manager for Dr. Martin in his three successful campaigns 1958, 1959 and 1962. And then in 1966 when Dr. Martin retired, Bob succeeded him as Member for St. Matthews. But he was certainly capable of going beyond the partisan politics. For most of his selected political career he spent on City Council as a Councillor and as a mayor and he sat as an Independent person.

For many years he lived in that part of Winnipeg where — which is now known as the West End and his overwhelming interest during all the years that I knew him was in the betterment of his neighbourhood and the betterment of his city. He wasn't what you'd call a flashy elected representative. He certainly would never be accused of being what we sometimes refer to as a headline hunter, but he sought always, sincerely and quietly to preserve and improve Winnipeg's older neighbourhoods, neighbourhoods for which he had a personal attachment.

Mr. Speaker, I've always thought of Bob Steen as being the little guy's politician. For all of his political career he fought for the little guy. Those men and women, often of modest means who lack powerful friends. But with Bob Steen as an MLA and with Bob Steen as a member of City Council and with Bob Steen as a Mayor of the city of Winnipeg, the little guy always had a friend. He always had someone who would go to bat for him. For Bob understood, I think better than any politician I've come across, he understood the importance of neighbourhoods and he understood the problems that were important, problems that were of immediate concern to older neighbourhoods in the city of Winnipeg.

I can often remember him telling me that it's not the grand buildings or the big schemes but it's the day-to-day problems that make or break a neighbourhood, that make it a nice place to live or that make it a place where you want to move away from.

When problems arose — and on many occasions I dealt with Bob personally — when problems arose, problems that were important to the people in the neighbourhood; problems, little problems in some people's minds, but problems like garbage collection, or problems like zoning, or traffic control, or sewers, or streets — these problems weren't too small for Bob Steen as mayor, or city councillor, to take care of — he was always there; he was always working on behalf of his constituents; he was always there to help.

He didn't limit his area of operations exclusively to the 6:00 o'clock news, or to the daily journals. He went to where the problem was. And I have constituents who relate stories continually to me of how Bob Steen arrived at the corner store, or Bob Steen arrived at the community club, or Bob Steen had sat in their living room and discussed problems with them, worked out a solution, and then went to bat with the other politicians with whom he worked to find solutions to help those people in their own neighbourhoods.

With Bob Steen in the mayor's chair, there was no need for the little man, the little guy, to fight city hall, for the little guy could always be certain that the mayor understood the problems of the little guy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the people of the West End, the people of St. Matthews, the people of Winnipeg, indeed all the people of Manitoba have lost a dedicated servant.

So it is with sorrow that I second the motion of condolence moved by the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to also add a few words to the Resolution before us. Bob Steen, Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, dying at the age of 45, so young, yet having lived a very very complete life.

My first recollection of Bob Steen races back to the Tuxis Parliament that the First Minister made reference to in 1954. While a member of that parliament, I had first opportunity to observe and to feel the leadership and the very fine qualities and characteristics of Bob Steen. And his concern for his fellow men was quite evident over the years. On my last occasion to visit with Bob Steen while he was in his hospital room, I could not help but feel the fact that although he must have felt the pain and heartache, he talked not of himself. He talked not of that pain and heartache but rather discussed the affairs of men, the problems of the city, the problems of the province, and of the Canada that he loved so much.

I believe this is very indicative of Bob Steen, always concerned for his country, his community, his fellow men, rather than for himself, even in those final hours and weeks of his great struggle.

I would also like to comment that I believe there was another characteristic of Bob Steen, that although he was a committed and certainly a loyal member of his party, he did not hesitate, he did not pause one moment to express differences with his party, with the group in which he was a member of, if in fact his own convictions, his own principles, directed that he ought to do otherwise.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that throughout Bob Steen's life, he can be best described by the fact that although there were two roads through life, that Bob Steen chose the one that was less travelled by and that, Mr. Speaker, made all the difference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS McGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the condolence messages to Irene Steen and boys, and also to his brother and his parents.

I served with Bob Steen in this Chamber from 1966 to 1969. I moved the Speech from the Throne and Bob seconded it in 1968, under the then Premier Walter Weir. I also had the privilege of putting the Second Degree Collar on Brother Steen when he progressed from the Masonic Lodge of Manitoba to the Khartum Temple of the Shrine.

In talking to Bob Steen at the Canada Winter Games at Brandon last winter just seems like a short few weeks ago, at that particular reception of the Honourable Iona Campanella, and Bob expressed his complete happiness with his Mayor's position, and it does seem a shame that that is no more. I could always depend on Bob for support within our Caucus of those days. Bob Steen was everyone's mayor; Bob Steen was everyone's councilman and Bob Steen was everyone's friend. My house and this Chamber is a better place because Bob Steen passed our way, Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster. :

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to the expressions of sympathy that have already been spoken to by various members of the Assembly, because I had the opportunity of entering the Legislative Assembly at the same time as the deceased, Bob Steen, and therefore to some extent, commenced my political career at least at the provincial level with Bob and maintained a personal relationship with him throughout the years since 1966.

What is most compelling with regard to this tragedy, is the fact that Bob Steen passed away at 45 years of age, and although we would acknowledge, as has the First Minister, that he did much in a short period of time; what we can all surmise upon is that he had much to do. And that those of us who have gone beyond the 45th year are aware of the fact that a full life lies ahead of us in which there are opportunities in which we can serve our fellow man. Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that Bob Steen's heritage will take the place of his being on earth in terms of what was left to be done.

He has a wife and two boys who can be very proud of him, and who can look to his passing and to what were his aspirations and perhaps can do something to make up the fact that he is no longer with them in body but remains in spirit. I think that the things that he still had to do are very important, just as the things that he did were important and will be a part of everyone of us.

I visited Bob Steen in the hospital as did many others in this Chamber and as did many of his friends. The morning that I saw him was not one of his better mornings. But there was a way in which to activate Bob Steen and I started talking politics, and suddenly, Mr. Speaker, as of magic, his remaining energy showed forth and the conversation became almost agitated.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, my leader has already referred to one of the more distinctive qualities about Bob Steen, which can be looked upon as a great asset in many respects and probably had some affect on limiting his political activities in other respects. Bob Steen, although a committed

Conservative, was a man who always looked for good on the other side. He could never really get angry with his opponents and that perhaps, Mr. Speaker, is probably why the mayoralty became his avenue of activity rather than the more spirited partisan type of politics that takes place in this Chamber. And as each lends his particular talents and assets to his service, it is no doubt that society and the public found those particular talents and assets in Bob Steen, which made them, compelled them and induced them, to elect him as the Mayor of all of the citizens of Winnipeg. A job which his particular personality, was very well suited for and which once again, Mr. Speaker, shows that sometimes the electorate has far more wisdom than politicians give them credit for. That is certainly exemplified in their election of Bob Steen to the Mayor of Winnipeg.

I make these remarks, Mr. Speaker, as an addition to the expressions of sympathy which have already been made. I think most of the family, I think that this conveyance of the expressions of sympathy by this Chamber to the wife and children of Bob Steen, will give them what is already there in abundance, pride in the achievements of their dear departed loved one, and also a message that there is still much to be done. And Bob Steen would have done very much and there remains a legacy for the dear ones who remain to think in terms of their lives and as to what their father had done; father and husband.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly, to add to those expressions of sympathy that have already been expressed, my own personal sympathies to Bob Steen's wife, his two young sons, his parents, his brothers, relatives, and friends.

Mr. Speaker, I knew Bob Steen as a practicing lawyer in the City of Winnipeg; he was a very able lawyer. I served with him on Council for six years along with other members of the Assembly. I developed an even closer association with him during his eighteen months as Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, and in my own capacity as Minister of Urban Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I think one outstanding characteristic of his tenure as Mayor of the City of Winnipeg was his dedication and his devotion to his responsibilities as Mayor, and I think what will be remembered by literally thousands of residents of this city, was his attendance at so many social functions; teas, bazaars, community functions. Functions, Mr. Speaker, which had been in the past the type of function that was very easy for a mayor of a city of this size to delegate to a member of council, but which Bob Steen wanted to attend personally to meet the people involved in the various activities and he did so, Mr. Speaker, and he spent countless hours during the day devoting himself to those duties.

One other brief point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize for the record. Despite the burdens of his office and despite the fact that it has been truly said that politics was his life, Mayor Steen, I think, at all times — certainly in my conversations with him — was extremely interested in sharing stories about his two young sons. He was a good father, I think, and very proud of his sons and I'm sure that the comments that have been expressed today, having been placed on the record, I'm sure will be of some help and some consolation to his sons and wife, in future years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to join in the Motion of Condolence for Mayor Bob Steen, and his wife, Irene, and the two boys, and the family.

The seven and one-half years that I rubbed elbows with Mayor Steen seems to have gone by very quickly and I certainly have become a better person for my association with him. I'd like to bring the condolence messages today from the Board of Directors of the Convention Centre, who have lost a member as well, as Bob served with us on that particular board. In my many visits to Bob at the hospital — I lived very close by — I got to talking to him about the future of that particular hospital and his spirits seemed to be picked-up when it was mentioned to him that that particular hospital and the emergency section, was going to stay, despite the Restraint Program, and this seemed to delight him to no end.

I couldn't help but think that, a few short months ago, he wrote my speech for me at the Brandon Winter Games, when I was there with the Member for Virden, representing the Minister, and we talked at great length then.

I did, after our very gallant fight in the leadership campaign, our stars seemed to be falling, and it was at that point that I picked up Bob and we decided to give his political career a boost in running for the second most powerful position in the province of Manitoba, that of the Mayor of Winnipeg and we fought an extremely fair and middle of the road campaign. Even though we were outnumbered by professional organizers and certainly dollars, we were able to bring home the message to the people of Winnipeg, and I think they demonstrated their wisdom in selecting

Bob as their mayor. I think he would have been a great mayor, had he been given the time, because he saw both sides of the coin, and I think this was demonstrated by his untiring service to the many functions that he had to attend.

So I would like to make my contribution by saying that, all the years I sat on City Council with him, I've sat at the very lower level, at the Midland Community Committee, I was the adjoining councillor with him — he represented the Westminister Ward — and we attended all those meetings, when The City of Winnipeg Act called for a full-time job, and he did it without question. I know the sacrifice his wife and family made, and they've made a greater one today, and I would simply like to say that he did his job well and I'm a better person for having associated with Mayor Robert Steen.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I also would join all those who spoke of the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg. I met him approximately 23 years ago, about three years before I was elected to this House. He was just a youngster, he looked like a young kid he looked so young, and he was one of the well-known and best organizers, I think, of an important political Party in Manitoba; he was very devoted to this Party.

I might say that all through the years that we sat here together, we disagreed very often, but there was never any bitterness, and I think the Premier and some of the other members will remember some of the debate that we had on the question of aid to private schools, and on French as a teaching language, and so on and there was no bitterness, and I always felt that here was somebody that understood, that certainly recognized that everybody had their rights, and I don't think that he implied too many motives to others. I always felt that we were friends.

Now this motion that we have in front of us today, Mr. Speaker, during the 20 years that I've spent in this House there were many of them; and at times, especially when we were talking about some of the old timers that we had never heard of — I don't think it was a lack of respect, but we didn't know these people and it was quite difficult to have some members talk about them. We would say, some of us would say, "I wonder what they'll say about you, or what they'll say about me when our time comes?" I remember such an incident with Bob Steen, and I think if he's listening, and no doubt he is, if he's listening today I think he'd want us, or he'd want me, to recognize some of the things that were so important to him.

There is no doubt that he was a good team man, but he was more than that. I think that if it can be said of any member that his conscience was his guide in everything, there certainly was a case here. Without hesitation at all. He was in politics to help his fellowman and his country which he loved so much, and as my Leader said, he was a very outspoken man. He never hesitated and some said that that probably held him back from the Cabinet ranks, well, it's something that we'll never know. But anyway, he certainly didn't take the easy way, he called the shot as he saw it, and I think he left a lot of friends, a lot of friends who feel as we do as we've heard today and the last few days. He'll be sadly missed here in Winnipeg, and in Canada, and like the Premier said, he's accomplished so much and he died when he was only 45 years old.

I think that we will miss him. I think in these days, when there seems to be so little respect for politicians, and no doubt we help in this thing, I think that it was obvious to see that there was one politician who was well respected. Although, as it was mentioned, he didn't take the easy road, but he followed the dictates of his conscience. I think that we will miss him.

I would like to join those who offer their condolences to his wife and his family, and I think that wherever Bob is, he is looking on us today and I think he is working with us too, hoping that whatever we'll do will be for the betterment and for the good of the people of Manitoba. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN: Mr. Speaker, might I just take a brief moment and say to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, and all Manitobans, on behalf of my family, our sincere thanks and appreciation for their words of sympathy on the passing of my brother.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance, in view of the Budget announcement last night involving the freeze on Hydro rates for the upcoming five years, my question to the Minister of Finance is whether or not he has had prepared for him projections as to the extent of rate increases that might have taken place during the next five-year period.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question, I would reply that we have had any number of projections done, looking at almost every eventuality that we thought could occur or happen, and this took place over some period of time and led us to the conclusions which we drew last night. The position of the utility was, last fall in its representation to the Public Utilities Board when they applied for their last rate increase, that the indications were that they would be applying again for the spring of 1980. There was some improvement in their revenues during the early months of this year, that improved their position and the conclusion that was drawn, as I indicated in the Budget last night, was the removal of the threat, if you call it that, of the foreign currency payments. With the removal of that threat and the return of that to the provincial government, and with the backing of the provincial government in particular in the event that unforeseen circumstances brought about difficulty somewhere between now and the end of the five-year period, that the decision, the judgmental decision was combined with the desire of the government to lay the base for a sound domestic and industrial development policy to make the move that was made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Minister of Finance advise whether or not the Public Utilities Committee will be called into being so that we may receive the presence of Manitoba Hydro and have the opportunity to question its officials?

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the Telephone System or one of the other utilities is before the Public Utilities Committee at this time. The indications by the House Leader were that Hydro would be called during the course of the session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance on the same subject. Is the Minister of Finance saying to us that if there were no foreign currency problems, that is if the Canadian dollar did not have its weakened position as against the Euro-dollars and other foreign currency, that the subsidy would not be necessary, that the rate would not go up and that the real reason for the subsidy is to maintain the integrity of the borrowing based on a sound Canadian dollar as against the weakened Canadian dollar.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to all members that we have the whole subject of the Budget coming up for debate in the Chamber and some of the questions that are presently being asked may properly be termed debatable. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe that there is no rule that questions are prohibited during the Question Period because they may be matters which can be discussed in the Budget Debate. As I understand the budget debate, you can discuss anything in the budget debate. And if, Mr. Speaker, we were to accept your guidance, and I assume it is only guidance, there would be no Question Period for the next eight days. And since I have no intention of relinquishing the Question Period for the next eight days, I would ask the Minister of Finance if Canada's dollar was not weakened as against Euro-dollars, would the subsidy that he is talking about be necessary?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, first of all, it's not a subsidy. It's a return to the provincial government of the obligation of the foreign debt differences. So I want to make that distinction clear, Mr. Speaker.

And with regard to the second part of the question by the Member for Inkster, I think the Budget Speech is pretty clear with that regard because what the Budget Speech says is that, along with the recommendations of the Task Force Committee and the examinations of the department, by going back and replacing the debt with Canadian equivalent at interest rates that would have been prevalent in Canada at the time those particular bond issues were issued, that having done that in each case and bringing it forward and returning the foreign debt to the province, Mr. Speaker,

and giving the backing of the provincial government to any other unforeseen things that may happen over that period of time, Mr. Speaker, such as a major prolonged drought, which of course could happen, Mr. Speaker, and it has happened in other periods of history, that the obligation was taken on by the government for that purpose.

Now, that's essentially what has been done, and as the member reads the Budget, he'll see that the answer is there specifically. We're providing Canadian debt to the utility, going back to the various dates when the foreign debt was taken on, replacing it with rates that were prevalent in Canada at that time. So I think that's the answer.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister then saying that this payment from consolidated revenues to Hydro, which the Minister refuses to call a subsidy but which they always called a subsidy when it related to Autopac, is this payment from consolidated revenue to Hydro, or this guarantee, is it meant to undo the adverse effects of the deflation of the Canadian dollar and that if that deflation had not occurred, then Hydro was so well planned, Mr. Speaker, and so well financed that we would have had stable Hydro rates for the next five years, had it not been for the devaluation of the Canadian dollar?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the undertaking by the provincial government to the utility goes further than just the threat of the foreign currency exchanges, but it's impossible to put a dollar figure on it. It's an insurance program, it's an underwriting program of the government moving in behind the utility and saying that we're going to provide a guarantee for that period of time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a final supplementary.

MR. GREEN: Yes Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister then telling us that other than the devaluation of the Canadian dollar, he cannot at this point say that there would be any Hydro increases in the next five years if it weren't for the devaluation of the Canadian dollar? And the Minister said it's impossible to say.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there are more variables that are going to have to be faced by the utility and by the province than just this. Mr. Speaker, I can only advise the Member for Inkster that his former leader that is no longer in this Chamber predicted some short time before he left the scene, that he would have expected a couple of more substantial increases in the hydro rates at that time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a fourth question.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ask a first question on another issue. Given the new Conservative policy of using the consolidated revenue to stabilize prices of things which are necessities — which, Mr. Speaker, I think is a wonderful procedure, will the First Minister, yes, will the First Minister now ask the federal government to use consolidated revenue to stabilize the price of bread for the next five years, and the price of milk for the next five years?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend with his very quick mind and so on, is once again asking us to compare apples and oranges. —(Interjection)— Well, bread and hydro rates then, and I don't want to get into that dough with him or anybody else. But, Mr. Speaker, I think we can get at the point of what my honourable friend is saying. He is saying that he supports the policy that was announced by the Minister of Finance last night, and if I judge him right, Mr. Speaker, I think he's also saying that he wished he'd thought of it first.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a fifth . . .

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, indeed we have done that type of thing in the past first, and I've always been referred to as Doctrinaire Socialists for doing it. Now, will the First Minister deal with the question, will he ask the federal government, whichever party — and he can address it "To Whom it may Concern" because it could be Liberal, New Democrat or Conservative — would he ask now, Mr. Speaker, the federal government, to stabilize for the people of this country the prices of very essential commodities, namely bread and milk, by payments out of consolidated revenues, so that the price of bread and milk to the people of our society, and which the people at the lowest income level have the most difficulty in meeting, will be stabilized for the next five years?

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Minister of Highways points out, of course, as

my honourable friend would know, he being like myself an old agriculturalist, that the dairy industry is already subsidized to a large extent by the taxpayers of Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, that's neither here nor there; the point that we have to concern ourselves with in this House are the matters over which we have jurisdiction. And, Mr. Speaker, I am happy, and I hope I am not imputing any motives to my honourable friend or any attitudes at all, but I am happy to judge, as I think I do judge correctly, that my honourable friend supports the policy of stabilizing what have been before rapidly escalating energy rates for all consumers in Manitoba, after having gone through a period of five years when they, on a compound basis, had increased by more than 150 percent, thereby, inflicting itself on the cost of living of the weakest in our society — the poor, the senior citizens, those on fixed income and so on. This is one of the greatest helps that this government or any government could be, in terms of keeping the inflationary pressure off the weakest in our society for a commodity that is not a luxury, for a commodity that is absolutely a necessity in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I largely suspect that the Conservative Party is stabilizing what they know is going to be stable in the next five years and which they can't explain. I ask the First Minister whether he does not consider it his function, as a First Minister of this province to get in tough with the federal authorities who, up until a short time ago, did subsidize bread, did make a bigger subsidy towards milk and ask him to do, for these two products, what he says he is doing for hydro rates. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it. I believe the rates would have stayed the same without this, and that was the embarrassment of that administration.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The time for making statements having expired, we're now in the Question Period. The Honourable Member for Inkster with a question.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I ask the First Minister whether he will ask the federal government, as First Minister of this province, to stabilize and freeze for the next five years, the price of bread and the price of milk, by having these commodities subsidized by consolidated revenues?

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps if we lived in the kind of Utopian society that my honourable friend has dedicated his life to — where governments could control everything that the private sector looks after so well in all other respects. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, if we were living in one of the provinces of one of those countries where they have that system, I might take my honourable friend seriously. We do not, thank God, live in one of those countries. We live in a country where we have a free-market system. We do, however, live in a country where we have a mixed economy, Mr. Speaker, and within that mixed economy, the job of the government is to run those Crown corporations as well as it can. And without trying in any way, Mr. Speaker, to be offensive or partisan with my honourable friend, I think he will have to admit that the manner in which this particular utility was run during the eight years when he was in government, is certainly at least —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I am being modest, was at least subject to question, and is being questioned and is being looked at by a Commission of Inquiry today. I will say no more, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. In view of the First Minister's undoubted enthusiasm for curbing inflation and his desire to restrict himself to the Manitoba jurisdiction; in view of the fact that telephone rates are also a matter, in general, of necessity and not a luxury, is the First Minister prepared to announce the stabilization of telephone rates in the same way in the province?

MR. LYON: No, Mr. Speaker, we already have, notwithstanding the predations of my honourable friends during eight years, we still have the lowest telephone rates in Canada.

MR. PAWLEY: A further question to the First Minister. In view of the fact that he's indicated that he is not moving on telephone rates, due to the fact that they're the lowest in Canada' is he prepared to acknowledge that Manitoba's hydro rates are also amongst the lowest in Canada at the present time?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend will make reference to the Budget Speech of last evening he will see that the statement of policy that was announced by the Minister of Finance on behalf of the government is going to ensure that those hydro rates remain the lowest in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Given that the fixing of Hydro rates will have an adverse effect on the City of Winnipeg's revenues, will the province provide additional grants to the city to offset losses in revenue?

A MEMBER: And stabilize taxes for five years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the fixing of the rates, looking at it from, I suppose the point of view of the City of Winnipeg, who made revenues from the City of Hydro as a result of the rate increases that were indicated last night in the Throne Speech, 20 percent, 20 percent, 15 percent, 14 percent, 14 percent, for five successive years, was providing increases, regardless of the fact that the costs were not part of the City of Winnipeg's system, but were part of Manitoba Hydro's system. The fact that those are not going to continue, I suppose, are the loss of a partial windfall at least that was occurring each year.

However, apart from that, Mr. Speaker, I find it a little difficult to agree that it was causing a revenue problem. What it does is, it removes a partial windfall that was occurring at the cost of the ratepayer. So, quite apart from that, as a result of the government's move to assume the debt back from Manitoba Hydro, there will, in fact, be some benefits due to the fact that there is a cost-sharing formula with regards to Manitoba Hydro's operating production side, that is passed on to the City of Winnipeg. There will be some benefits. I can't give the member a direct figure, but it will, in fact, be a saving to the City of Winnipeg that they would not otherwise have received, because they would have been billed by Manitoba Hydro for a share of the costs, including the costs of the increased debt service due to the currency repayments that would have fallen due in the next year or so.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the answers to some of the questions could be a little bit shorter. We are half-way through the Question Period, and only three people have had the opportunity of asking questions.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to engage in a semantic argument with the Minister of Finance about profits, or windfall, or whatever. There was a benefit to the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg as a result of profits shown in Winnipeg Hydro, and as a result of the measures announced by the Minister of Finance and the government last night, there will either now be a reduction in services, or increased municipal taxes, so I ask the Finance Minister, will he compensate Winnipeg for these losses in revenue?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there are no losses in revenue to the City of Winnipeg. There is a gain to the City of Winnipeg by a reduction in the amount that they would normally have had to pay Manitoba Hydro in the cost-sharing formula on the debt service. So there is no loss in revenue. What it does is, it fixes the rates for City Hydro, the same as it fixes it for Manitoba Hydro' for the suburbs of the city. —(Interjections)— And I think the member knows that those rates are identical.

MR. DOERN: MR. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs, and I'm quoting the Deputy Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, who pointed out that there will be a loss of several million dollars a year, the former profits that were acquired . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I find the honourable member's question repetitive and out of order. —(Interjections)— Would the honourable member care to rephrase his question?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Is he prepared to provide additional funding, block funding or whatever, to compensate the City of Winnipeg for the profits that would have accrued to them from their hydro utility? They are now going to lose that revenue.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is repetitive. Out of order. The Honourable Member for Pembina. The Honourable Member for Elmwood on a point of order.

MR. DOERN: My question was related to block funding. I didn't discuss that before. I asked the Minister — I believe it's in order — whether he's going to provide additional block funding to compensate the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has no point of order. The Honourable Member for PEMBINA.

MR. DON ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Economic Development. I understand that there is risk that a high-skill electronics capability at the University of Manitoba may be lost due to lack of government funding for research. Is his department prepared to do anything in that regard?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, we have written the National Research Council at least a month ago, and last week we were in discussion with Dr. Schneider of the National Research Council — my colleague, the Minister of Finance, and myself. We brought this to their attention, that it's very important, and we've had representation from industry saying how important it is that there be some funding to the Faculty of Engineering at the University of Winnipeg. I believe the member is referring to Dr. Kinsner's work especially, which is going on at the present time.

We have indicated to the National Research Council that we will participate in funding to support, through the Faculty of Engineering, the work of Dr. Kinsner in the Province of Manitoba, and as soon as we hear from the National Research Council as to what they're prepared to do, the Province of Manitoba is prepared to move.

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

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education . . . he's occupied at the moment, but perhaps he might hear my question. What is the policy of the government in regard to communities retaining their local schools in order that students may attend schools in the proximity as to there they live?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in that particular policy. The member may be referring to some situation where declining enrolments have caused school boards to look at the possibility of some consolidation, but that particular decision has been left with the school boards in each particular area.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister. Could he advise what the policy of the government is in regard to Kindergarten students having to travel by bus 20 to 40 miles twice daily to attend classes?

MR. COSENS: Well, the distance that the member mentions, of course, has a rather wide variation in it, Mr. Speaker, but again, that is a determination of the local school division as to the distances, and the particular Kindergarten classes that will be held in their division.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose with a final supplementary.

MR. ADAM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Would the Minister consider additional funding to communities who are losing their local schools, and where students of Kindergarten classes have to travel such long distances to attend classes because of lack of funding for their particular divisions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, if there is a problem in that regard, I am sure that particular school boards will contact us. I have had no information in that regard to this point.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Finance. It's regarding the proposed changes in the sales tax on childrens clothes. Is it the intention of the Minister to require children under 14 to sign a simple declaration when they purchase clothing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if it's oversize, the parents would be required to sign a declaration. There will not be identification type of system or cards instituted for that purpose.

MR. WALDING: For clarification, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't referring to adults purchasing clothing; I was referring to children under 14 purchasing clothing. Will the Minister require them to sign a declaration?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the administrators will have to work it out. I would presume that if there is some doubt about the age of the person who is doing the purchasing, that there may be some request. There could be the requirement for a proof of age.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital on a final supplementary.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with a case where a child of 10 years old might purchase a pair of socks as a gift on Father's Day. Would that child be required to sign a declaration or not?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, no doubt there is going to be some slippage, some leakage, when you change systems, I am sure there was some before but there were far more abuses before and lack of justice in the former system which, Mr. Speaker, the members of this House voted unanimously for in the early 1970s. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES DOWNEY (Arthur): Yes, Mr. Speaker. During my Estimates, I took note of some questions that the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet had asked and I have the answers prepared seeing that our Budget has driven him in out of the federal campaign, that he has to come back for shelter into the House. One of the questions being what percentage of the hail coverage does the Manitoba Crop Insurance carry for Manitoba farmers and out of the total hail coverage carried in Manitoba, Part II, and the hail spot loss carry approximately 59 percent of the hail insured crops in Manitoba?

Another question was: how much of the policy study money was unexpended? There was approximately \$79,500 unexpended in the Minister's policy study allocation. One of the other questions that was asked was: when was the contract entered into with the University of Manitoba to do a study on grain transportation; when did that study commence? The contract was signed with the University of Manitoba with Dr. Ed Turchinets as the research director and it commenced on or about the 1st of September, 1978, and is to be completed by September 30th of 1979,

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Has the union representing workers at Canadian Bronze operation been informed of the stop-work orders issued today by the Workplace Safety and Health Division, and has the Minister of the department met with the union representatives for the purpose of reducing the economic impact of that shutdown on the workers economic situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I believe that discussions are taking place this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have in my possession a baseball cap that is seen on the odd occasion in northern Manitoba, and I happened to pick this one up along the side of the road where somebody had thrown it away. But my question is to the Minister of Economic Development. Can the Minister justify that while there are certainly a number of manufacturers capable of producing such a baseball cap here in the Province of Manitoba, the Progressive Conservative Party is passing out this cap that states quite plainly on the label that it was made in Korea; can he justify that contradiction?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly bring that to their attention forthwith.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary.

MR. COWAN: Yes, seeing as how the caps have already been passed out and discarded, it's a bit late to bring it to their attention.

My question is to the Minister of Finance. In light of the reference that was made during the Budget Address last evening that Hydro users operating under separate contracts would be exempt from the five-year freeze and as many of the remote northern reserve communities are functioning under such separate contracts for the production of Hydro power within those communities, can the Minister assure us that that freeze will be extended to the remote reserve communities that are operating under separate contracts with Hydro?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the freeze indicated applies to about 95 percent of Hydro's production. I'll take the member's question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of finance respecting his statement last night that for a second year in a row, property tax rebates or provincial property tax credits would be frozen, can the Minister advise the House whether he has any estimates, or can he give us any estimates of the increased burden on the municipal ratepayer that will be caused by this freezing of property tax rebate system for a second year in a row?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I expect that the amount of grants that go out under that specific program will be fairly much the same as they were last year in their totality.

MR. EVANS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the honourable minister that the estimate of the total grant may be the same, but would the honourable minister not agree that municipal tax rates are increasing year by year across the province? And given that fact, and given the fact of a constant amount of provincial tax assistance, would he not agree and could he not provide some estimate of the increased burden therefore, on the municipal ratepayer, who now gets a smaller percentage of help from the provincial government?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm just reminded here by the Minister of Municipal Affairs that the per capita grants are increased by 11 percent this year to the municipalities which will have an offsetting effect as well. And if the member wants to get at some of the specifics, this was dealt with pretty extensively through the Estimates process, and I think he probably has in his possession, if he wants to dig it up, the necessary figures to give him the answer he wants.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplementary.

MR. EVANS: On another supplementary, I appreciate the Minister's comments regarding per capita grants, but will the Minister not agree that the per capita grants were going up previously under the NDP administration as well?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that questions of agreement

are more argumentative than not, and maybe he would care to rephrase his question.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the per capita grant to the municipalities was and is in effect anyway, and is increasing anyway, and inasmuch as the property tax rebate system was another form of relief to the municipal taxpayer, can the Minister not provide the House with an estimate of the increase of the burden on the municipal ratepayer of this province caused by the maintenance of a freezing of the assistance that the province of Manitoba does provide municipal taxpayers through the property tax rebate system?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, there's the municipal grants that I've just indicated are increased. There's the Property Tax Credit Program which will be basically the same, the cost of living tax credit is indexed. That will go up; the amounts are in the Estimates. The member has to add all of these things in if he wants to arrive at the grants or benefits going in the way of rebates to the average citizen, including the property owner. Certainly if the taxes on property, from school taxes and municipal taxes exceed the increases that are brought about by the per capita grants, then certainly there will be a difference and an increased burden that the property taxpayer will probably have to take.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a fourth question.

MR. EVANS: Then another question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise whether the study that's now going on and will be issued by means of a White Paper as I understand, in a matter of weeks or what have you, will that study, will that White Paper include some idea of the relief afforded the municipal ratepayers in Manitoba through various provincial programs and will they provide an estimate of the impact of the provincial tax rebate system per se, apart from any other program that has been discussed or has been mentioned by the Minister, and can he — in that White Paper, can we look forward to some estimate of the real burden on the householder, the municipal ratepayer who has to pay the shot for municipal services over and above any assistance to be received by the province?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, without dealing with the specifics but with the general question, I would say that those things would generally be addressed in the White Paper and as much information as possible will be provided for members to make as far-reaching an assessment as possible of the total picture that now exists and where it's likely to head for.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Meer for St. Johns.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want to address the Minister of Health. Having had my report on professional association legislation for about eight months, will he indicate whether or not he intends to make it public?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: At this juncture I have no such intention, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is certainly entitled to make it public if he wishes to do so.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, since I have had a number of requests now for copies of it and since the Minister knows that I only have one copy and he has more than one, I believe, is he prepared to make a number of them available to me for distribution?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, certainly the honourable member is entitled to do whatever he wants with a report that he prepared. I am not inclined at this juncture to undertake the printing of a report that he prepared and that he may wish to use, that may indeed be very useful, but is not sanctioned officially by the government. So I would have to say no. If he wants the copy back that he released to us, he's certainly entitled to have it. We're not intending to print a number of copies of it for distribution by him.

MR. CHERNIACK: I want it back.

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

MR. ADAM: Yes. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I would ask the Minister if could

provide the opposition with one copy of a list showing the names of all the lessees of agricultural Crown land along with the number of acres being leased.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, if the member is asking for a list of all the land lease program, or all the individuals holding leases, I'll take that question as notice and see if I'm able to provide that information for him.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Question Period having expired, we will proceed with Orders of the Day. I believe there's a question. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on Orders of the Day there is an Order for Return from the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall we proceed with Order for Return?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe you have to proceed with the orders as they appear on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Member . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: No, Mr. Speaker. There is a motion standing in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that must be called first.

BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that that matter stand.

ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster,
That an Order of the House to issue for return of the following information:

1. The legal description of each parcel of land sold by public tender by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation since October 24th, 1977.
2. The original purchase price on each of the above parcels of land and incremental subsidies and costs to MACC associated with each parcel.
3. The reserve bid placed by MACC on each parcel of land.
4. The appraised value, name and position of appraiser on each parcel of land.
5. The names of bidders and amount of each bid on each parcel of land.
6. The sale price, name and address of purchaser for each parcel of land sold by MACC.

MR. SPEAKER: You've heard the motion of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet. Do you want it read out? The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I will accept with one reservation, that being item number five, the names of the bidders, of those people who were unsuccessful in attempting to purchase the land. I wonder if it would be all right if they were referred to by letter or number. If it is already not made public, because I don't know whether those individual names were opened in public because the individuals were not successful.

MR. USKIW: Well Mr. Speaker, we would be satisfied with a list of other bidders, even though they are not listed by name, but the number of bids and the amounts if the Minister wishes to, for some reason, not provide that information.

MR. DOWNEY: I will accept that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have two Messages from His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Estimates of Further Sums required for the Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1980 and recommends these Estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Estimates of Sums required for the Service of the Province for Capital Expenditures and recommends these Estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Attorney-General that the said Messages, together with the Estimates accompanying the same be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Will you call Bill No. 2, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second reading. Bill No. 2, an Act to Amend the Financial Administration Act. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can put it this way. I can close debate on it. There were some questions that were directed that I don't have the complete answers to; I'm quite willing to go ahead on the basis that they will be dealt with at the committee stage and this way we can get it into committee. So perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if —(Interjection)— Well in that case, Mr. Speaker, we'll let it stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Was the Honourable Minister of Finance speaking on a point of order?

MR. CRAIK: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the matter stand in name of the Minister of Finance? (Agreed)

MR. CRAIK: I was speaking, Mr. Speaker — continuing on the point of order — I'm gathering that there would be some preference to have the specific questions dealt with at the second reading stage and in that case I'll let it stand and I'll deal with it as soon as I have them all here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns on the point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: We're using the technique of the point of order. I want to thank the Honourable Minister. There are a number of questions that I posed and I think I was the only one who spoke on this bill. I would much appreciate having them in an orderly fashion on Hansard in advance and that's why I appreciate the Minister's offer to deal with it under second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well then, Mr. Speaker, will you call the remainder of the bills on adjourned debates on second reading, from 14 to 39? Will you call them in that order?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 14, An Act to Amend The Planning Act standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 18, An Act to Amend the Natural Products Marketing Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 22, The Public Schools Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. Agreed to stand? (Agreed) The same with Bill No. 23? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 35, An Act to Amend The Workers Compensation Act. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 36, An Act to Amend The Real Estate Brokers Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 38, An Act to Amend The Trustee Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Stand.

BILL NO. 39 — THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1979)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 39, The Statute Law Amendment Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: I'd like to retain this bill, but if anyone else wishes to speak on it I have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I only want to deal with a couple of items in The Statute Law Amendments Act; it covers a broad variety of items as it usually does. The ones that caught my attention are specifically those dealing with the repeal of The Transit Grants Act. That is an Act which was passed about 10, 12 years ago, about 10 years ago, I believe and it introduced for the first time the concept that the provincial government had a role to play and recognized the need for subsidy and support of the transit system. It applies to Winnipeg, Brandon and I believe Flin Flon. I'm not sure about the third one, but certainly it does apply to Brandon and Winnipeg. When it was first introduced a small percentage, I believe 5 percent, to be based on the revenues, percentage of the revenues collected by the transit system but not to exceed 5 percent.

Now Mr. Speaker, what we are looking at now therefore, is the repeal of the statutory responsibility that the Province recognized it should assume and had to assume in dealing with transit. Because transit was recognized as being a utility, a public utility, that had an essential role to play in any major city. That if we were to, somehow, try to move people away from total dependence upon cars, the private automobile, the transit had to be encouraged, transit had to be made more attractive and the best way to make it more attractive is through a fare, a transit fare, which is appealing, which is economical, reasonable, and as the cost of fuel, gasoline went up, that in fact the differential between using one's car and using transit would be so appealing, that more and more people would be attracted to transit.

The results of that are obvious, apart from the fact that there's a definite saving in the energy we use, which everyone I think, pays lip service to. There's also the added benefit of having to avoid extensive capital costs of new, wider roads, medium express highways or urban highways, roadways. This was the purpose really, of recognizing the need for the province to assume a responsibility in this manner.

Now, I know that the Act itself, calls for a very small subsidy, because as I say, it's only 5 percent of the revenues of the system, so it wasn't very much. The former government certainly stepped up those grants considerably to the point where they actually covered about 50 percent of the deficit. Now, this government has chosen to do two things; one, is simply toss the entire transit support into the total block funding which has been given to the City, which they may or may not spend on transit and under the guise of autonomy, they say, well, the money is there and you can use it to subsidize the transit. But they've now gone the next step; they've now removed any statutory responsibility by even eliminating that first basic Transit Grant Act which was passed, say back in

I think '69. Yes, as I recall it was introduced in the winter of '69, the spring session of '69 and then reintroduced again after the 1969 election.

So, I deplore the fact that in doing this, they're not just turning their back on what I feel is adequate funding of the transit operation, they are even repealing that concept, which was acceptable to all members of the House at that time, and subsequently, that in fact, the government has a role and has a responsibility to fostering and developing an adequate transit system within Winnipeg, and within Brandon, and by doing so, recognizing that it is a utility that must be developed, must be maintained and must grow and not simply be left to user fees, which as the user fees increase, the ridership, the number of people who use the transit inevitably drops. It drops because it is not as convenient as one's own car, and the cost unless it's substantially in favour of transit, isn't sufficient to attract riders to transit. So, I see that as a retrogressive step and one, I think, which will hurt the City of Winnipeg in the long run, because more and more dependence upon the automobile, more and more requirement for widening of streets, more thoroughfares, more limited access thoroughfares throughout the heart of the city, wider bridges, more bridges. So, that's one aspect as I say, that I think is a step backwards.

The other deals with — I can't mention section numbers, Mr. Speaker, so I won't, but it deals with the amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act and the —(Interjection)— What's that?

MR. CHERNIACK: Give it a number. What number is that?

MR. MILLER: It's on Page 7 of the summary notes introduced by the Minister. I'm not going to break the rules here. Mr. Speaker, this deals with The City of Winnipeg Act, and it deals with amendments which on the surface don't seem to mean much but I think strike at the very root of the concept of what a city council is all about.

If I read this correctly, where the Committee of Environment has held meetings and public hearings, with regard to an area plan, they are no longer required — as I read the amendment — that they may refuse to receive and have read a petition respecting that matter. They may refuse to receive and read a petition, and have read to them, either by a member of council or by a citizen or whoever — they may refuse to receive and have read a petition respecting that matter. I suppose the reasoning is that because the Environment Committee has had hearings, that there is no need thereafter to have the council sitting as a whole have to hear petitions, who either may be for or against the implementing or the proposal for some action area plan. I think this is a retrogressive step.

The Committee on Environment, firstly, does not have on its membership all members of Council. It is a small number of councillors chosen by Council to sit on this committee, and they may indeed, have held meetings and they may make a recommendation. That recommendation has to be ratified, endorsed or rejected by the Council. But what's going to happen now is that Council will not have the benefits of having a petition read to them, or having presentations made to them which might influence their thinking on it. They will be influenced by the Committee on Environment — I suppose they could read the Environment Committee meetings, but that takes away from people a very essential right, an essential right to be heard not just by a select group, a committee but having exhausted that right, they then have the further right to appear before Council and say despite the fact that the Environment Committee approves of this or despite the fact that the Environment Committee rejects it, in my opinion and in our opinion, if I represent a neighbourhood or people within a community, we don't agree or we want certain things to occur. And that is now going to be denied to them. It's a step backwards and since Council is always considered as a grass roots level of government whose ear is always closest to the people — not like the provincial or federal governments — then I think it is a retrogressive step. I think it again sort of introduces an attitude of, well, a small group have heard, they'll have passed judgment, they'll make up their minds and Council will simply then have to say yea or nay to endorse or to reject the recommendation of the Committee.

It denies the citizens an opportunity to be heard by the entire Council and not just by a Committee of Council, and in this regard therefore I say, it is I think a poor step. Because I think if we pass this, it is I think just a beginning of similar steps by a certain element in Council and perhaps in the provincial government who really are not in favour of the concept within The City of Winnipeg Act which is trying to bring more accountability into city operations, more access by the citizens to city operations, and more opportunity for the citizen to influence City of Winnipeg decisions.

So that apart from the fact that this particular amendment is in itself a retrograde step, it could be and I suspect may be just a beginning in various amendments that will be coming forward over the years to eliminate and down play those sections in The Winnipeg Act which encouraged citizen participation and gave access by the citizen to his City Council as a final opportunity to be heard

and to influence the decisions of the City Council.

Those are my comments on this particular Bill, Mr. Speaker. There are other items which I may raise when we get into Law Amendments and deal with it there — not dealing with either of these Acts — but I felt that I would certainly like a response from the Minister on these two matters when he closes debate. It won't be today but when he does get around to it.

I'd also like him to explain — I think I understand what it is, but just to explain if he would — that subsection which authorizes the city to levy local improvement taxes in accordance with old agreements. I think I know why but I'd like him to put on record the explanation, so when we get into Committee, we perhaps wouldn't spend too much time on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to have the matter stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan? (Agreed)

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Will you call Bill No. 50, Mr. Speaker?

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 50 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE MANITOBA TELEPHONE ACT

MR. MCGILL presented Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 50 deals with short-term financing for the Manitoba Telephone System. Short-term borrowing is provided for in The Telephone Act and is used by the system in conjunction with the Department of Finance, principally to provide interim financing, prior to arranging long-term debt issue. In addition, it provides the opportunity to have part of the debt structure in short-term majorities, and thereby, take advantage of the lower interest costs, which may be associated with shorter term borrowings.

Mr. Speaker, limits on the total amount of short-term borrowing that may be done by the system are set out in a section of The Telephone Act. The previous changes, which have occurred in this item were in the year, 1955, when the limit was set up originally as \$1 million. In 1966, the limit was raised to \$5 million, and in 1968, the limit was raised to \$10 million. The size of the system's assets, total debt outstanding in average construction program are now two and-a-half times what those values were in 1968. And thus the system and the Department of Finance do not have the same flexibility in choosing the optimum time-frame for floating a long-term debt issue, and there is no longer the opportunity to maintain a reasonable part of the debt structure in lower cost short-term majorities. Raising the limit to \$25 million would restore the same relationship to assets, debt and construction program that existed in 1968 and would provide the necessary environment for the ongoing sound management of the debt structure of the Telephone System.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal, of course, has been discussed with the Minister of Finance and he is well aware of this submission. So, Mr. Speaker, what we are submitting to the House is really an upgrading of the numbers in respect to the limitations within the Telephone Act on the amount of short-term borrowing the Manitoba Telephone System can do. This would be the first adjustment of such a limitation since 1968.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would not really have become interested too much in discussing this Bill, nor do I know that members on this side are particularly concerned about it in relation to Second Reading. We might want to discuss it further in Law Amendments Committee.

Last night we learned the government's intention to fix rates of Manitoba Hydro for a five-year period by taking over foreign borrowing commitments of the Hydro, and putting it on the shoulders of the taxpayers of Manitoba. The Minister, in his presentation, and it's clear from the Amendment before us, wishes to increase the right of the Telephone System Commission to borrow up to \$25 million, on what they call short-term, instead of \$10 million. And we've just now been presented with Schedule A, the borrowing requirements for Capital purposes of the province for this current year, which includes \$35 million for Manitoba Telephone System.

I even wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we get involved in discussions on what is temporary and what

is longer term, whether it wouldn't have been easier for the Minister just to get \$35 million in this present Bill, and then we might not have to deal with the Schedule A for some considerable period of time.

The reason I rise to speak, Mr. Chairman, is to indicate to the Minister that I will give him enough time when I conclude so he can close debate if he wants to, and when we get into Law Amendments we can deal in greater detail. But I would ask the Minister how it is that, as a member of the Cabinet, he is not protecting the Telephone System the way the Minister for Hydro persuaded the Minister of Finance to protect the ratepayers of the Hydro system?

We have learned that Hydro, which has been an independent body in terms of setting rates, even to the extent where it did not have to go to the Utility Board and could set its own rates, but was bound by the legislation which indicated that they may not make a profit on the rates, that the rates had to be set in accordance with costs, that the government is . . . —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines, who has a good mind about a number of things, is one whose opinion I have yet to learn to respect when it comes to matters of capital and other types of financing. So his comments are really useless from his seat, unless he wants to speak, in which case by all means, he will have the opportunity so to do. —(Interjection)— By all means, the Minister for Mines is welcome for thanking me for my suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, I'm saying that where Hydro is bound not to make a profit, where Hydro is bound to charge rates which will keep it from going into deficit, where Hydro has all these restraints imposed on it in Legislation, this government has decided to shift the burden, a certain burden of cost of Hydro, onto the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I'm being very careful to say that I only heard the proposal. I am not opposing it in principle. I do know that Conservatives should, because they've done it in Autopac — they've opposed the principle of shifting the costs of the premium-payer. They say, "No, the premium-payer should pay it." They did it when we talked about shifting from Medicare premiums to income tax, and they complained bitterly about the Conservatives were great user-pay people. And now we find a shift that I have yet to explore. And, Mr. Speaker, I have to make sure that nobody attributes to me a comment, adverse or favourable, in regard to the principle of what the government is proposing, because obviously, none of us have had an opportunity to study it to any depth. I hope the Minister of Finance has studied it to some depth.

But I say to this Minister responsible for Telephones, what protection is he providing to the ratepayers of the Telephone System? The Minister of Mines made his contribution from his seat by saying they're not in such a great mess — I think those are the words he used. The fact is that the telephone ratepayer, who is paying the lowest rates in Canada, nevertheless is subject to variation because of the fact that the cost of borrowing is a variable insofar as foreign borrowing is concerned.

Now we know — the Minister for Telephones and I certainly know — that there's outstanding debt due by the Telephone System on foreign borrowing. So now, because, Mr. Speaker, because Manitoba's the lowest telephone ratepayer, and because Hydro is, to use the First Minister's words, "one of the lowest ratepayers of electric power in Canada," there's a difference.

MR. MCGILL: We'd like to see it stay that way.

MR. CHERNIACK: You see, Mr. Speaker? "We'd like to see it stay that way" says the Minister for Telephones. "We'd like to see it stay that way" — in view he takes no account in the way hydro-electric power is being produced, be it by hydro power, by thermal power, by whatever.

Now, the point I'm making is, if it's right to do it in one utility, it should be right in the other. The principle should be there, not the pragmatic approach. Because, Mr. Speaker, you will now find, to be consistent, that if and when there's a change in foreign exchange, and suddenly Canada is a beneficiary on the exchange side, what are they going to do? They are going to reverse their policy and still help the Hydro ratepayer by giving them the benefit which would otherwise accrue to the taxpayers? This is a form of manipulation, Mr. Speaker. As I'm saying I'm not sure just what the impact is, but I do know they're changing the burden from ratepayer to taxpayer.

Maybe it'll work out to the advantage of the low income taxpayer. Maybe — I don't know. But their incentive, their motivation, may not be that. And, therefore, I have to say, if the principle is right in one case, why is it not right in the other? Is it important that they be the lowest, or is it important that they pay a fair cost? And this government, boy, I used to think that they were completely dogmatic, but they have thrown that out of the window completely. They've argued, opposed in principle the certain changes that we made, now they're doing the same thing. And the Minister for Telephones should be accountable to the ratepayers of the Telephone System, the people who use the Telephone System, as to why he is not taking advantage of that principle to assert the right of the Telephone System to have the same treatment by government as that of

the Hydro ratepayer. And I suggest to him that he should not be able to say, "We want to do it in one case because one is only one of the lowest, and the other because it's lowest."

Let's deal with some principles, Mr. Speaker, and let's get some clarification as to how this government thinks, and what it bases its manipulation of moneys, or shifting of moneys, or changing the burden the way it is proposing to do.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister will be closing debate.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there some consensus to call it 4:30?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, it seems hardly possible that we could go into Committee of Supply at the present time but I think there is a general agreement that we were not going to proceed with Private Members' Hour today. However, the Member for Brandon East has a Bill that he would like to proceed with today, and we are prepared to give him leave to proceed with second reading of this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed.)

MR. JORGENSEN: Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce before we go into Private Members' that it would be my intention to call the Private Bills Committee tomorrow afternoon at 1:45 p.m. to deal with a matter of extension of time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 44 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE BRANDON CHARTER

MR. EVANS presented Bill No. 44, An Act to amend the Brandon Charter, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, I would like to explain that this particular Amendment is a technical amendment. Nevertheless, I am very pleased to introduce it now for second reading to facilitate the development of a very important downtown shopping mall — a \$12 million shopping mall in the City of Brandon — which will include 40 stores, and will go a long way to rejuvenating the downtown core of Brandon.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the estimated tax revenue for the City of Brandon from this particular development will be somewhere in the order of between \$250,000 and \$300,000 per year.

After many years of planning and negotiations this development is about to take place. However, Mr. Speaker, the city has been advised by its legal counsel that there may be some questions respecting certain air rights and sub-surface rights, and also I am advised that it's vital that it be made clear that the city have the power to create a parking authority, and to be responsible for its management and operation.

So, Mr. Speaker, this Bill clears away any legal problems that might arise. I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that the City Council of Brandon was unanimous in its decision to request the Legislature of Manitoba to bring in this particular amendment to the Brandon Charter.

I might also add, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that time is of the essence in this matter. The developers are very anxious and ready to proceed, and I would certainly appreciate the co-operation of all members of the House in supporting this particular measure, and indeed hopefully being able to pass it today. Thank you.

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

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I can assure members of the Legislature that I have asked my department to review this particular Bill. We are satisfied that the Bill contains no major policy issues or changes in principle in local government, but merely assures the Council of the City of Brandon that the arrangements which they propose in the development agreement is within their power, Mr. Speaker, and on that basis I would commend the Bill for second reading.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I would move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider and report of the following Bill for third reading, No. 44, An Act to amend the Brandon Charter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: We are prepared to give my honourable friend leave to proceed at this stage of the Bill.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill No. 44, An Act to amend the Brandon Charter.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

BILL NO. 44 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE BRANDON CHARTER

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedge (Bill No. 44 was read page by page and passed.) (Emerson): Bill be reported.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, your Committee of the Whole has reported Bill No. 44 and ask me to report same.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I move that Report of Committee be received, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin.

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READINGS

BILL No. 44 was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, I believe there is disposition to adjourn at this point, so therefore, I move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Thursday afternoon.