



Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable Peter Fox



Vol. XIX No. 77 2:30 p.m., Friday, May 12th, 1972.

Fourth Session, 29th Legislature.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, May 12, 1972

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have 12 students of grade 12 standing of the Verona High School of North Dakota. These students are under the direction of Mr. Bell.

We also have 9 students of Grade 9 standing of the Sansome Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Richard Roschuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

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

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Before recess we were on Bill 16. The floor is now open. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry the Minister of Finance is not in his chair but I feel sure that he will be before we go too much further with this bill, because we have a bill here which is I think fairly important to the government. The Minister of Finance has certainly worked very hard to bring forward this piece of legislation which calls for the massive expenditure of considerable money which will not fall under the realm of the current expenditures of the Legislature. It will not be taxed for this coming year, but the citizens of tomorrow in this province will be called on to pay for the money that is going to be authorized by this Legislature in this type of bill.

We heard the Minister of Finance this morning make reference to the operations of the Leaf Rapids - and I have not got his exact words before me but in essence the Minister said that the expenditure of the money under the Leaf Rapids agreement would be subject to the scrutiny of this Legislature and it was under an appropriate Minister and his estimates would be before the House.

I would sincerely hope that the Minister when he presents those estimates on the Leaf Rapids development or the Leaf Rapids Corporation - - I'm sure that when he developed his program he must have known what his intentions were with respect to that corporation. He must have known what they intended to do and what the estimate of expenditure would be. Those were the words, not in that sense, but those are paraphrasing the words of the Minister of Finance.

However, we find that the Minister of Finance in presenting this bill, hasn't got the same confidence that he expressed this morning in what is going to happen in Leaf Rapids. He is presenting a bill to us this morning with an open ended agreement, an agreement that says that all the borrowing that we are going to have in this bill has a limit on it with the exception of the Community Economic Development Fund and the Leaf Rapids Corporation. He's telling us that the Minister responsible for the Leaf Rapids Corporation doesn't know how much money he wants. He's telling us that the Minister responsible for the Community Economic Development Fund doesn't know how much money he's going to spend, and he's not willing to let him spend only that money that is allocated in his estimates of expenditure. He wants an open ended agreement that he can borrow unauthorized capital, unauthorized capital, Mr. Speaker, because he wants the door left open in those two particular categories, so that they can go out and borrow additional money without the approval of this Legislature. He wants that door left open because he's afraid that the Minister in preparing his estimates for those two particular funds does not know how much money he is going to need, he's not willing to use the existing framework that extends through the operation of our whole system of current revenue in expenditures, he wants an open ended agreement so that they can borrow money without the authorization of this Legislature.

Sir, I say that is wrong. It is wrong, it is morally wrong and I would suggest, Sir, that it may be legally wrong. I don't think the Minister would want us to pass legislation which provides for unlimited capital borrowing, without the authority of this House. Mr. Speaker, I was elected to this legislature as a farmer, as a member of a community which is an agricultural community, of a community that for years has fairly well paid its way in society, a community that has gone through good times and hard times, a community that knew the value of a dollar in the days of the 1930's, the so-called "dirty thirties", and I don't believe, Sir, that the policy expressed in this bill is a policy that the people of my community would endorse.

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.)

In this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, throughout the years, we have found members of the farming community have held offices of high influence, indeed we have had premiers of this province who were members of the farming community, and, Sir, in their wisdom of the day throughout the history of our province I think history will show that their management of the financial affairs of this province has by and large been fairly commendable.

The history of this province has shown that we in Manitoba have always been in a fairly secure financial situation. But, Sir, since the advent of the present administration, people are now starting to ask questions and they haven't been getting the answers. They have now been starting to ask questions on the method used by this administration in handling the financial affairs of our province. Mr. Speaker, we have a bill in front of us asking for the borrowing of \$393 million, that's \$393 million that this government says should not be placed on the tax-payers of today, it's going to be used today but the taxpayer of today does not have to pay for it. Mr. Speaker, in our gallery we have young people, I believe we have represented various schools both in this country and in other countries - these are the young people who are going to be asked to pay the bills that this government is levying on them today.

Mr. Speaker, I have not got the figures in front of me but if my memory serves me correctly, since this government has taken office I would say that in the first year of operation, in the year 1969 they borrowed somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$67 million. The next year it more than doubled, the next year it doubled again until this year we are now up to \$393 million in capital borrowing. Mr. Speaker, this is a fairly substantial mortgage that is being placed on the young people of tomorrow and it is questionable whether the long term financial policies of this government can succeed, and whether the people that are going to be asked to pay the bill in the coming year will have the financial capacity to pay those bills.

Mr. Speaker, this is all happening at a time when the monetary systems of the world are coming under increasing scrutiny. Mr. Speaker, this morning I read with some concern an article in the Toronto Globe and Mail of a report of the meeting that is currently under way in Montreal of the International Monetary Conference. Some of the representation that was made at that conference - and I would presume it was yesterday - when a Mr. Peter Oppenheimer a Fellow and Lecturer in Economics at Oxford University made a fairly strong representation to that conference, and in that presentation he expressed the concern that the present monetary system of a pegged or a two-price system for gold was not the proper answer. He also expressed the concern that the special drawing right that exists do not provide the stability in the International Market that is essential for long term planning in international finance.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the areas which are particularly strong in the field of finance are the German market, the Japanese market, and for years and years, Mr. Speaker, the Swiss Bank has been probably the strongest of any, and yet we find that the Minister in his glee and doubtful wisdom has stood up just recently in this House and announced that the Province of Manitoba was borrowing on the German market. He also announced that his Minister of Finance I believe was in Switzerland and he also expressed an intention of talking to the Japanese people, and I understand some of them may be in the building at the present time. He informs me they have already left.

But, Mr. Speaker, here we have a province which we must admit in international affairs is a relatively weak sister - we are not that influential - dealing with the strong financial barons of the international market. They're not dealing in Canadian dollars, any of the deals he has made have been in the terms of Deutschmarks, and at the same time we find that the International Monetary Conference is suggesting a re-evaluation of those countries that are on the relatively so-called gold dollar. I question, Sir, as a farmer who really doesn't understand the full implications of the monetary fund, but I assure you, Sir, that I'm not the only farmer in Manitoba, nor are there too many people in this legislature who do understand. The Minister of Finance says that he understands but today I begin to question whether he does or not. He has also said that because of the confidence placed in the Manitoba Government that they can pick and choose the time when they should borrow money. And yet, Mr. Speaker, we find that they are making deals at the present time when the dollar is certainly under attack. The long term implications even to a farmer are quite apparent, that if the dollar devalues the reichs mark we borrow today may take considerable more money to repay in the future. And he does this when he says that he can pick and choose when and where he can go to the market;

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) and if that is the case, Sir, then I think he is making a very serious mistake in making his dealings now.

Mr. Speaker these so-called experts in the international monetary world meeting in Montreal are not dealing lightly with the international monetary matters. They are concerned about the position quite frankly, the position of the American dollar; the Canadian dollar so far has been allowed to rise free although there is some pressure at the present time to peg it at 85 cents, and these are the so-called advisors to this government that suggest that. What's wrong with 65 cents? What's wrong with 95 cents? What's wrong with \$1.00? But, Mr. Speaker, when this happens we may find the Province of Manitoba when they could have borrowed substantially on the internal market where the dollar that we borrow in the province is directly related to the economy within the country, we find that that is not happening that the Minister is going outside the dollar market, and he is borrowing on the international market. And I would suggest to you, Sir, that it's basically sound philosophy that in times when matters may be under question, or may be under pressure, that you draw in your horns rather than going out and spreading your soul wide open for all to see on the international market.

Mr. Speaker, as a farmer I express the concern of many in this province. I would hope that others in the community of Manitoba express that concern to the Minister, and I would hope that the Minister would heed those expressions of concern and act accordingly. However, we see no signs, Sir, that the Minister would reduce the amount of borrowing in a time when the international market may appear weak. We see no sign that this government would govern their affairs according to the economy that exists both within our country and without. All we see, Sir, is signs of a government that is more concerned with power for the sake of power rather than the use of that power for the good of the community which is in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard some of the philosophies of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. He is a man well skilled in the academic world. His practical use of that knowledge is something that we in this province hasn't seen as yet. And what you know and what you learn from the book, Mr. Speaker, and what you use in the field, quite often are two different things.

Mr. Speaker, at this particular time in this debate on a bill which wants to provide \$393 million to this province, I wanted to express my concern about the manner in which this government is handling the financial affairs of this province, and I think that there are others in this Chamber who have a similar concern. Thank you very much.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 40 students of Grade 9 standing of the Elphinstone Collegiate. These students are under direction of Mr. Kiliwnik and they are from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. On behalf of the honourable members I welcome you here.

Order, please. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - (Cont 'd.)

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this bill so I intend to be very brief about it but as I sat here since the last few days - I am a plain and simple man, Mr. Speaker, and I sometimes find the reasoning of some people difficult to follow. It would seem that if you are in business, a smart businessman operates on credit, and if they are really smart they operate on not only total credit but a little more than their total amount that they need, like CFI. Now I see nothing wrong really with a man paying for what he uses and if the future is going to, you know, the students up in the galleries are the ones who are going to be using the facilities that are going to be built. I see nothing wrong with their paying for their share of them then. I don't know what else I can mortgage but the future and unless I really want to operate on full cash at the moment, that's what I have to do.

The question that needs to be asked is whether the projects entered upon make sense. Not whether borrowing is done to pay for them but time of borrowing may be something that is questioned. But to argue somehow that we are going to make slaves of the future by borrowing money to build things for it, is not an argument that I can follow too well. If we had done a little more borrowing 25 years ago to build schools in the north we wouldn't have the tremendous degree, the tremendous lack of education that exists in the north, and the degree of the number

(MR. ALLARD cont'd.) of untrained men that exist there.

So insofar as this bill requests money, or the authority to borrow money, to build things that are useful I must support it. It seeks money to build hydro plants, roads. You know I am always a little surprised it's been all right to build roads to every little hamlet in the southwest corner of this province, and it was all right to tax the north to do it and to take money from the north, but now when we somewhat reverse the process a little bit there's a great hue and cry, and I don't find this very reasonable. Now as I said, Mr. Speaker, I am not a very voluble man. I speak little in this House but I just thought I would get up and make these few comments and state that I intend to support this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I am going to be very brief because I had the opportunity to speak on the list of estimates this morning before the bill came, and I want to make something very clear and I frankly, Mr. Speaker, would like to be on record, and I am sure many people on this side of the House would be too. In all this discussion, Sir, about how much we are leaving the future generation to pay for - and the member for Rupertsland has looked at the young people in the gallery and said well they will have to pay for some things that they have, or that they will have use of in later years. But let's not fool around, let's make it very clear that we don't leave them a debt that they can't pay for. I certainly don't intend to leave, or would like to leave this world leaving my family, or the people behind me a \$100,000 worth of debts that they'd have to scramble their whole lives to get out of.

And I think the younger generation today are perfectly willing to fight their way, and pay their way and the ones I know will do it, and they are very capable of doing it. But let's not as people sitting in this House being damned stupid about the amount of money we are spending right now, leave them in a position where they will never get out of, and that's basically, Sir, what we are saying. The capital budget of Manitoba is getting to the point where if you want to try and get out, you'll never make it because there is nothing tougher than getting out of a situation when you're flat broke because then you really cut down the services, then you really cut-back, and it takes years to get on your feet. And that's the thing that we're trying to put across to this House; I believe that's what the Member of Thompson is saying. Nobody is saying the young people that are coming ahead in this world aren't willing to pay their own way, but let's make sure that the older people in this world don't leave them in a damned mess. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My remarks will be also quite brief, I just wanted to make one or two comments because we have listened to many experts in the financial field in the past few days on the particular Bill that is before us and one of the things that alarms me to some degree is the extent of the capital borrowing. I am certainly in no position to criticize the methods used in financing the amount of borrowings, or the methods they have used in arranging the various loans because obviously these are done on the advice of experts and people like the Deputy Minister in the Finance Department are well respected, and well regarded in the field of finance, and I am sure that they have given due consideration to the fluctuations of the Deutsche mark and the devaluations that may occur, and I don't think we could look for better advice in this area, and I am sure that they have made the best deal for Manitoba possible. We've even got a . . . on the fluctuations we have a company in Mexico now in case the Mexican peso becomes opportune, we can maybe use that to advantage. But I am sure that the members of the department that have advised the government on the various methods of financing and the fund raising instruments they have used is good advice and they have done the best that they could possibly do in this area.

I don't entirely agree with the Honourable Member for Rhineland and his method of financing, and his views on the banking structure, but I am alarmed by the size of some of the borrowings, the \$150 million for Hydro Electric Board if it is used wisely, I think it is probably wise to borrow money for this purpose, but if it is wasted then it's not a good idea either.

I will confine my remarks probably to Schedule C of the Bill on the Capital Borrowing Structure and I do feel with my experience in the business field that we probably should have a little more detail. We are being asked to provide \$92 million that really I don't think the Minister has broken down to any degree. We do have a breakdown of \$384,000 under Agriculture, and so on down the line, but there is an item of \$12,974,000 under Health which we really don't know what that is for, and an amount of 8 million some dollars under Highways, and various other items that really haven't been earmarked that clearly that we might be in a position to assess what these funds are being used for.

(MR. BLAKE cont'd.),

I wouldn't go so far as to possibly call it a slush fund but it certainly looks like a fund of convenience. If someone presented a proposition in the business world in the strict sense of the word with as scanty details as we have been provided here, I am sure they would be subject to some closer scrutiny, and that is what we are attempting to do in questioning the expenditures such as we are doing today in the second reading of the Bill, and I don't think that there is anyone would criticize the fact that we are using some of the House's time in getting answers to some of our questions, and getting a little more detail on some of these expenditures.

Now as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I won't belabour the point because some of the time has been used, a good deal of the time has been used on the methods of that they have used to raise the funds for Capital Supply, and I really don't think that they can be questioned because I am sure they have used the expertise of the people of the Department and as I have said these are above question, and they have taken into consideration the world markets, and I am sure they have made the best deal for the Province of Manitoba that they could possibly make. But I am alarmed at the size of the Capital Expenditures and in many cases the lack of detail. I have felt in the short time that I have been exposed to the Chamber that information certainly is hard to come by and I don't think we are being unrealistic when we question expenditures of the like of \$45 million as just listed under General Purposes, and then we get a breakdown that really isn't that detailed as to how the \$45 million is going to be spent.

I think that would be the extent of my remarks on the second reading, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for the time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the bill? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 70 A (1) - - The Honourable Minister for Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, I am not too sure of the procedure in this case but I would like to make an announcement which I think is rather urgent and this deals with the Department of Highways, and I didn't have the announcement ready this morning to bring it in in the regular procedure and I am wondering if it's in order to make the announcement at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: By unanimous consent anything is possible, Mr. Speaker, and if it's that necessary we would be prepared to grant the Minister that leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed? The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, this is a joint announcement within the Department of Highways and the Department of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs. This is in regard to the construction of the weigh scale, tourist reception and visitor centre and campground areas on the Trans Canada Highway at the Ontario border. The project will involve the four-laning of about 1.5 miles of the Trans Canada Highway at this point to provide for circulation space and acceleration and deceleration lanes. The weigh scale would be located in the median, while the tourist reception area to include an information booth, picnic and overnight facilities and parking space, will be north of the highway.

The area required for this development will overlap into the existing right-of-way of Provincial Trunk Highway No. 44 which runs parallel to the Trans Canada Highway on the north

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd.) side at this point. To provide adequate and safe service to the new tourist reception area it will be necessary to close PTH No. 44 at this border point. Traffic to West Hawk Lake from the east will use a traffic interchange on the Trans Canada Highway which presently serves the West Hawk Lake area. PTH No. 44 will remain open as far east as Hunt Lake to provide access to existing cottage subdivisions. An analysis of the traffic presently using PTH No. 44 indicates that it is made up largely of service vehicles and local traffic with the bulk of tourist visitors to West Hawk Lake entering by the way of the Trans Canada Highway West Hawk Lake interchange. The closing of PTH No. 44 will provide a number of advantages in the area. It will reduce traffic congestion on the beach front where available space is at a premium on peak days. It will also reduce the volume of traffic in the vicinity of the new reception centre where there will be large numbers of pedestrians.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Does the Honourable Minister have copies for the opposition and one for the Chair of the statement he is reading in?

MR. BURTNIAK: I'm sorry I just have the one but it certainly can be made available very quickly. It will also reduce the volume of traffic in the new reception centre where there will be large numbers of pedestrians. As well it will mean that the park gate on PTH No. 44 can be closed and in this way help reduce park operating costs. Tourist operators in the West Hawk area have expressed concern that the closing of the Ontario entrance to PTH No. 44 will adversely affect their business. Studies of tourist movement indicate most traffic through the Ontario entrance is local in nature and tourists are entering through the Trans Canada Highway interchange.

In order to provide information on holiday opportunities in the province as well as to provide for a communication setup for accommodation reservations, tourist operators in the area will be provided with space for an information plaza in the tourist reception area. It is felt this additional access to information on the area will more than offset any loss from way-side and casual business which is lost through the closing of PTH No. 44. Work on this entire project has already started and is to be completed for the use in the spring of 1973.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nobody from the opposition wishes to reply? The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Are we on Resolution 70 (a) -- 72 (a), Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are still on (1).

MR. SHERMAN: I beg your pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We haven't passed (1) yet.

MR. SHERMAN: We're still on General Administration, Resolution 69?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on Resolution 70 (a) (1).

MR. SHERMAN: Right. Mr. Chairman, I will naturally defer to your direction as to whether I'm under precisely the right resolution as I pose this question to the Minister. If it should properly and legitimately come up on a later resolution then I will withdraw and wait until that time. But I want to ask the Minister about trucking rates and my understanding of the order of the resolutions is that it's under the area of Management Services that I should raise the question.

The independent truckers in Manitoba have I know been in consultation with this Minister and with his predecessor for some time with respect to the trucking rates existing in the province and their impression, their conviction that rates should be raised to meet the kinds of costs and expenditures that they encounter as a consequence of the general rise in the cost of living and cost of operation in their industry.

Now I want to say at the outset that I know that they have had hearings from the former Minister, the Honourable Member for Thompson, and I know that they have had equally sympathetic hearings from the present Minister, the new Minister in charge of this department. That, however, does not alter the fact that up to this point there has been no change, no increase in trucking rates in the Province of Manitoba since 1966 if my information is correct.

Now, as a consumer I admit that increases in trucking rates are increases of the type that occur in the economy and that find themselves reflected in consumer prices and consumer costs but everyone is interdependent in our economy and the fact that consumer costs and prices might be involved to a certain extent is no legitimate argument for deferring the legitimate right of truckers, or anybody in any industry for that matter, to be justly rewarded, fairly rewarded for their investments and for their efforts.

The scale of trucking rates in the Province at the present time seems to me

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) inconsistent with and incompatible with the costs the truckers face with the general increase in the cost of living, the general increase in prices across the economy, because I would suggest there are very few sectors of the economy which have not seen or experienced an increase in return to the operator since 1966. The fact is that in the trucking industry there has been no such increased return to the operator since 1966. In that time, in the intervening six years, Mr. Chairman, the cost of licensing, the cost of insurance, the cost of gasoline, the cost of wages, the cost of repairs, the cost of equipment have all gone up and I think that the independent truckers have a legitimate case when they ask for an upward revision of the trucking rates under which they operate and I would ask the Minister what is being done in this connection. As I say, I know that he and his predecessor have both thought about it, and studied it but I think the time has come when the truckers would like to know what is being done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is quite correct that there have been representations made by the independent truckers to the Department of Highways. Not too long ago, at least since I became the Minister responsible for the Department they have been in to see me and my Deputy Minister in regard to the kind of problem that the honourable member has just stated. I suppose that there is a bit of a problem as the honourable member mentioned. I agree that because of the cost increases of whatever nature they may be and the minimum wage and repairs and what have you, that I believe that they do have a legitimate claim.

I am also informed that the last time that any increases that have been made insofar as rental equipment is concerned was back in 68 rather than 66. However, that's neither here nor there. We have agreed that based on the various increases that have taken place insofar as repairs are concerned, minimum wage and everything else, that we have decided to work out on a certain scale whereby these rental equipment will be increased and I think that in turn the independent truckers will benefit as a result.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague from Fort Garry has raised a very interesting subject here. We talk about the increased costs to the PSV, the truckers in this province. I'm wondering - one item that is a real increase in cost is the insurance, Autopac. What is the increase in the licences that truckers now have to pay as opposed to what it was before Autopac came into operation? Could the Minister give us that information?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't have that particular information but I am not aware that there has been any increases insofar as PSV's are concerned in relation to Autopac. If there is any I would certainly like to be informed, but I am not aware that is the case.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I might like to say to the Minister - I'm not able to give him the increase, the percentage increase - but I do want to say to him that if anybody was hit from Autopac it was the truckers in this province. I think that this is something that should be known by this House, but I'm not able to give the exact percentage increase at this moment. But I do want to say that the PSV licences were hit as hard and probably the hardest of any motor vehicle on the highways in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, I believe, Mr. Chairman, from the comments that have been made it's pretty general. Perhaps this is something that should be discussed with the Minister of Municipal Affairs who is responsible for Autopac. But I would like to know, you know, some specific cases where this happens to be the case. I don't think there has been actually an increase in licences as such because of Autopac. I'm not sure, I haven't heard of this thing, that's why I want to refer to the question of perhaps discussing this thing with the Minister responsible for Autopac if there has been any . . . I'm not aware of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think before we proceed any further on this particular topic I think I should draw to the members' attention that Autopac comes under the Department of Municipal Affairs. --(Interjection)-- Oh, yes it does. This is the Department of Highways and I don't want to have to remind members that we should have to go back to Rule 62 subsection (2) which is relevant to the item that is under discussion, and nowhere do I see under Operations and Contracts any reference to Autopac. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just getting back to the dialogue that I had with the Minister a couple of minutes ago. I naturally am pleased to reflect on the tone of the Minister's response to the question I raised but I was not able to determine that there was much substance to it in terms of any decision, any departmental decision to move in this area and offer the truckers some hope of relief in this respect. I would ask the Minister whether firm and definitive consideration is being given to a raising of the trucking rates, and if so how long the truckers might have to wait for it.

Allied with that question I would like to ask him whether there exists in the legislation and if not whether there will be steps taken to incorporate into the legislation the kind of protection that would guarantee that independent truckers working with sub-contractors would also qualify for the trucking rate specified by the province. If I can just elaborate on that point, Mr. Chairman, the difficulty at the present time is this: let's say you're talking of a trucking rate of something around \$8.00, you're talking about a ten cubic yard box and you're talking of a trucking rate let's say in the neighbourhood of \$8.00; now if the government contracts a job to a large contractor -- and I don't wish to mention any names but any one of the large contractors that somebody cares to visualize, those large contractors then often turn around and sub-contract the job out to an independent trucker. Now the increased rate would not necessarily, would not necessarily be passed on to the independent trucker as I understand it unless there is protection in the legislation guaranteeing him that he'll qualify for that. It's possible that the large contractor could get the increased rate but turn around and sub-contract for the old rate of \$8.00 or \$7.00 or anything that the traffic would bear and that the independent trucker has no protection against that.

My understanding of the situation is that in Alberta and Saskatchewan steps have been taken in the past to try to guarantee that the independent, the small independent trucker is protected against that kind of abuse. Whether the steps they've taken in those two provinces have been totally successful I don't know, but is the Minister contemplating some kind of action along this line?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister replies I should like to raise a point of order dealing with the statement that you made a moment ago. I have no desire to create undue problems for you, you have plenty enough as there are. And I can well accept your ruling to the extent that Autopac could in no way under the particular item that is being discussed now be brought into question.

However, under the Motor Vehicle Branch as we see it there appears to be a degree of cross-subsidization between Autopac and the Motor Vehicle Branch and I don't know how it would be possible to elicit information that we intend to seek without some reference to Autopac. I hope that your ruling did not mean that we were to be unable to ask questions relating to this particular item No. 72, because there is a very close relationship between the operations of that particular branch and Autopac. I would hope that the rules could be flexible enough to permit us without - and I accept your caution that you don't want to get into an Autopac debate here, there is a proper place for it - but without some cross references and some questions being asked in relation to this particular branch, and I hope that was the understanding that we received in your ruling.

MR. FROESE: I would like to support what the Honourable Member for Morris has indicated because we have under Resolution No. 72 the Motor Vehicle Branch

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. That was just the point I was going to draw to the attention of the Honourable Member for Morris. That under the Motor Vehicle Branch, that if there was any cross reference to Autopac I think this is the area that it should be discussed under. We are right now under Resolution 70, Management Services, Engineering, Planning and Design and we're under subsection (a) (1) and (2) which is Operations and Contracts, Salaries and Wages and other Expenditures. Under this, I am under no circumstance going to entertain any questions on Autopac.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . exactly the point I made and I hope that that was our understanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways..

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, getting back to the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member from Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman if I may, on Resolution 70 as well dealing with Management Services and especially the matter of operations and contracts, could the Minister give us some information as to how much work is actually done by municipalities for the various

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) government districts and what kind of contractual arrangements are being made from time to time for this work. It appears to me, and seems to me, that in many instances the work can be performed at less cost by the municipalities than by the government districts. I think the municipalities operate more economically. In many cases they are closer to the situation, and I would like to know from the Minister what kind of agreements the department has with the various municipalities, whether the rates in the various municipalities are the same or whether you differentiate from one municipality to the other where work is performed on the various provincial roads, and so on. Maybe the Minister could enlighten us on that as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Chairman, taking first things first - getting back to the questions on dealing with independent truckers, as I stated a few moments ago there is, or there is going to be very shortly an increase in the rental rates and I said at the time, and I repeat, that I hope that this will probably solve part of the problem that the independent truckers seem to be faced with. However, in dealing with the other matter, insofar as actual contracts are concerned, as far as the Honourable Member mentioned, I believe there are such contracts in one or two provinces in Western Canada. I am not sure whether the member is correct in saying Alberta and Saskatchewan. I do believe there is something like that in the Province of Saskatchewan, and I can say to the member that we haven't taken any action in that regard as yet but perhaps this is something that we should be looking at and see if something can be worked out.

Then on the question for the Honourable Member from Rhineland in dealing with, as far as the contracts with municipalities are concerned and as far as rates are concerned, the rates, most of the municipal equipment that is used is mainly for maintenance, such as grading, and so on, and of course rates are established by the department and I don't think that there is any such thing as a variance between one municipality and another, when the rates are established they are established for all the municipalities across the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Under operations and contracts we see an increase in salaries and wages. Has there been any new staff hired in this respect?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Chairman, just one or two comments on operations and contracts the Minister mentioned - I understood him to say that there's going to be an increase coming out shortly in regard to trucks and equipment. I think this increase has come out within the last week or two weeks. It seems to me the information I get is that trucks have been increased from - a tandem truck of certain yards has been increased from \$7.50 to \$8.50 and this has happened shortly within, let's say, the last month just for argument's sake, and probably your Deputy Minister could clear that with us, and that is a good increase, that's about 12 percent, although I don't know that that is going to be adequate to carry the truckers' operation.

Other equipment, the information I have, is that there is an increase in the area of four to five percent that came out lately. The government has to remember when they set these rates that there's a good many contractors across the province use this as a guideline to pay their sub-trades or hired equipment, hired trucks, etc. I think that the municipalities throughout the province when they come to hire equipment from private contractors or private truckers, equipment contractors, that they use the government rates to set their pay base on, and I think that the government has got to take that into consideration when a person gets a job with the government it's sometimes a month or six weeks work, or two months' work, and it's worthwhile him setting up for it. He can get 12, 14, 16 hours a day work during the summer months but then when it rolls back into the wintertime, the City of Winnipeg may hire motor grader or trucks. They go back, they use the same rate that can show a profit in the summer although it forces the contractor or the truck owner to operate at a deficit in the winter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, in regard to increases, the increase, or normal increase in annual increment and general salary, that's the only thing that I can report in that respect.

I'm sorry I didn't quite really understand the question posed by the Honourable Member for Charleswood. I caught the last part but the first remarks that he made, I really wasn't quite sure as to what the honourable member was really getting at. So if you care to repeat your statement I'll hope that it's a little quieter in the House so I can hear what you're saying.

MR. MOUG: Well what I was mentioning, Mr. Chairman, was the information I get that there has been an increase on equipment rentals including trucks, and the information that I have is that it went up from something like \$7.50 to about \$8.50, an increase of about 12 per cent, and it seems to me that's on a tandem truck with a cubic yardage of something like 10 or 12 yards, and also that other equipment, construction equipment, road grading equipment, scrapers, draglines, etc. etc., will be something like four percent increase and if you got the balance of the queries I made, I think that that will fill you in on the first part.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 70 (a) (1). The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: I'm not too sure whether the subject I want to raise is under operations and contracts, or whether it might come under planning and design, but we do know that the province has had a study made of their operations which advocate the increased use of computers in their operations. We do know that in the last couple of years we have had a change in the maintenance procedure and the recommendation has been made that the same similar type of program be instituted into the contract procedures, and I was wondering if that, or that recommendation has in fact been put into effect, and if there is increased use of computers under what section would that occur, so that we could examine it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I think that's a valid question by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. There is quite an extensive use of computers. I am sure that this will be discussed when we get under the heading of Motor Vehicle Branch, but there are other areas where computers are used but on a normal basis as they have been in the past.

MR. GRAHAM: Then I would take it there is no change being contemplated by the department as recommended in the Moore report.

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as the Moore report is concerned we are, I am not prepared to say at this moment that whatever is in the Muir report will be put into effect. However, we will be taking a look at it and if there is a possibility that some improvements can be made they will certainly be under study at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss maintenance and it might involve contracts or not but I don't want to be ruled out later if it involves contracts because contracts are under this item, but maybe the Minister would rather discuss maintenance under resolution No. 71 is that correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 70 (a) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed; (a) -- passed; (b) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed; (c) (1) -- passed; (c) (2) -- passed; (d) (1) -- The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Under bridges we notice there is a fair increase in salaries, could the Minister indicate how many additional staff have been added in this department?

MR. BURTNIAK: Yes, there is somewhat of an increase there. There is one additional yardman been added, as well as the normal increment and general salary increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, dealing with bridges and the planning and design, when a public road is constructed and bridges are involved what is the rating that these bridges can carry? What are the specifications for a public road and also for a Provincial Trunk Highway because I notice that in my particular area inter connecting yards provincial roads 243 and 248, we have had bridges there that can only carry so much weight and any of the larger loads have to go round about in order to travel those roads and this has been going on for quite some time, and we find these signs put up that the bridge is limited to such and such a weight and I feel that there should be improvements on this. This is why I am asking the question as to what the scope, and what it calls for the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: I would like to respond in this . . .

MR. JORGENSON: I hesitate to rise on a point of order again but I wonder if we're to deal with the particular roads and bridges that are going to be constructed and built whether it would be more proper to deal with them under Item 71 which gives you a pretty wide-ranging discussion on construction and maintenance of roads and bridges. This particular item is dealing with management services more particularly and rather than having a duplication of debate, I wonder if it would be possible if members would be given the opportunity on Item 71 to have that kind of discussion that I fear is going to start taking place now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point is well taken. Would the honourable member raise that question under Resolution 71?

MR. FROESE: As long as I'll be given an answer at that time I don't . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure the Minister will take the question as notice.

MR. BURTNIAK: It's agreeable with me. However I would like to perhaps -- you can rule me out of order in view of the decision made. However I would like to respond to the honourable member at this point, that maybe we should not be dealing with any particular road but it's a general situation, if I may, that exists in the province. As you know the truck weights in the province over PR's and PTH's are 74,000 pounds. However some of the bridges were constructed not only on the roads the honourable member mentions, but many other roads in the province, and these bridges were constructed by the municipalities some years ago which did not take into account the truck weights at that time and we realize that in many instances some of these bridges just cannot stand up to the kind of load weights that are crossing them at the present time but as the honourable member must understand that all the bridges cannot be -- new bridges cannot be constructed at the same time, so that wherever it is possible to use the existing bridges we will try to do so but if it becomes absolutely necessary that there has to be, a new bridge has to be constructed to carry these weights and these bridges are depleted and new ones have to be constructed we're certainly doing that, but as I say in many cases some years ago most of these bridges were constructed by the municipalities without giving any due consideration to the kind of weight that would be going over those bridges which we now have at 74,000 pounds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) (1) -- passed, (d) (2) -- passed; (e) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed; (3) -- The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, on Section (e) (3) dealing with highway buildings, storage yards, acquisition and construction. We find a fairly substantial increase in the amount of money here and yet we find that we have a bill also in front of us which will authorize the Minister to enter into agreement where there was a previous limit of 500,000, we now find 5,000, and I wonder if the money that he will be using is under this particular heading.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Before the Minister answers, I hope I'm not out of order, but yesterday we had a capital expenditure of over a million dollars concerning the garage for the Manitoba Government. I'm just wondering if the Minister is ready to give us any plans or details of the garage that is intended to be built. I think it was mentioned, it was to be built in eastern Winnipeg. I hope it is in Steinbach, Mr. Premier, but perhaps as close to Steinbach as possible if it isn't in Steinbach, but I'm very interested to know if this garage is planned on the basis to serve present units, or if perhaps you're planning that it's supposed to serve more units and take perhaps some work away from the local garages. So before you answer I thought I'd put that question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again I'm just in a bit of a quandary here. I don't -- the main heading of Resolution 70 is Management Services, Engineering, Planning and Design. I think what members are asking questions about is a specific construction. Now I quite realize that item (3) is Highway Buildings, Storage Yards, Acquisition, and Construction; whether this is planning for it or not, I leave it up to the Honourable Minister.

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, under the Resolution (3) (e) naturally there is the general salary and price increase, the new snowplow sheds at Poplar Point, Grand Beach, Mafeking, Ruttan Lake and Teulon. I believe that pretty well takes care of the amount of increase.

On the other question from the Honourable Member for La Verendrye the decision I might report at this time has certainly not been definitely made as to where the garage is going to be located. That is still a matter of policy which has to be decided and I am unable to tell him definitely where the garage is going to be built at this point in time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (e) (3) -- passed; Resolution (f) (1) -- passed. Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: The other night we got into a rather lengthy procedural wrangle over where in the estimates was the best place to raise the question of the Moore report and the House Leader, and I refer to page 1847 of Hansard, of May 9th: "If my honourable friend wants to raise a point on District Offices and the conduct there I suggest in all due respect he has the opportunity." Mr. Chairman, ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I think the Chair made a decision the other night. The Chair's decision was that there was a tabling of a report in this House. At that time a substantive motion was in order which was not moved. The House subsequently upheld the decision of the Chair and I don't think this is the item.

MR. JORGENSEN: On a point of order. I believe that we changed our rules in the House last year and the tabling of a report, Sir, if I recall correctly is no longer a debatable item in this House, so that the opportunity for debate in that respect does not lie when a report is tabled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It is true that we have changed the rules of the House but any report by due notice is debatable by a substantive motion. That was not done and on the tabling of that report . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: On that point of order. I think there should be some clarification as to the kind of report that you're discussing. The tabling of a report by a Minister simply is a report of a person or an inquiry commission that's set up to inquire into a certain matter. The tabling of that report is not necessarily a debatable one. What is debatable is the concurrence in a committee report, and it is at that stage that a debate will now take place on the concurrence of that Committee report. So therefore there is no opportunity provided under our rules other than in this occasion to debate a tabling of a departmental report, which is the case in this instance.

The other evening when this matter was receiving some heated debate the House Leader suggested that if the Member for Lakeside wanted to discuss that particular report then he would be able to do so under the item that we're now dealing with (f). This deals with District Offices. That was the suggestion of the House Leader at that time and no one disagreed with it so we on this side presumed that at the direction of the House Leader we would have the opportunity then to discuss the report under this item now, and that's what the Member for Birtle-Russell was attempting to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On the same point of order. Certainly the tabling of reports does not preclude that we cannot discuss the contents of those reports in the consideration of Estimates. -- (Interjection) -- That's for sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I rise on the same point of order. I notice that the member quoted a certain statement made by the House Leader which he uses as authority to give him the right to make a debate on the report. I suggest to him, Mr. Chairman, that notwithstanding what commitment the House Leader made or what opinion he may have expressed, the Chairman had ruled after he was challenged by the Opposition and I think the Chairman's ruling supersedes anything that the House Leader might give as an opinion or even a commitment. He cannot go beyond the Chairman's ruling which has been made.

The other point I wish to raise, Mr. Chairman, is when you can discuss it. It's true when a report is tabled, it's very difficult to discuss it specifically without first reading it. It happens in every instance. But there is another opportunity Mr. Chairman, and that is on the Minister's Salary when you can have a wide-ranging discussion with just about no holds barred. That opportunity for reasons best known to the Opposition was not taken and therefore I suggest that they cannot get into the wide-ranging -- as much as I would like that -- they cannot get into that kind of a discussion at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order. We can understand the Member for Thompson's reluctance to engage in a debate on this particular subject -- and I might say, Sir, that if you rule that we are not able to debate that particular report on this item, I have no quarrel with that. If that's your ruling, that's the way it will be. We can find other opportunities and other occasions to debate this particular item. I don't intend to

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) take up the time of the House and particularly the time of the Committee, which is our time essentially, to embark on a procedural debate on this particular question. We'll be happy to let the matter go and debate it at a time that we think is more convenient.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that the ruling that I made the other night is the one and notwithstanding what the Honourable House Leader may have said, but I made a ruling based on Citation 238 subsection 2, which was subsequently challenged by the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the ruling of the Chair was sustained by the House. Therefore I'm going to have to rule any subsequent argument on this out of order.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do believe then that the record should clearly show that to this extent at least we were misled by the House Leader the other night when he indicated to me and to members on this side that the time to discuss this report was on the item that we're now on. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I don't think that I can accept that. If there's any misleading it would have to be on the honourable member's own interpretation. The ruling of the Chair was substantiated and sustained by the House, therefore I don't think that we should open a subject matter that has already been discussed. If you want the pertinent section in Beauchesne I can quote it to you. -- (Interjection) -- Order, please.

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . I wonder if . . . to leave the imputation that was made by the Member for Lakeside about misleading the House? We could make the statement that Gurney Evans misled the House, too. That kind of thing should not be left on our record and I submit that the member . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. I think the subject matter is closed. (f) (1) -- (Interjection) -- All right, the Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: I would want to first of all correct any false impression that I may have left. I did not impute anything to the House Leader, I stated a fact, I stated a fact. The House Leader told us last night that it was under this section that we should properly discuss this bill. So it was not imputation of motives or anything else, it was a statement of fact by the House Leader which I am just now repeating for the record today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. When this House elected me as Chairman I think they elected me to make a ruling. I've made a ruling, it has been challenged, it has been sustained by this House and the ruling was - if you wish I will repeat it, but I am not going to entertain points of order on something that has already been decided. If we want to have another hulla-baloo in this House you can go right ahead. It's your time, I have ruled that that topic is out of order. You know your rights and privileges in this House. Resolution (f) (1). The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I notice that there is a considerable increase in this item. If I understand correctly we have, or used to have 10 districts. Is there an increase in the number of districts in the province or what is the reason for the increase? Do we employ more people than the districts that were already established?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: I believe, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member said there were 10 districts. I want to correct the honourable member, there are 12 districts in the province and as far as the increase, it's just provision for general salary increase and normal annual increment. That's the only increase there is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (f) (1) -- passed; 2 -- passed; The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. PETER ADAM (Ste. Rose): Under Section (2) here I would like to know whether this represents rental of offices, district offices, does this represent rent or what does it represent; and if it does I would like to know what agreement we have for the Minnedosa offices that we rent there, rented under the previous administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, staff is looking up the answer for the Member for Ste. Rose but before they come up with the answer -- provisions for maintenance, government employees residence and general rise in cost of material and supplies, also travelling expense for

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) district engineering, staff, clerical staff help, casual engineering staff and preliminary engineering and design and operation of district offices. So this will include the rental of offices as well.

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

MR. ADAM: Could the Minister indicate what we're paying for rent for offices at Minnedosa, for our district offices.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm not in a position, I don't have a breakdown at this point in time to give the honourable member a breakdown of various offices, I don't have it here. That information could be made available I suppose at any time of any offices, but we don't have a breakdown of it, just a total figure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: I'd like to ask the Minister are negotiations presently under way in connection with the premises that are leased in Minnedosa by the Highways Department in connection with renewing their lease?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I didn't quite catch the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable member please repeat the question.

MR. BLAKE: I was wondering if negotiations were under way at the present time in connection with the premises leased by the Highways Department in Minnedosa with a view to renewing that lease.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I am not aware whether negotiations are being conducted at the present time for the renewal of the lease, I would have to find out when the lease expires. If it hasn't expired then it would be probably shortly and therefore at that time we will have a look at it. But I am not aware that there are any negotiations at the present time that are being carried on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: What department would undertake these negotiations or how would I ascertain this information for instance?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this falls under the purview of the Department of Public Works.

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

MR. ADAM: I am wondering when will the Minister be able to give us the information that I have asked for? At what time will we be able to get this, under what department?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I think that the same answer applies to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose as I've just given, that the Department of Public Works would be able to give that answer to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (f) (2) -- passed. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give a little explanation on Other Expenditures here. You know, this is something I think in every resolution but could he explain the increase from 577 to 630 thousand?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had already given that, but for the benefit of the Honourable Member for Rock Lake I'd be pleased to repeat it again. This is simply provision for maintenance of government employees residence and general rise in cost materials and supplies, also covers salaries, travelling expenses of district engineering staff, clerical office staff and casual engineering staff and preliminary engineering and design and operation of district office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (f) (2) -- passed; (g)(1) -- passed. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Under planning and Design, I wonder if the Minister could indicate if there's been any substantial planning taking part within the department with regard to improved design of highway construction to carry loads which are consistent with those that exist in say, the Province of Ontario east of us?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I think that the honourable member will agree with me, I hope he will, that in this day and age with so many different things that are happening, such things as the abandonment of rail lines and what have you, where perhaps the province will have to rely more on the trucking business, definitely I would suggest that our roads ought to be constructed to a much better level or standard than they have in the past, and

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) although I don't want to get into an argument with the honourable member, nor do I want to appear too critical, I would say that perhaps the previous administrations -- and I'm not hitting at anybody -- but I think the previous administrations ought to have had a better look into the future and perhaps our standards would have been a little better than what they are today. But nevertheless, I suggest that we are definitely designing and planning better roads, better standards of roads for the future in order to contain the traffic that will be on them and heavier traffic for hauling larger loads of all kinds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What I really wanted was an assurance from the Minister that the increases in planning and design that occurred in the past 15 years in this province would continue so that the province would continue to progress as it has in the last 15 years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (g) (1) -- passed. The Honourable . . .

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I think that I should answer the honourable member when he stated that the design of roads over the past 15 years ought to continue. I agree with him that it ought to continue but there's certainly room for improvement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g) (1) -- passed; (g) (2) -- passed; (h) -- passed; (j) (1) -- passed. The Honourable Member from Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on Traffic just what is included under this item? Could the Minister explain?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, this is generally the engineering staff, I believe I'm correct, traffic engineering, that's right. Repair, replacement, sundry tools and service equipment . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: (j) (1) -- passed; (j) (2) -- passed; Resolution 70 in the amount of \$5,345,600 -- passed; Resolution 71(a) -- Honourable Member for Charleswood.

. continued on next page.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask of the Minister in regards to the proposed inner beltway that's been on the back-burners in the government for the past five years or so - and a large amount of expropriation has taken place is Charleswood, The Metropolitan Corporation during its years picked up the privately owned golf course there. It's hampering residential development - it's putting farmers in the position in the outer two miles of Charleswood in the south end towards the Macdonald area that their land can't be sold; the developers don't know what's going to become of it, the goodly portion of river bank property, some 20 odd acres is tied up. It's expensive land and subject to development at any time if there weren't a freeze on it. I was wondering if the Highways Minister could explain to the House what the government's intention is or if they have anything more than what we've had in the past so that these people would know what direction that they have to go in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Chairman, this again I would say is a matter of policy that I cannot elaborate on at the present time, but I do believe that the government I'm quite certain is looking into the various aspects of this question, and some policy will be announced in due course. I'm sorry I'm not in a position to reply to the honourable member exactly what the policy has been in the past, and I'm not aware of any real strong rigid policy that exists at the present time. The government has been looking at the possibility; I'm quite aware of what the member is trying to put forward but I'm not in a position to answer questions that relate to matters of policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, - I was wondering if the Minister could enlighten us - it seems to me there was a committee set up some time early last year, possibly a year ago right now that was to study this and bring an answer back to the department late in the year sometime like December. I think the former Minister of Highways announced that to us at one time in the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Chairman, I believe the honourable member is referring to the committee called PACT and it's under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us deals with highway maintenance and construction; and also then later on there's - distinguished between maintenance programs and assistance programs. I'd certainly like to bring notice to the Minister, or mention to the Minister that we were in to see him together with some other people in connection with Provincial Road 243; and I see that there is some work done west of Blumenfeld which I appreciate. And I also want to congratulate him on some of the other work that he proposed to do in the Rhineland constituency - and I was going to do it later on under another motion but maybe if I'm allowed, Mr. Chairman, to do that at this time I would like to congratulate him on it, because for all these many years we've been waiting to see some development in Rhineland and very little has come about. I realize that we would like to see much more coming our way than what is coming in the present highway program. I see that Highway 75 there is a further 8.5 miles of bituminous mat servicing to be constructed. This is part of last year's program that wasn't completed. But then I particularly want to express my thanks and gratitude for finally tackling Highway 30 which is the highway from Gretna to Rosenfeld, and which has caused so much grief over these many years because the highway didn't have the shoulders it required and as a result the amount that could be carried, especially during the springtime, the road restrictions were very severe and this certainly hampered Co-op Vegetable Oils in getting in their supplies. This certainly caused a lot of trouble for many of the truckers coming in. And now we find that there will be work done on it, the grade is going to be widened, there's shoulders going to be added and gravel and then some structures. I do hope that the Minister gets on with the job, that we get the tenders out and that we get as much as this stretch of road finished this year.

As far as the other roads mentioned, I mentioned 243, there's not too much in the way of mileage; the total mileage on that I think is around 2-1/2 miles which is very little. A delegation was in to see him; not only that, a petition with well over 200 names was sent to his office requesting work on this particular road and I certainly would like to emphasize to the Minister that this is a road that is used very widely. It is heavily populated in the area right along this particular stretch which goes from Gretna to Highway 32, and this is also used

(MR. FROESE cont'd) many a time because of the border crossings; at Gretna, the border crossing is open till midnight whereas at the Winkler crossing which closes at 10, and if they come late they have to go around and about way - and all the people after going around naturally have to use that particular road. But therefore I think it's so important too that we get some work on that particular road.

I mentioned the bridges before - and one of the bridges also situated on that particular stretch of road which has been restricted not only for one year but for several years; and I feel very strongly that the Minister if at all possible give some consideration to do a little more this year, and at least when it comes up next year that that will be in the program because I feel that that one is one of the most important next to Highway 30 which is being included this year.

The other one is Provincial Road 248 which I see will receive some work in the Plum Coulee access stretch, and I welcome this as well. In addition to that Highway or road 421 is going to receive attention and here again we had a delegation and I, too, wish to thank the Minister for this - to bring in a certain stretch, namely 8.2 miles of grade and gravel on this particular road. This is heavy soil in that area and it seems that the gravel every year, even if new gravel is put on, that when the road is being used in spring that it just does down and afterwards there's very little left, it's real heavy gumbo. This is where people really are in need of a good road that can be used right through the year, and all-weather road.

So I wish to thank the Minister and the department for giving attention to these roads that are on the program. But in connection with 243, it has been mentioned by some of the councillors that service insofar as maintenance should definitely be improved because they feel that they could do a much better job themselves; if they received the money to do it they would look after it themselves if this was provided for. I mentioned the use of it and I'm sure the government has had traffic counts; they are knowledgeable of what kind of traffic is on this road, and that I would like to see more servicing and more maintenance on that particular road. I could mention other ones but I think these are the main ones, and 243 especially. I do hope the Minister does consider this and try and do as best he can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, Mr. Speaker, we're dealing with an item here which is almost \$23 million. Further on down under Regulation 73, we're dealing with an item which is \$23 million. The Minister has seen fit to provide us with a detailed program of how he intends to spend the money on Item No. 73, but we have not one scrap of paper to indicate how the Minister is going to spend \$22,957,000 in this particular resolution. He's given us no breakdown, has never told us how much goes to the various segments of their community, which is the Province of Manitoba. We have no idea of knowing how much is for maintenance; how much is for maintenance within the Metropolitan area; how much is for grants; how much is for grants for transit systems. We've got absolutely nothing, just one item here for \$23 million and no breakdown for it, so I would hope that the Minister will give us a detailed breakdown of how he intends to spend \$23 million under this resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the member that just spoke. I think this of course will come up under Section 73. It's rather hard to understand that all of rural Manitoba will perhaps need no more monies than the construction of provincial trunk highways and other work in the City of Winnipeg but I'm sure if the Minister can provide us with some details afterwards this can perhaps be clarified.

I am one of those who agrees that perhaps the ten percent or so increase, it's perhaps a little less from last year to this year. I think we can also say that our gasoline taxes have perhaps risen to that amount; and I don't think anybody in this House would argue that roads are of perhaps one of the - other than education and a few other things - are perhaps are one of the most important things in our way of life today. I imagine this is the hour where gratitude must be given at times, and I want to thank the Minister for - although I want to remind him - because of the fact that I perhaps got more roads than any member in this House, I'm not boasting about this fact because it just so happens that the Trans Canada Highway happens to run through my constituency and I do not want to be penalized to the rest of my constituency because of the Trans Canada Highway. And I would like to say though that the 1.2 miles of four-lane highway through the Town of Steinbach are appreciated; I think they were due and I'm sure there will be a fairly large expenditure involved in this work. And I don't have to

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) remind the Minister that these short pieces of work that were done in the Kleefeld area and a few other places, some of the work in Hadashville, Prawda and Falcon Lake areas are appreciated, although I must also bring to his attention - I'm sure his staff are because most of them are so very capable, that I'm sure they are aware of this - there should be more work done on some of the small roads especially south of Falcon Lake that has deteriorated to some point that I think -- I'm sure that his staff is taking a look at it but this has been deteriorating over the last two years to some point where I think quite a bit of work is necessary.

Now other than that, Mr. Chairman, I want to mention one particular road to the Minister. I have brought this to his attention prior and I know he is aware of it, but I wish it to be on the records, and that is referring to Provincial Road 210. Now I know there has been some work that is going to be done on 210 further south closer to the Marchand area, that there is a particular problem between the Village of La Broquerie and the Village of St. Anne's. There are a considerable number of large dairy farmers - I think between 15 and 20 - of considerable size; they have a road problem, a grade problem plus a mileage problem. The transfers or the trucks operating and hauling the fluid milk out of this area just about have to come through the Town of Steinbach which makes them go around approximately eight miles by the time they've picked up the last customer. I'm sure the Town of Steinbach does not mind this and they're very happy to see them come through, but it isn't really quite fair because there are speed restrictions to the tune of close to a mile and a half or two miles - and of course these fellows haul pretty heavy loads and their traffic is really slowed down while they have to pass through the town. But there are about approximately six miles, six to eight miles between these two villages that I hope that the Minister and his staff is going to take a serious look at. He has already assured me that it will get the attention needed for the time being; and he could not give me any promise at this time but I hope they will sincerely look at it. I know with the shape that grade is in it will need special attention, and I hope we can get this attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, I'm one of the fellows that happens to be rather pleased that there's an increase in the budget for roads - about ten percent - because I'm one of the people that believes that money spent on a good road is invested and invested properly. And I realize that roads that are bad and rough and gravelly, where you're getting windshields broken and are ruining your cars, that they are an expense to people, so I'm happy to see the budget increased.

But I have a few roads in my area that I'm rather concerned about. There's 242 from La Riviere to the U. S. boundary; it's a gravel road and it's very dusty, and many people that are travelling up and down there have an awful lot of trouble with the dust - and I've been talking to one person that's had three windshields broken this winter. Now there's a lot of people -- we have a ski resort at La Riviere and there's a lot of people use this road during the winter time and there's a lot of complaints about it, and I think that the road would be used a lot more if it was in good condition.

Another thing I'd like to say is that probably our roads in the south, we've been very fortunate and had good roads before, but in this last number of years I think the money has been spent in the north more and some of our roads haven't had maybe as much work done on them as they should. The result is that we have some highways there that have restrictions on them at 250 pounds per square inch. Now anybody that's farming and handling grain knows that that's just about putting your roads so that you can't use them. And if you've got a road with 250 pounds per square inch that means that you can't hardly travel on it even with a farm truck with more than about 50 bushels of wheat. It's really ridiculous. I know that they're trying to save the road and I know they check it but I'm one of these people that believes that the roads are here and they're going to need to be better and that we should keep the roads we have up in shape so as the people, the farmers and others that are using them can use them, because a highway that you can't use isn't very good to you.

My other thing that I'd like to speak about is, I'm happy to think that our road from Manitou to La Riviere is being fixed but I hope within this summer sometime or towards fall that we can see this road continued on down through La Riviere. That's all I have to say; in fact, I'm rather happy with the program but I am one of these -- and I think the other country members are too -- I haven't heard people complaining about money spent on roads. They feel it's invested. This is one department I would like to see with a bigger budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would like to just say one or two things at this time and I would like to compliment the Minister on some of the work in my constituency. I think probably I'm getting a little bit of work there, too, and I compliment him on the promptness with which he is fulfilling a by-election promise made in my constituency. The tenders I believe closed today and the people in that area and myself are most grateful for the fact action you have taken there, Mr. Minister. Also I'm speaking of Highway 24 in the Oak River, Hamiota area which is receiving 11.2 miles of asphalt surfacing this year. Also I understand the work that was promised on 250 in the Sandy Lake area, in the approach area, that the survey crews are in there now attending to that. Unfortunately we're not getting all the road work done in the Erickson area but I realize that those promises were made by the candidate rather than by the Minister so I can't really expect that they'll all be fulfilled.

I'm sure the Minister is aware he's received a copy of the resolution passed by the Municipality of Blanchard in connection with maintenance on roads. This has been mentioned by several of the other members on this side so I won't belabour the fact, but I think it's most important that the good road system that we do have, that proper maintenance be carried out and it's most important that these roads aren't allowed to deteriorate to a degree where bringing them back into shape would probably cost us a great deal of money. I realize full well the necessity of roads in the north and it was necessary to spend money there but we have to keep it in relation to the requirements of the roads in the south also.

That's about all I would like to say. I do wish to thank the Minister for the promptness with which he has acted on the road work in my constituency. If the maintenance of the roads in our area received the attention which I'm sure he is well aware that they're in need of, that the road system that has complemented the Province of Manitoba over the years will be maintained in good condition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words, not to hold up the estimates here but to concur with some of the comments made by my colleague from Pembina. In our P. R. road system I have been somewhat critical of that. I think that three years ago - and I'm not going to say that just because we were government we had developed a P. R. road system that was getting to be a pretty good road, and I think that at that time, the change of governments, there was some thought of changing the formula of schedule of maintaining our P. R. roads, and I want to say to the Minister that I feel, and I've had a lot of criticism - this is not from myself, I'm getting it from my constituents, that we do have to take another look at the maintenance program of our P. R. roads. I think that there is room for improvement to get them back to what they were a few years ago.

I'm hoping, too, and I see and I'm very pleased with the Minister having the Highway No. 34, it was on for last year, they had just nicely got started on it in the fall and I'm hoping that this will be done this year without waiting until freeze-up.

Just one other item. In the Town of Pilot Mound where the front street was taken over by the Provincial Government, I have consulted with my engineer in this matter, he's aware of it and he's not happy with it and I just wanted to let the Minister know that I'm hoping something will be done with that this summer because it's something that should have been completed about two years ago. I don't know what went wrong here but the quality of the material that has gone into that front street in the Town of Pilot Mound has been anything but satisfactory. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Chairman, I also would like to make some comments regarding the highway program. A year ago when I spoke I was very unhappy about a particular six miles at the west side of Manitou on 259 that was not in the Estimates; however, the department did see fit to do this through the district man and other influences and I'm very happy to see this completion. And also to report on - I see on our projected program for this year, Highway 41 in the Municipality of Archie and I express to the Minister and to his staff the deep appreciation. This has been a road we've worked for for many years, came close to seeing it started but never quite. This municipality is well inhabited and has not got a square inch of black top and I say through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister and to his staff on behalf of the Archie municipality the deep appreciation for this base and asphalt surface - I believe I read that to be a cold mixed type, if the Minister would nod on this and this is certainly - it's joining hardtop north of it and I am sure it will encourage tourists.

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd)

On Highway 83, Mr. Chairman, you know my position on that particular highway program and to be able to report to the southern states that there is 11 some miles of base and bituminous surface is also, that is in Wallace municipality, and I'm again there quite happy to express appreciation.

On 254, yes that's near my own locality and again it's in Woodworth municipality, and again I say the same things. I've worked with these civil servant staffs for many years under many ministers and I do appreciate the Minister's approach, when I bring in delegations today, he listens to them, gives them his thoughts, never committing himself or his department, but I've always said that is the right approach even if he cannot say yes.

And again, too, on the Daly municipality on the east end I'm sure that none of these municipalities will be completely satisfied but I have five miles of grade and gravel, I travel that road twice a week I know how rough it is and again there must be considerable appreciation. And I might report, Mr. Chairman, the only one municipality that seems to be left out, and maybe because my new colleague from Minnedosa has got the big share of 24, but the west end of 24 is really in dire need. It's got to be one of the roughest roads, so I hope in a year from now that we can see some work on the rougher parts of 24 at the west end that's next to 83.

And with that I just express, through you, Mr. Chairman, the appreciation of working with the Minister and with his staff and hope that my future proposals will come up something like the total this year because you'd almost think I was on that side of the House to be used so very well and I just say I deeply appreciate it for that. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 71. Order! The time being 4:30, the last hour of every day is Private Members' hour. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and has directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The first item Friday on Private Members' hour is private members' resolutions. The resolution at the top of the Private Members' hour is Resolution 22. The Honourable Member for Brandon West -- The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Brandon West was unavoidably called out and unable to proceed with his resolution today. The only way it can remain on top of the Order Paper is by leave of the House. I hesitate to ask for that but if . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It would have to be by unanimous leave, that's right.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, may I ask for unanimous consent that this resolution remain on top of the Order Paper for . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN Q. C. (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, as a member it would probably be of some value to know whose resolution is next because then they could certainly agree to that if it would only be bumping the next resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The next resolution is the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason I asked for this - because this is one of the - I think - two resolutions that have yet to be introduced. I think all the remaining resolutions have already been introduced and have been debated to some extent.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) Very well. Next resolution No. 9. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Absent as well?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the debate on that particular resolution can continue. The resolution has been introduced. If there's nobody that wishes to speak on it then we vote on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask you, Sir, for some clarification. I believe I was the last person speaking, or my . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I would have to check with the Clerk. Just one moment please. No. 9. The Clerk informs me that we have introduced this resolution and the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, the Honourable Member for Swan River and the Honourable Member for Wellington spoke on it, and the Honourable Member for Wellington introduced an amendment. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye has spoken on it and the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek spoke five minutes on it. He has 15 minutes, I'll extend a minute or two as well. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had only spoken five minutes, but to just recap, I can only say that the amendment that has been presented by the honourable member is just not acceptable. The reason being there are people in nursing homes at the present time who are presently paying their medical expenses, they are presently paying their hospitalization and those people who are paying their own way and are in the position of being in wheelchairs at the present time are finding themselves in nursing homes who are under the care of a registered nurse at all times where there is a doctor on call. These people are very definitely needing medical attention in a nursing home situation.

Now it has been stated that the government is all for having something done about this but as mentioned previously, and just to recap a little bit, that there is a very large amount of money to be found or to be picked up towards people with this kind of care. I think that if they are paying their hospitalization and their medical and we can find a way to save a lot of money on the present medical bed we should do it. It's absolute fact, Mr. Speaker, and I can produce these figures if somebody would like them that there can be approximately at least a million and a half to two million dollars saved annually if people who are convalescing in medical hospitals were to convalesce in an area where they would not need the attention that people need when they are in a medical hospital.

Presently in Ontario, Sir, they are even going so far as to rent motels and they have taken some over to put people in who just need this type of care. So we can accomplish a tremendous amount of saving and if that amount of saving can be found, people who are paying their medical and their hospitalization should really when they are in the position of being in a nursing home and having to have nursing care where there is a doctor on call at all times they should be covered. Now we have said - the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge brought up the fact that - I believe she said 62 or 67 percent of the people at the present time are already on Care Services and a person on Care Services receives the medical attention that is requested by their doctor.

To give you an example. If a person in a nursing home under Care Services has therapy recommended, the therapist is brought in and it is paid for by Care Services. A person in a nursing home who is paying their own way in that nursing home and paying their Manitoba Medical and their doctor recommends therapy, they pay for their own therapy because that is not covered under the Medical. So there's a very large discrepancy here between those who are paying their Medical and paying their own way in a nursing home and those who are on Care Services. And to cover those people who require nursing home care of this type -- and I think that we should be looking towards geriatric care first and then we can move into the other -- we should be looking towards doing this. It is not quite good enough to say that we would like to do it but we'll wait and see what the Federal Government is going to do, because there are ways that we can do it right now and we can start by taking a tremendous burden off those people who need geriatric care, who are in wheelchairs and who have to be in nursing homes and they are paying their own Medical and their own hospitalization. They should have this service just the same as if they were in a hospital. There can be a lot of money saved by releasing medical beds which can cost up to \$75 a day by putting these people into beds that really come down to about \$15 a day, and there's a lot of money to be gained right there now.

Mr. Speaker, it's just not fair. I think there would even be a case for the Human Rights Commission. If somebody who is paying their own way under Manitoba Medical is not receiving this benefit and under Manitoba Hospitalization is not receiving this benefit when others are, I think there's a case to be made and there's a lot of dollars and cents to be saved that we can apply to doing this.

And speaking to the amendment, it is just not good enough for the people of Manitoba or the Government of Manitoba to say, let's wait and find out what the Federal Government is going to do. We can do it now. We can make a big move to doing it now. The whole total would be about \$4 million and we can probably save about two right off the bat by releasing

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) medical beds in this way. So we all know, Mr. Speaker, how long the Federal Government takes to get around to these things. We all know how long the negotiations would be but there are people that are deserving of this right now and it's not good enough to say to wait and see what the Federal Government's going to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a difficult position on this particular resolution and I debated with my conscience before making the reluctant decision to speak on it because I, like many members of this Chamber no doubt, have a relative in a nursing home who is living out the very declining years of her life and requires medical care and attention but is able to afford a room in a nursing home and as a consequence is in one. And because I'm in that position I, as I suggested, Sir, debated with my conscience at some length before making the decision to speak on this resolution, but I decided to speak on it anyway because I'm sure there are many other members of this Chamber in the same position and I'm confident that there is a meeting of minds throughout the Legislative community in this province on this question. And I decided that it would not be a position of representing a particular personal privilege should I speak because I'm sure many many colleagues on both sides of the House feel the same way and are in the same position and if we were to adopt the position that we therefore had to remain silent then the subject would never be aired, would never be properly examined.

I say that I think there is a meeting of minds on the question because many members on both sides of this Chamber, inside and outside the Chamber, to my knowledge have expressed a conviction that the kind of service, the kind of assistance that the resolution asks for is desirable and is necessary. And I know that the First Minister himself is concerned with the question and said not long ago that perhaps a per diem regulation of some kind along the lines of rate regulation such as is carried out by the Public Utilities Board or some other such agency would be the most viable and practical procedure and mechanism through which to institute this kind of relief. No one yet has come up with an acceptable formula for introducing this kind of relief but many many persons of all political persuasions seem to think that it's desirable and necessary. And it's ironic that when there is such an extensive meeting of minds on a question such as this that nothing seems possible or practical; nothing has been done, and the attitude of all too many seems to be that nothing can be done, certainly that nothing can be done unless the federal authorities initiate action and act in concert with us. I submit that with all the difficulties involved in Manitoba's striking out on its own path and its own directions on a subject such as this, notwithstanding the difficulties, mechanical and legislative and perhaps even constitutional the urgency of the matter demands that an initiative be taken by the elected legislators of this province and by the government of the day, and for that reason I side with my colleague the Member for Sturgeon Creek in his repudiation of the amendment offered by the Honourable Member for Wellington.

I believe that the Honourable Member for Wellington is as concerned about the problem here of inequity as anybody else. I believe that he has offered the amendment because he feels that there is no way out of the maze at the present time short of federal initiative and federal co-operation - and that rather than have his colleagues hung with the kind of implied criticism that is contained in a resolution of this kind, he wants to make the case clearly and unarguably that his colleagues are as interested in this kind of measure as we are or as anybody is, and that they are anxious to move in that direction but that they require above all else federal participation and federal initiative. Now that's a fair enough position for the Honourable Member for Wellington to take and I think it's a perfectly legitimate amendment for him to offer from a political point of view. I don't quarrel with his amending the resolution; had our positions been reversed we probably would have done the same thing. But the amendment is in effect meaningless and certainly constitutes nothing but window dressing and is unacceptable to us; and I suggest to my honourable friend from Wellington that if the positions were reversed and we had moved such an amendment, he would say the same thing to us. The amendment does not get at the basic question that is contained in the resolution moved by my colleague the Member for Fort Rouge, and any attempts to amend and adjust the import of that resolution by the Member for Fort Rouge are side-steps. They side-step the basic issue, the basic question, the basic urgency that all of us admit, at least in private conversation, requires some action and attention.

Mr. Chairman, the argument has been made again and again and doesn't need to be

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) repeated that there are many many hundreds of persons in the Province of Manitoba - perhaps there are thousands of persons in the Province of Manitoba - who are occupying hospital beds unnecessarily, but are forced into occupying hospital beds because of the kinds of financial relief and medical care protection offered them under the Medical Health Insurance Program in this province which does not apply to the care that they could otherwise be receiving in nursing homes. That case has been made many many times. It will be made no doubt many more times until this question is faced and resolved. It can't be escaped and it can't be avoided by amending proposals such as those contained in the basic resolution. It can't be hidden away in a corner or swept under the rug; the fact of the matter is that one of the fundamental crises in medical and hospital care and services today as every school boy and school girl knows, is shortage of acute care beds, is overcrowding, is an overstraining of hospital facilities. Part of that evolves from the very fact that many of the aged and infirm require medical care and treatment that they cannot pay for out of their own funds and that they are entitled to receive through the medical care premiums they have been paying - and the other taxation input that they have made into our economy during their lives - and the only way that they can get the return on that and get the protection and care and coverage they need is to be in hospitals. If it weren't for that many of them would, I'm certain many of them would opt for a life in nursing homes which in many respects offer them perhaps a more comfortable - well a modified, but a more comfortable and a more enjoyable and a less clinical atmosphere than the hospital does. Nursing home life would not be the goal or the objective or the desire of many of us, but in terms of priorities and in terms of comparison to the other kinds of situations that ill or ailing or elderly people can find themselves in, nursing care life is relatively acceptable and attractive. And certainly there are aspects to the environment in a good nursing home that probably tend to make for a healthier situation mentally and emotionally for many elderly people than the purely clinical, antiseptic environment of the hospital does. I think that it cannot be argued that many persons would opt for the nursing home environment if only they could receive same without putting themselves into a situation where they are strained financially; in fact for many many people putting themselves into a situation that's impossible. Not only that but the reverse side of that question as I suggested a moment ago is that relief of an extremely urgent nature would be available and forthcoming for our hospitals and our hospital services because the problem of overcrowding, particularly in acute care and geriatric wards would be at least partially solved, if not substantially solved - it would certainly be substantially relieved.

So the logic for the resolution is self-evident, and even in the life of this Legislature this kind of resolution, this kind of suggestion has found itself before us both in formal and informal ways on numerous occasions - and I'm sure that the same desire, the same proposal has been before other Legislatures of this province. It's certainly been before other legislatures of this land and before other law-making bodies in this province. It's been before social agencies; it's been before quasi government agencies; it's been before community and citizens groups - and yet nothing, Mr. Speaker, nothing so far has revealed itself as being practical and possible in terms of implementing it and undertaking it. The important thing for the government and the opposition, to the Legislature in total, to be doing is examining ways where a forward constructive step towards the implementation of that kind of measure could be worked out. And for this reason I submit, Sir, that an amendment such as that proposed by the Honourable Member for Wellington, notwithstanding the political legitimacy of it, an amendment of that type really does a disservice to the resolution and to all those on both sides of the House who believe in the sense of the resolution - because it diverts the legislators in this Chamber from the objective contained in that resolution. It says we can't do anything about it, we'll have to sweep it aside again until we get some initiative from another direction.

Now on the service that may be true, but this government has made much of its faith in and adherence to the principle of equity - and when one looks at the kind of situation facing many elderly people where their medical costs are concerned and where nursing home care is concerned, none on the government side, no one on the government side could stand up and argue in conscience that there is a principle of equity evident or obvious there. It's not an inequity of the government's making - it's not an inequity of the government's making, but it is a social inequity and it's one to which the government should be by its own philosophical commitment and conviction should be addressing itself. It should not be diverting attention from that basic question by sweeping the problem under the rug of an amendment such as that

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) before us. The question is one purely of conviction in and commitment to the principle of fairness and equity and this government has a responsibility to attempt to find that equity; to attempt to erase the inequity that exists in that field in just the same way and with just as much energy and with just as much imagination as they feel constrained to attempt to remove what they see as inequities in the taxation field. Where some people are burdened by taxation loads, others, Sir, are burdened by this kind of load, and this kind of load reflects itself down the line and involves secondary and tertiary individuals two, three and four steps removed from the initial individual because it, as I've suggested, takes up beds and acute care space in hospitals that could be devoted to persons far more in need than are receiving those facilities at the present time.

So I feel that on this side most of us have to stand against the amendment proffered by the Member for Wellington and we would hope that our position would not be misinterpreted or misconstrued. It is a position that will say we don't agree with that kind of a side-step. What we want is attention to the need as outlined in the original resolution; and what we want is attention to a resolving of the problem so that there is equity for elderly people who now are in nursing homes and who are paying for the cost of their care in those nursing homes in addition to the medicare premiums that they pay when the medical attention that they received could be available to them without that expense should they go into hospitals and take up acute bed space. So -- Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Is the honourable member aware that except for the Honourable Member for Swan River and myself -- that no one else is paying attention except for the two of us.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware of that but I would say this, that as long as I've got the attention of the Honourable the First Minister and the Honourable Member for Swan River, I think I'm ahead of the game. I'm grateful to those two honourable members for that . . .

So, Mr. Speaker, let me leave it on that note, that we don't accept the amendment because it sweeps the whole question under the rug and we ask the government to address itself to equity in this area with the same diligence and the same kind of conviction that they've expressed in financial and fiscal areas.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Member for Fort Garry if he agrees that this problem is essentially one that originated the very day that our country adopted universal hospital care coverage, which I believe was July 1, 1958; and does he attach any significance to that fact that that was almost 14 years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I would agree that the origins of the problem lie in the adoption of the universal medical care program to which the First Minister refers, but whether I attach any particular significance to that opens up a whole supplementary area of debate, Mr. Speaker. I think that all of us are aware now that as legislators we've got to look at the whole universal medical care program and look at the anomalies and the inequities that perhaps weren't foreseen at the time that we entered into that program and corrective legislation has got to be devised, and it's going to have to be creative legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Would the honourable member permit another question? Did the recent Federal Budget not make any concession towards this expenditure?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Did the recent Federal Budget not make any concession towards this expenditure? Not to my knowledge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a word on this particular resolution and amendment; the resolution by my colleague the Member for Fort Rouge and the amendment of the Honourable Member for Wellington.

I, like the Member for Sturgeon Creek and the Member for Fort Garry, think about the same on this particular amendment because what it does as they mention, pretty well kills the resolution. I, as mentioned by the Member for Fort Garry have a relative in a nursing home, or personal care home as they're called today, and have watched the rates go up at least 60 percent in the last four years and here lies the problem. Many people when they retired 15

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) years ago, husband, wife, both in good health, one of them having passed away, the other having to go to a nursing home, find that their resources are depleted after they're in the nursing home for a short period of time.

In the case of my mother, she went to the nursing home in Brandon over four years ago, the rates were \$8.00 a day, now they're \$13.00 a day, and I guess this is one of the cheaper homes - Central Park Lodge - in the Province of Manitoba. Now the problem as I see it is -- it is a beautiful home but it's one of the cheaper ones and I admire them for the way they conduct their business and the care that they give their people within that particular home -- but the problem is that about five years ago the acute hospitals were around \$15.00 a day and now they've doubled and some of them have more than doubled, it's just unbelievable the way the acute hospitals have gone up. I think the one at Wawanesa now is about \$30.00 to \$35.00 a day, somewhere in that neighbourhood, where it used to be 15 years ago about \$7.00 or \$8.00 a day. Now the extended treatment hospitals are up - where they used to be about \$10.00 a day they're up over \$20.00 a day. Both those hospitals are covered under the Health Insurance Plan and once you're not able to qualify for health treatment within those hospitals, the problems start. Under the acute hospitals and the extended treatment hospitals you can build up an estate. This is one of the things that bothers many of the people in the nursing homes who have to be re-located into a personal care home. During their time in the extended treatment hospital which many of them have stayed for a year they've been able to put away in the bank most of the money they've got on their social security money and their supplement. Now once they get in the personal care home immediately they have to start spending their estate. At the rate of four or five thousand dollars a year along with the price of drugs, it doesn't take long before their estate is wiped off.

Now I realize that about 50 percent of the people in nursing homes are paid for under social allowance and here lies the problem again. It isn't quite right for the people who have put their savings away during their lifetime that they should have to pay their way and the other people who have during their lifetime spent their money as they went along and both of them get the same treatment when they enter a personal care home. This is the way I see it anyway. I've always taken the attitude that the personal care home, nursing home should be included under the Health Services Act, paid for jointly by the Province of Manitoba and the Federal Government, but I remember so well when we were the government and we in turn tried to persuade the government of the day at Ottawa to consider this for the benefit of the people of the province who had to have this care, but they in turn up till the present day under different governments haven't seen fit to do this.

So where do we go, Mr. Speaker. Where do the people who need this care go? Some of them have been reluctant to go into personal care homes because of the fact that they would be a debt on society. Some of the people don't really consider this to be of consideration but I think it would be right and proper if the Government of Canada would consider this point of view; the Province of Manitoba consider the people who are in need and consider also the people who have a small estate. And when I'm talking of small estates, Mr. Speaker, I'm talking of estates around \$15,000, \$20,000, which was a big estate for people who retired 20 years ago. I would hope that the government reconsider their amendment that they have proposed here to the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Reconsider - I'm not expecting them to do any miracles this year, but I think in their next budget next year that they consider it at that time as a basic need for the people of the Province of Manitoba. It's quite true you might have to eliminate or decrease some programs that you might have thought of but I think this is one program that the people of the Province of Manitoba should have and should be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I think that's about all I have to say at this time because it's pretty well explained by the two members who have spoken here this afternoon in support of the original resolution and they both mentioned they're going to vote against the amendment. I, too, am going to vote against this particular amendment.

Mr. Speaker, people are living longer now and for this very reason we need more care in our nursing homes and there's more beds being built in our nursing homes today. Brandon, actually about ten years ago, twelve years ago didn't have a nursing home or I think one or two old ones. Today the City of Brandon have three beautiful nursing homes along with the other ones that have been fixed up. Central Park Lodge is opening up a new one in the very near future. I think this type of care is needed and I think it should be treated in the same way as

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) acute hospital care is treated and extended hospital care is treated. Only until we do accept the responsibility as taxpayers in the Province of Manitoba will we be doing justice for the people who pioneered this country of ours.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the original motion and now speaking to the amendment if I may. I notice that the amendment indicates that the government looks upon the original resolution very kindly and supports it but I believe that the effect of the closing part of the amendment suggests that it may be put to one side.

Now you know, Mr. Speaker, only a 100 years ago hospitals were charitable institutions and by and large over the years it has come around that people have put an end to that sort of thing and I think one of the big problems that we're meeting with today is that somehow or other this facility must be provided through the health scheme. The First Minister spoke of what happened 14 years ago. He's quite right, but in the succeeding years, Mr. Speaker, a tremendous effort has been made not only by governments but by private organizations in the provision of senior citizens' homes, so that today we have these institutions around all around the province from north to south and they're filling a tremendous need.

I remember so well, Mr. Speaker, when our senior citizens' home opened up some ten years ago. I had a great deal to do with it but on the opening occasion it occurred to me that somehow or other there was something missing and something we would have to think of; and what I was thinking of at that time was a home of some kind between the senior citizen's home and that of the hospital. So that as they had lived out their years in the senior citizen's home and required that minimal medical care, a nursing care home would be the proper thing rather than taking up expensive beds in our hospitals. It's accepted, Mr. Speaker, it's accepted by the government and it's accepted by the people of the province and no doubt of the nation. It's just a question of getting on with it and finding the dollars to do it. With the tremendous strain on the public purse these days I can see the reasoning behind the government's hesitation in going into a tremendous plan of this kind, because I think it's reasonable to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that where we have a senior citizens' home, and we have many here in the city and also around the province, each and every area, Sir, will require one of these homes for nursing care. There's no question about it, as my honourable friend was saying a moment ago, that people are living longer and they are going to become a part of life.

I would hope that the Honourable Member for Wellington as well-intentioned as he may be -- and I know he is well-intentioned in this particular respect -- but if I had the assurance that somehow or other there would be action taken with regard to the contents of this resolution I would support it, but under the wording as it is laid out here, I'm afraid too, that I must vote against the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I only will make a few comments because if the motion should go to a vote naturally I would have to take a stand, therefore I'd like to qualify my vote.

I know of a few instances especially that have come to my attention; I know of one particular lady who was bedridden at the Home for the Aged at Winkler for 18 years and another case where an elderly couple, the wife was also placed in a home, at different intervals and at different homes and that the husband found it very difficult to carry on with his pension and live on his pension that he was getting. I, too, feel that if something could be done to help these cases that we should do so.

I was just asking the Member for Souris-Killarney just about what the amount would be involved. He informs me that it would be between four and five million dollars. Is that the term we're speaking of, and if so certainly I think an attempt should be made. I do not dispute on the other hand the government's attitude that this should be shared by the Federal Government. I feel that they rightfully should participate in this but if we can't persuade them to do so what are we going to do? Are we just going to leave things as they are or are we willing to make some adjustments and some changes? I think it's for this very reason that this resolution is being brought forward, that something be done in this respect and that some alleviation be made. Therefore I would support something being done in this respect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a resolution here before us that I think is certainly commendable to the House. I'm only disappointed that the amendment that is attached hereto -- that the Honourable Member for Wellington saw fit to bring in this amendment. When

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) I think of the many senior citizens throughout the Province of Manitoba who have -- I think that my colleague here from Souris-Killarney briefly mentioned it and I would like to stress on that point just a little further -- people who spent their lifetime making their way and during that time have probably taken consideration to the time when they became senior citizens and were unable to provide for themselves, so they accepted that responsibility by putting money away in such a way that they would have sufficient to provide for themselves, and then when they reached the stage of senior citizens they have taken on that responsibility and looked after their needs because they realized that responsibility early in life. That is one category that we talk about,

There is the other group who have probably in some cases, through no fault of their own, have not been able to create a savings to look after themselves in their old age. That I wouldn't quarrel with and they are those people who have to be cared for today. But there are those people who it seems that if they have the idea that someone is going to look after them, they're going to spend all that they make and not worry about that day when it comes. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I've had so many senior citizens today bring to my attention that very thought. And they've said to me that they didn't think that this was fair to those who were prepared to take the complete responsibility of their total lives.

We have situations where we have felt that a care home for senior citizens is something that is very important. Doctors running hospitals have indicated that having had a senior citizen in the hospital as a patient and the time has arrived when they couldn't give them any future medical services but they were not able to go back to their homes and take care of themselves, and many have said they often wish there was a facility whereby they could be put in a care home and they could be looked after at a considerable lesser cost.

I think that some of these reasons that we mentioned here this afternoon are valid. Another matter I would like to bring before the House is that with the senior citizen entering a home, and the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney and I know of so many who have saved their money through hard work and because of the high cost today in these senior citizen homes, it has taken up all the equity that they have saved up. In some cases where there is husband and wife and one of them is not able to take care of himself and is put into a home, whereas the other one may be able to remain in their home, and this is another area where a hardship is created. I think, Mr. Speaker, that when we consider all these cases of our senior citizens that serious consideration should be made in this matter. And we talk about well this is going to cost more money and if the figure here has been mentioned to see this matter come to realization, the cost would be somewhere maybe in the neighbourhood of four or five million dollars. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, but supposing that is about what it would amount to, I think that the government of the day could look into other aspects of other departments and probably see where they could cut down on some of the costs without increasing taxes and could very well find that \$5 million, if that is the figure that may be necessary to raise in order to bring our care homes under the auspices of the Hospital Services. I think of one department under the Minister of Health and Social Development where I've been told of so many many cases of the abuse of the taxpayers money; I think this is one area where we could certainly do well to consider this. I know when this matter is before the Cabinet, it comes before Management Committee and when Management Committee is told well this is a matter of four or five million dollars we have to find, I would hope the government could say to the Management Committee, can we not find ways of cutting down costs in other departments, and in this way I think that we would be getting much better value for our dollar.

After all, Mr. Speaker, we are talking of a group of people that have made tremendous sacrifices in this century to make this country, to make their respective communities for what they are for those of us who are here to enjoy the amenities of life that we have. I don't think it would be asking too much, Mr. Speaker, in giving this matter serious consideration, and I say, Sir, that I regret to have to vote against this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I, too, feel the same as the other members on my side, that there's many of our senior citizens who have done so much for the country and that when they go into these homes and have to pay it all, their savings is used up very quickly. Because the way things have changed what used to be a considerable saving isn't really very much after they go - the way expenses are rising their funds are soon depleted.

But I also look at it another way. I think this here clause that says, "whereas it is

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) desirable to relieve the pressure of high cost acute care hospital beds as expeditious as possible", - I think that's a very important clause because I feel that many of the rural hospitals are keeping some of these people in there because they can't afford to pay their costs and they can't go home and they are looked after there. Now I know that this isn't just the way it should be but I have a feeling it's happening quite regularly. While in some ways I myself am somewhat reluctant to be in favour of it, I must say that it's something we're doing for so many and there's only a small percentage of the people now that aren't, because most of the people give their - some of them in particular give their material things away and then they get everything paid for them. But for the people that have been proud and that have worked hard and have saved, these are the people that you're taking their last earnings from them very quickly when other people who haven't been, shall we say, as proud or as independent are still paying their share, or paying for the cost.

I thought that the way things are now that this really was a good resolution and the amendment to it just really means that you're not going to do anything now at all. I don't think this is very fair to those senior citizens in these homes.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I really haven't much more to say on this except I think the amendment that we have before us is really defeating the resolution. It seems peculiar to me that somebody from that other side is proposing this amendment when they've always talked about being so generous. I just hope that we'll defeat their amendment and pass the resolution.

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

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): It's really remarkable the amount of agreement that seems to be in this Chamber this afternoon. Members on the other side have said how much they agree with the government stand and I must say how much I agree with many of the sentiments expressed by members on that side of the House. Particularly the Member for Fort Garry. I agree with him completely when he tells us that many senior citizens are occupying high cost acute care beds rather than be transferred into nursing homes. And I also agree with him when he tells us of the rapid depletion of a senior citizen's savings once they enter a nursing home. I also agree with him when he says that if his Party had been on this side and we'd been over there and if we had proposed a similar resolution that he would have replied in the same manner. I also agree with him when he suggests that there is on this issue developing a meeting of the minds and that we are coming together to seek a solution to this sort of problem.

In fact there has been so much agreement this afternoon that the debate has been getting really dull as it always is when everyone agrees with each other in a debate. So there are just a couple of things that I wanted to take issue with. One of them was the statement by the Member for Fort Garry who considered that in bringing forward an amendment such as this that the government was intending to sweep the problem under the carpet and not do anything about it. I'd like to suggest to him, and enlarge on it a little later, that this is simply one aspect of a much broader problem and that it's far too easy to take a very simplistic view of this matter. It's politically a very popular issue to recommend and to speak in favour of. But it is part of a much wider and a much larger problem that the government and the Department of Health and Social Development is presently grappling with.

Another point I wanted to take issue with the Member for Fort Garry on, was his statement that every school boy knows that there is a lack of acute care beds in Manitoba. Well he didn't produce any statistics to back this up and I haven't any either but it's my understanding that the rate of acute care beds in Manitoba is the second highest in Canada, that it's presently in the area of seven per thousand and that this compares with a North American average of something like five acute care beds per thousand. A number of medical studies have recommended that even this is rather on the high side, that a number of other countries manage quite well, quite easily on a figure even lower than this due to a different arrangement of the degree of medical services.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour of 5:30 having arrived, the hour of adjournment is here. The House is . . . The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, before we do adjourn, it's customary on Friday to give some indication to the honourable members opposite as to the order of business for the following week, so I simply indicate then that it is proposed to proceed next week, the beginning of next week to continue dealing with the Capital Supply bills and continue with the Estimates of the Department of Finance and Highways followed by Executive Council and I believe -- it just

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) escapes me at the moment what is next after Executive Council and Legislation, the Estimates of the Legislation, that page in the Estimate book. We may also wish to include somewhere, perhaps around midweek, consideration of Bills 5, 6 and 17 which are standing in the name of the Minister of Finance. I hope that this information is of some value.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I think it was the intention also of the Minister of Finance to ask leave to introduce a bill at the beginning of the week which he would give second reading to by Thursday and he'd require leave to do that in order to get the bill read on second reading by Thursday. I was trying to remember the name of that bill but it's one that is of some concern to him and I indicated to him that we would be, as the Official Opposition, would be prepared to give him leave to introduce that bill for first reading on Monday or Tuesday so that he could then read it for second reading on Thursday, because I believe it is his intention to be away the following week, he has a conference of some kind to attend. Also I wonder if I might announce also that Public Accounts does meet on Monday -- we hope this time Public Accounts will meet.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.