

of 1970-71 for the Department of Finance which show, for instance, provincial employment loans program, 1971 and loans to provinces, provincial agencies and municipalities as defined in the Municipal Development and Loans Act, 1971 through 1973 fiscal years. It extends beyond one fiscal year as this does. It was for those three fiscal years and that was in the previous parliament. Take external affairs, the supplementary estimates (A), 1970-71—Canadian International Development Agency, vote 20A—the grants listed in the estimates—to extend the purposes of the special accounts established by Vote 33d of Appropriation Act No. 2, 1965 to provide for payments out of that account in the current and subsequent fiscal years for social development assistance. That is a clear precedent for what we are doing here. Or take the supplementary estimates, 1971-72 for the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources—Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, nuclear research and utilization program. Vote L51a—loans in the current and subsequent fiscal years to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve, to finance the rehabilitation of the Glace Bay heavy water plant. Again, that is extending a vote beyond the fiscal year which was being reviewed in the estimates.

I want to go back to the years in which the government was under the leadership of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), and I should like to submit to the House a few precedents where authorization was granted beyond the fiscal year in question.

Mr. Alexander: With or without argument?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Let me turn to further supplementary estimates for 1958-59 for the Department of Transport for air services, civil aviation division, vote 793 for airways and airports—construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment. There is a further amount required including authority to contribute during the current and fiscal years amounts not exceeding in the aggregate \$196,000 and so on. Or look at the estimates for 1959-60 for loans, investments and advances for the Department of National Defence. Vote 475 was to authorize loans to be made in the current and subsequent fiscal years in respect of housing projects constructed pursuant to an agreement with the Minister of National Defence for occupancy by members of the Canadian forces. That is in the amount of \$10 million. Or take the estimates for 1958-59. Vote 285 relates to the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources for the northern administration and lands branch, Yukon Territory. It authorized payments to be made in respect of each of the fiscal years for the period commencing April 1, 1957 and ending March 31, 1962—a five year period, well beyond the fiscal period reviewed in the estimates. I submit to the House and Your Honour that I could introduce at least 100 precedents completely within the four corners of the item now before Your Honour.

May I say that the suggestion made in the House and before the committee by the hon. member for Yukon to the effect that the estimated cash flow—which may be more now because the provinces are applying pursuant to agreements to be signed, for an encouraging amount to meet winter unemployment this year—against the substantial amount of \$350 million, were it divided into three,

Supply

would completely destroy the purpose of the three year fund. The purpose, which the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) has suggested, is to allow the provinces and municipalities to plan, to allow the municipalities who have limited resources in their budgets for future years to count on the fund as a continuing \$350 million fund to meet winter unemployment so that they can plan ahead. The provinces can do likewise.

I went across the country in June, meeting my counterparts and their colleagues who were dealing with manpower and employment. Each of them stressed to me the importance of special planning and a sufficient period of time, consecutively taken, so that they could mount a consistent, logical and effective attack on winter and seasonal unemployment. This is the purpose—

Mr. Alexander: I wonder if the minister would permit one question in order to clear something.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Certainly.

Mr. Alexander: Is the minister now telling the House that if this is passed it is a definite commitment. I get confused when I remember the failure of this government regarding certain commitments on urban renewal. Is this a definite commitment in the event that this vote is passed?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): This is a definite commitment. It will have two controlling authorities, the ultimate authority being parliament, if parliament should authorize the loan provision in the total amount over the three year period of \$350 million, these loans to be forgiven at the rate of 50 per cent or 100 per cent labour intensive depending on the period the work is done. First, the authority is the authority of parliament pursuant to approval of this item and subsequent approval of the supply bill; second, individual contracts between the Minister of Finance of Canada and each of the provincial governments for the amount of their allocation and setting out the criteria under which the provinces are to disburse and later seek forgiveness. As I said, these contracts are reviewable by this House. Disbursements in future will be shown in future estimates before this House.

Mr. Alexander: I was just a little concerned with respect to urban renewal, Mr. Speaker. I thought definite commitments had been made and, all of a sudden, the government did a flip-flop and frustrated a lot of cities across the country. I want to elicit from the minister whether this is a definite commitment. I understand now that it is; it is in writing and is subject to the approval of parliament on a year to year basis.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The commitment will take—

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order and, with apologies to my hon. colleague. The hon. member's comment on urban renewal, with which I was associated at the time is really a misinterpretation of the type of commitments made to the municipalities. There was no legal commitment made at that time.