



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 70 2:30 p.m. Tuesday, April 17, 1962.

5th Session, 26th Legislature

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 17th, 1962.

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

Before I call the Orders of the Day, I should like to introduce to Members of the Legislative Assembly, Riverview School, some 60 pupils, Grade VI, under the guidance of their teachers, Mr. Brown and Mrs. Pawluk. The school is located in Osborne constituency and is ably represented by the Honourable Mr. Baizley. We are happy to have the students with us this afternoon and we hope that at some future time they may come back and visit with us.

We also have in the gallery St. Malo Collegiate, some 75 pupils from Grade IX to XII. Their teachers are Sr. Andre St. Jean, Principal; and Mr. W. Gosselin and Sr. St. Jean Baptiste. This school is located in Carillon constituency and is ably represented in the House by the Honourable Mr. Prefontaine. Would you like to say just a word?

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Monsieur l'orateur il me fait un grand plaisir de me joindre à vous-même pour souhaiter la bienvenue aux Révérendes Soeurs et leurs élèves de l'Institut Collégial de St-Malo. Je désire leur apprendre s'ils ne le savent pas déjà que la langue française malgré certaines lois passées dans cette Législature demeure encore langue officielle quant à l'usage parlée de la langue non pas de l'usage écrite. J'espère que vous jouirez de cette après-midi et que vous en conserverez un bon souvenir et que certains d'entre vous seront inspirés à se préparer afin de remplacer avant longtemps le vieux député de Carillon dans cette enceinte.

English translation of above:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join you in welcoming the Reverend Sisters and their pupils from St. Malo Collegiate Institute. I wish to inform them, if they don't know this already, that the French language, in spite of certain laws passed in this House, still remains an official language for speaking purposes but not for written purposes. I hope that you will enjoy your afternoon and that you will keep good memories of it. I also hope that some of you will decide to get ready so that before long you may replace the old Member for Carillon in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. Elman Guttormson (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the provincial government made any representation to have the federal government extend their assistance on fodder and hay beyond March 31st?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture & Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Yes. The Honourable Member just beat me to my feet. I just received word this morning that the federal government has agreed to extend the program until the 30th of April, and I would be very appreciative if the press and radio would give this some coverage because an awful lot of farmers are waiting to get this news. Those who have already acquired supplies since the end of March, at which time the program ran out, those who have acquired supplies on their own, I would expect, will qualify for the assistance since it has been extended to cover this period. But it has been extended and will be effective until the 30th of April.

MR. GUTTORMSON: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Is it correct that the provincial government is going to share in the cost of this assistance?

MR. HUTTON: Yes.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a subsequent question. Did the Minister say April 30th? Would he not consider possibly the 15th of May if our present weather conditions continue?

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the First Minister if I may. I understand that an announcement was made at Ottawa at 2:00 o'clock this afternoon by the Prime Minister that we shall have an election on June 18th. I wonder if the First Minister would indicate when we might have an election in Manitoba as well.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I can't give a positive answer to that question, but I'm sure that when it does come the government will be returned with a handsome majority.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Acting Minister of Public Works)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table a Return to an Order of the House No. 10, standing in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to ask a subsequent question of the First Minister. I'm happy to see his enthusiasm and his unbounded optimism -- not shared by the remainder of the people in the province I'm afraid. I wonder if now that the federal government has made this announcement, if he can tell us whether they also made a decision on the matter of the sharing of the costs on the floodway plans in Manitoba.

MR. ROBLIN: I want to tell my honourable friend that he'll hear about that particular arrangement much sooner than he thinks.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the bills standing on the Order Paper for third reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

Bill No. 20 was read section by section and passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, a number of these bills are relatively uncontentious and, if it would meet with the approval of the committee, I'd suggest we pass them page by page. But where any member has a point that he wishes to raise, naturally that can be dealt with as it arises, so if there would be no objection, I would make that suggestion to you on these bills. I wonder if you will be kind enough, Sir, to call Bill No. 108 next, the one on income tax as the second bill -- out of its order on the Order Paper.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to going page by page, on the understanding that where there are questions we can stop on the page.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): We agree too.

Bill No. 108 -- Pages 1 and 2 were read and passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, on the top of page 3, the end of the second line, we see the word "Manitoba". I would like to move an amendment that the word "or" be inserted after "Manitoba". Insert the word "or" at the end of line 2 on Page 3. It's a word that was left out in the typing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Insert the word "or".

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, at the end of the second line on page 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 3, line 2 -- agreed.

The remainder of Bill No. 108 was read page by page and passed.

Bill No. 48 was read page by page and passed, with page 4 passed as amended.

MR. MOLGAT: Page 4 is amended by the deletion of Section 14, Subsection (24)(b) -- correct? Completely deleted?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Bill No. 56 -- Page 1.

HON. JOHN THOMPSON, Q.C. (Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Virden): Could I have the permission of the House to have this bill stand?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill stand?-- Agreed.

Bill No. 59 -- Pages 1 to 4 were read and passed.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, on Page 5, Section 16, I brought this matter up in committee and I still feel that we're setting a precedent in this instance. I feel and I think that the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg securities are a second charge in most instances. I think the first charge has been taken by the cities and suburban municipalities and that the Metropolitan Corporation is a second charge. I'm sure that heretofore any securities invested with sinking funds are a first charge, and I'd like to just state the case.

The remainder of Bill No. 59 was read page by page and passed.

Bills Nos. 61, 62, 63 and 64 were read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 65 --

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, in connection with the definition of "dependent" in Section 2 (1) subsection (g), I wish to move that the committee give consideration to the advisability of changing the definition of the word "dependent", as it appears in that sub-section, to conform to the definition of the word "dependent" as used in the Income Tax Act and the regulations passed thereunder.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health)(Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I don't feel that we can accept that interpretation as moved by the member from Selkirk. The Income Tax Act, as he knows, defines who you can include as a dependent. The purpose is for exemptions on the basis of income under that Act, and, of course, the individual's responsibilities; and the purpose of the definition under The Hospital Services Insurance Act is different from the Income Tax. The broadness of the definition in The Income Tax Act is meant to carry out another function, as we know, and if it were applied to our act, where you can include great-uncles and any dependent -- grandfather -- would be at variance with all the definitions across Canada with respect to those provinces who have this type of legislation. We feel that the very necessary inclusion, which we have gained after three or four years of experience with the plan, is that the area of the greatest need is to include dependents up to the end of their 21st birthday. I would point out to the committee that in those provinces still operating with a premium system as we are, that our definition of dependency is now ahead of other provinces with the premium system.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Honourable Minister of Health, I would like to point out that our Hospital Insurance Act now has a dual system of premiums. It has the straight premium, then it has the income tax charge of 6% on the amount of tax paid to the federal government. For that reason, I feel that it will be more just and equitable if the definition of the word "dependent", as used in our Hospital Services Act, conformed to the definition of dependent in our Income Tax Act. I also feel, too, that if we adopted the definition of dependent as used in the Income Tax Act in our Hospital Services Act, that we would remove an inconsistency which presently exists between The Municipal Act and our Hospital Services Act.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I want to agree completely with the comment made by the member for Selkirk. As you know, he proposed this in a resolution in the early stages of the House. He was prevented from so doing on the basis of anticipation. He attempted to do it then in the Law Amendments Committee and was prevented from so doing there; and he is now taking the only course left to him, and that is to make an amendment at this stage of the bill. What he is proposing is the same thing as he proposed in his original resolution, and that is that anyone who is considered as a dependent for income tax purposes, which means particularly those students who are at an accepted school or university and who are over 21 years of age, that they be exempted from paying the premium here in the same way as they are considered to be a dependent on the basis of their parent's income tax return. Surely this is a very consistent position to take, particularly when you consider that the government accepted that definition of dependent last fall when they presented their own Income Tax Bill. They made no differentiation at that time and this is simply continuing exactly the same rule into this act. I think that the Member for Selkirk is making a very worthwhile suggestion to the government in this regard; that it's eminently sound and fair; that it will be, to a number of parents, an encouragement to have their children continue on at higher levels of education. That, I understand, is the purpose of having it in the case of the Federal Income Tax Act and it would be perfectly proper to follow that same procedure here.

Mr. Chairman presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. MOLGAT: I would like a divided vote, Mr. Speaker -- a standing vote.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows: 16 for the amendment and 26 opposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost.

Bill No. 65 -- Pages 1 to 6 were read and passed.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, with reference to Page 7, section 8, when this Bill was before the House I pointed out the fact that under this section a war disability pensioner, who did receive free hospital treatment in a hospital of the Department of Veterans Affairs in respect to his war disability, was required under this section as a resident of the province to

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.) . . . pay a premium. I understand that the subject is quite complicated, that even a hundred percent war disability pensioner does not, in all cases, receive hospital treatment free at a veteran's hospital; he only receives treatment free in respect of his war disability or in respect of any disability that could be traced to war service. I fully appreciate the position that the Minister is in in respect of this section, and what I would urge upon the Minister, in the interval between now and the next session of this Legislature, is that representations be made to the Government of Canada with a view to having a more just and equitable arrangement made between the Manitoba Hospital Services premium and the Canadian Pension Commission or the Department of Veterans Affairs, so that these pensioners who do receive hospital treatment at a veteran's hospital in respect of a war disability will not be required to pay the premium required of them to be paid under the provisions of this act.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word in respect to the comments of the Honourable Member from Selkirk. This has been looked into on three or four occasions by ourselves with the Department of Veterans Affairs. I'd like the House to be informed as to the two types of War Veterans -- there is the War Veterans Allowance and the War Veterans Disability. The disability pension is the compensation for war injuries and varies according to the extent of these injuries, with no regard to the financial position of the recipient. The amount of pension, therefore, is no way affected by additional income. There's no means test -- it's a disability pension for service. The War Veterans Allowance, of course, is the other type of veterans pension, as we call it, and here there is no provision made by the DVA respecting the premiums charged to recipients of disability pension, but there is with respect to the War Veterans Allowance. The Veterans Affairs pays the premium at the single rate for the recipient of War Veterans Allowance but he must cover his dependents and children. There was much confusion initially when this was inaugurated, because really of the change in federal policy where, for many years, any veteran can still go to a veterans hospital and receive total care. Prior to the inception of the plan, no charge was made to any veteran. Part of the terms of the agreement which was entered into between the province and the federal authorities, and with the onset of universal hospitalization, was the introduction of the premium system as a must for those disability pensioners to have to pay the premium. This, of course, caused confusion because of the tradition in the past. I can assure the Honourable Member for Selkirk we will continue to pursue this. The answer lies at the federal level and not at our provincial level.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister does intend to pursue it further, and I believe that he does, I would ask him, too, to make special representations to Ottawa regarding the war veterans. As The War Veterans Act is presently administered, a person in receipt of a war veterans pension does get his own hospital premium paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs but no similar provision is made for his wife. He has to pay for his wife here as a single person -- (Interjection) -- That's what I mean -- War Veterans Allowance Act. Now he has to pay for his wife and, in some instances, that really does work a hardship on that veteran because the amount that he receives as a married man is -- well it only meets the bare necessities of life -- and when he has to provide a single premium for his wife under the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan, I think it does work a hardship and I think that the Government of Canada should pay the premium of the wife as well as the husband.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, on this particular section, I don't have as strong a case as the member for Selkirk, but if the Honourable Minister is going to continue to make representations to Ottawa to try to get Ottawa to change its policy regarding war veterans allowances and hospital premium exemptions, I would ask him to keep in mind at the same time the thought that perhaps we should try to induce Ottawa to change its policy regarding hospital premiums of recipients of workmen's compensation -- those who will be receiving workmen's compensation possibly for life, and whose income from that source will be less than the maximum that's allowed for exemption under the Old Age Assistance and Old Age Security and so on. I realize it's something that might take some time, but I just hope that the Minister will keep this ever in mind and continue to press that some change may be made with regard to recipients of workmen's compensation.

Bill No. 65 -- Page 7 to 11 were read and passed.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on Page 12, I would move, under Section 17, (2)(b) in

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) . . . line 26, that the words "his spouse or" be deleted; and continuing on in line 28, that the words "or by his spouse or both of them" be deleted; in line 33, the same words "or his spouse or both of them" be deleted; and in Section 3, line 43, the words "or his spouse" be deleted. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is uncalled for that these words or these references have to be in this Act. I think experience has shown us that there is very few cases where this would come into effect, and I think it should be deleted.

Mr. Chairman presented the motion on the amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

Bill No. 65 -- Pages 12 to 17 were read and passed.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I would point out the Commission on Page 18, you're coming to the beginning of the amendments. I had these distributed to the House. These are the amendments as recommended in the negotiations between the Bar Society and the Legislative Counsel with reference to the subrogation clause. They are just as were corrected in the Law Amendments. It's very detailed and legalistic and no doubt hard to follow, but these are the amendments and I think you have them all there, Sir.

MR. MOLGAT: The result of these amendments will be to take out the obligation on the patient to take action on behalf of the MHSP. Is that correct? It will leave the MHSP in a position where they may, on their own volition, proceed to do so but the patient must inform them whether or not he will be taking action for them. Is that the sum substance of it?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): That or the

MR. MOLGAT: Beg pardon?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): They have to notify the commissioner within seven days of the filing of this action.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the changes proposed here then do nothing for the other matter which I have brought up I believe, which is the one of the Commission collecting from an individual. I have spoken to the Minister about this some time ago and I spoke in the committee, and I've now obtained the figures on the Johnson case with which, I think, the Minister himself is familiar. Now it's not the same Johnson, Mr. Chairman, this is another one. But in this case, Mr. Johnson was involved in an accident on the 8th of July, 1969. He will be crippled for life. The other person who was judged to be the guilty party in the accident by his own insurance company -- this did not go to court -- had minimum insurance. That is, \$10,000 to any injured party with a maximum of \$20,000. So in this case, the maximum that Johnson could collect was \$10,000. It turns out that in all probability his injuries, if it had gone to court, I'm told that he would likely have been awarded something upwards of \$20,000, probably between \$20,000 and \$25,000 had there been sufficient insurance available, but he was limited in this case by the insurance limits and he got \$10,000. Following the accident he was hospitalized, of course, and he ran up total hospital bills of \$1,353. Part of this was for private care which he needed during the early stages of his injury apparently and that, of course, was his own expense. But the net cost which was paid by the MHSP, or which they attributed to the case, was \$1,217.96. After lengthy negotiation with the MHSP they reduced that to half -- \$608.98 -- which may appear to be a generous arrangement, but when you consider, Mr. Chairman, that, in actual fact, in this case it's not the insurance company who is paying that \$608.00 but it's Johnson himself; because he was limited in the amount of his claim on insurance by the fact that there was only a limited amount available from the insurance company. The net result is that he got his \$10,000 from the insurance company, which isn't enough to cover his damages to himself, and yet he must turn around and pay \$608.00 to the hospital plan. This same man, Mr. Chairman, like every other Manitoba, is covered under the MHSP and is paying his premiums. He's been paying his premiums all along as a regularly insured MHSP patient, and yet when he has an accident of this sort he is forced to pay out of his own pocket, out of the award that was made to him, the amount of \$608.

Now I cannot see how this can be considered anything except a double charge on the individual, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the problems for the Commission. They have to recover wherever they can, but I think it's high time that we proceeded to make a change in the Act, simply stating that where the plaintiff does not get his full claim, then that he should not be forced to pay any hospital premiums provided that he is an insured person under the hospital plan. Now this seems to be quite fair and reasonable, Mr. Chairman, because let's assume

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . that Johnson had not had an accident but had simply been sick and had gone to hospital for the same period of time. He wouldn't have had to pay any money at all to the Hospital Plan. It would have been covered completely by his premiums, yet in this case he is forced to take out of the award the amount of \$608 without having full satisfaction of his own damages. This seems to be quite unfair.

There's a further problem in this case. I'll just mention it, although it doesn't bear on all the cases or the change in the Act now. He was actually prevented in this case from taking further action because of the retroactive clause that was passed in the bill last year. Had it not been for the retroactive clause, he would have obtained apparently his -- or at least he wouldn't have had to pay to the hospital plan any portion of this claim. That's my understanding. So I appeal to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, to make a change in the Act whereby whenever the plaintiff does not get full satisfaction of his own claim, then that he be covered simply under his premiums and not be forced to pay anything. If there is leeway over and above his insurance, then well and fine for the government to collect it.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): I have every compassion with the particular case which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has brought up. The difficulty is, as I understand it in talking to the many legal opinions -- and we have had trouble with this section as the Honourable Leader knows for the past three years -- the problem as I see it is simply this, that we are the custodian of public funds shared with Ottawa. Ottawa said we must, in all cases of third liability, as part of our agreement recover from third party claims. We must realize that private insurance companies and so on do insure their clients for this risk and it's incumbent upon us, as custodians of public funds, to do our best to recover in clear-cut cases. I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition shares with me this particular concern for that area where people get a small settlement for example, and have very large bills, and they have insured themselves under the compulsory system where they must insure themselves. We can't apparently put this into legal phraseology. We, as a matter of fact, have no legal right to prorate under the Act or in our agreement with the federal authority.

However, I can assure my honourable friend that -- and again under the subrogation we have to be, as again as custodians of public funds, in a position where when the lawyers for the claimant and the plaintiff may decide to make a private arrangement out of court, for example, we want to be in a position where we can protect public funds and other cases of real need by agreeing to settlements which these people may come to. We give the House the assurance that in every one of these cases -- I have a large file on this particular case, on which I called for, in order to try and find some means of giving more relief. I think in these cases they'll have to be dealt with in the fullest co-operation between the Commissioner and the people concerned, to come to the most equitable arrangement possible in these areas. But we are bound by these many difficulties and, as the Commissioner said yesterday, a tremendous amount of work has gone into this very problem. However, I can assure the House that we will do our very best to administer this with all humanity, and I am asking for reports on all of these cases when they come for final settlement as far as the commission is concerned. These are in the minority, as the Honourable Leader realizes, and I think really will call for individual assessment -- by the Minister possibly -- in the final analysis.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, these are probably few in number and that's why I don't think it should create such a problem, because I don't think it would be a financial hardship on the plan. The Minister said that where an arrangement was made out of court between the lawyers -- well in this particular case, of course, there was no point in going to court because there was a limited amount of insurance. There was no possibility of Johnson obtaining any more than \$10,000, and the insurance company didn't argue his claim at all. They were quite in agreement that he was injured beyond that amount and they gave him the full extent. But still the Minister will agree, will he not, that in this case Johnson is first, paying hospital premiums as an insured person; secondly, paying at least half his hospital bill. Is that not correct?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, further to what my Leader has said, I wonder if the Honourable Minister, when in discussions with Ottawa, would not try and get Ottawa in cases where there's a deficiency between the actual judgment recovered -- at least the amount of money recovered and the actual judgment -- whether he wouldn't have Ottawa agree to exercise

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.) a right of subrogation in respect of your hospital claim against the unsuccessful party.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): the National Department -- negative response.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, in this case it was possible to prorate it at 50%. Couldn't the rule be established then that wherever there isn't sufficient insurance that the government prorate down to, say \$1.00? In this case, Johnson would have been told: Well you're an insured person; it's unfortunate that there isn't enough insurance to cover all the claims; you have first right, we'll prorate you down to \$1.00; which would have meant that he would have got full relief. But as it stands now, he is paying \$608.00 out of his own pocket while still being an insured person.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): I didn't get the facts. I'm not familiar with the facts of the particular case, but is he suggesting that the judgment in this particular case was only for the maximum amount of the insurance?

MR. MOLGAT: There was no judgment because the insurance company

MR. LYON: There was a settlement though.

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, they agreed that he was injured beyond \$10,000.

MR. LYON: But was there no figure agreed upon? Because, of course, the liability rests on the driver in his personal capacity for any amount above.

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, but the driver was of such means that there was no point in pursuing him in his private capacity and it was left there.

MR. LYON: I just wanted to make sure, Mr. Chairman, that that point is not forgotten, that notwithstanding the insurance limits, that the Hospital Plan and the plaintiff would still both have a cause of action for any excess against the driver himself. I would presume from the proration that was made here, and not being seized of the facts at all, that probably the total judgment might have been in the area of \$20,000 and they prorated it down to half, still leaving the plaintiff and the Hospital Plan with a potential cause of action against the driver for the \$600 in the case of the Hospital Plan and the \$10,000 in the case of the plaintiff. I don't know the facts -- I'm merely enquiring.

MR. MOLGAT: Well there was no judgment. It was settled out of court and there was no subsequent action against the other driver because he was considered to be of insufficient means. Now if the Hospital Plan were prepared to try out their luck by collecting from the other driver, Johnson would have no objection I am sure.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, to give every co-operation as long as we're notified when this private arrangement is made what they expect of us -- in these cases of me -- and that's where I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition feels we should step in, in our wisdom, and do the right thing. In this particular case, this was the first really case of this nature we had come before us and there was agreement apparently made between the solicitors for both parties and the Commissioner that the Commission would recover 50%. Now the Honourable Leader has said that this is imposing a hardship on this particular individual. I would be happy to review this from the Commission's aspect once more and, in future, deal with these on a very careful basis.

Bill No. 65 -- the remainder of Bill No. 65 was read page by page and passed, with pages 20 and 21 passed as amended.

Bills Nos. 67 and 68 were read section by section and passed.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Secretary)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman, I think we have general agreement that these bills may all be dealt with by pages in order to save time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pages -- yes. We were, only there were just about two pages on those. Bill No. 73.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Education)(Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, I just direct your attention to the amendment which was moved in committee to add section 19, requiring the re-numbering of the present 19 and 20. I just noticed, Mr. Chairman, on the copy which I have and which was distributed, a typing error in the second line of clause 2 (c). The word "born" should have an "e" on it. Perhaps it should be corrected at this stage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: -- Agreed?

MR. McLEAN: There's a slight difference.

Bill No. 73 was read page by page and passed, with page 4 passed as amended.

Bill No. 81 was read page by page and passed.

Bill No. 82 was read section by section and passed, with Sections 3, 4 and 10 passed as amended.

Bills Nos. 84, 91, 93, 94 and 97 were read page by page and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 103.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour)(The Pas): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that this Bill stand in committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill stand? -- agreed.

Bills Nos. 105, 112 and 115 were read section by section and passed.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has considered certain Bills and directed me to report as follows: Nos. 20, 48, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 81, 82, 84, 91, 93, 94, 97, 105, 112 and 115 without amendments; and Bills Nos. 65, 73 and 108 with amendments; directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin, that the report of the Committee be received.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

Bills Nos. 20, and 48 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. JAMES COWAN (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 59 for third reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering if I would be in order to have this bill laid on the table and wait until such time as permanent peace is declared between the city and the metro organization.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

Bills Nos. 61, 62, 63, and 64, were each read a third time and passed.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli) presented Bill No. 65, for third reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I oppose Bill 65 on third reading, simply on the grounds that I feel that the subscription to, or participation under that Act should be voluntary.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

Bills Nos. 67, 68, 73, 81, 82, 84, 91, 93, 94, 97, 105, 108, 112, and 115 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: I might say that on third reading of Bill No. 108, it should have been put "as amended". -- House agreed?

MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate. Second reading of Bill No. 100. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, the authority of Metropolitan Winnipeg was incorporated in November, 1960, and this baby of 17 months, unless we call in competent help from outer space, it's already showing signs of becoming a juvenile delinquent if we believe all we hear and read. And while we talk of delinquent children, we are inclined to look around for delinquent parents. Perhaps this would be a good time for all of us to do some real soul-searching in regard to the matter of Metro.

I'm reminded of the time when William Green, the then President of the American Federation of Labour, found himself in the position of having to make an extemporaneous speech to a large gathering. This speech is considered as a classic and is recommended reading for university students. But the theme of his speech is what interested me, Mr. Speaker. The theme of his speech was that we are a lot of imperfect people living in an imperfect world; and what we might consider mistakes made in the past, may have been decisions made with the utmost sincerity. As an example, take the site of the City of Winnipeg. We became very conscious of it in the 1950 flood. In reading back we found out that the City of Winnipeg was originally to have been where the Town of Selkirk is now. The CPR main line, in fact, is heading straight for east Selkirk. I'm not in a position to know why it was changed, but these are decisions which were mighty decisions and certainly did affect the future of this city. I'm also told, and it's a matter of interest to me, that the Provencher Bridge was intended to line up with Broadway Street. The CNR established here and, there again, best laid plans had gone astray.

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.)

With the upsurge in the economy beginning in 1946, it was apparent that planning was a must if chaos in the Greater Winnipeg area was to be averted. Planning has been described as intelligent co-operation with the inevitable. I like that interpretation. It seems to me that we have gone part of the way in planning but we have fallen short on co-operation. There was no alternative to the setting up of the Metro Corporation, because the suburbs were opposed to amalgamation as firmly as the City of Winnipeg was in favour of it. I think this is an important thing to remember, Mr. Speaker. The city made no offer of compromise. Mayor Juba has repeatedly taken the narrow view when he says that he is interested mainly in those who elected him.

At the beginning of this session in speaking of Metro, the newspapers quoted me as being in favour of amalgamation. I checked my speech back with Hansard and they were right. In my speech I was asking questions of a rhetorical nature, but I did give the impression that I was in favour of amalgamation. I believe that we may be faced with amalgamation if we do not do something about Metro. But I wish to quote from a brief that I had the honour to present on behalf of West Kildonan in 1956 to the Investigating Commission. The question of amalgamation is stated here in the latter part of the brief, Mr. Speaker, and I'm quoting: "No mention has been made in this brief of amalgamation and Council can see no advantage to outright amalgamation. But if amalgamation or metropolitanization are the only alternatives to rising taxation, then all possible steps must be taken to acquaint the taxpayers with all the facts, without bias or prejudice, and the taxpayers given an opportunity to express their desires before positive and irrevocable steps are taken in this most serious matter." Now this was pertaining to amalgamation, when the referendum was favoured.

Other municipal officials, too, have expressed grave concern over the thought of amalgamation. I wish to quote from the magazine called "Civic Administration" of September, 1961, and I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker: "One of Metro's strongest supporters, Mayor Joseph Guay of St. Boniface, says at one time that he was against having a new level of government. St. Boniface is a bilingual city with a strong historical background. We were afraid of any innovation which might make us lose our identity. Now we are less worried. But even though the government brought in Metro without a referendum, it is up to all municipalities to co-operate says Mayor Guay. Failure of Metro might lead to total amalgamation of all municipalities and we would be very unhappy about that."

The commonest criticism of Metro is that it is going too far too fast. In other words, it's trying to take over too many services too quickly and spending too much money in the process. Well if we have amalgamation, we will force city standards and police and fire services immediately, with much greater increase in taxation; and Winnipeg, which is so concerned about the recommendation of losing its business tax to Metro, will have to share it then with the whole area. People of Greater Winnipeg are confused and embarrassed by all the recriminations being levelled by elected officials of both Metro and the local authorities. Although many of the remarks in these statements are not too discreet, I believe the people making them are sincere in their beliefs, but I think they would do well to ask themselves again what is best for the whole area, not just their little corner.

The Honourable Member for Carillon said, and I quote: "There had to be some kind of excuse to present this bill." In view of all his criticism of Metro, I was surprised to hear him say this. I regard this bill as a means of giving the critics of Metro an opportunity to prove their charges or air their grievances. In industry, we are taught that as long as a man has a grievance, whether it be real or fancied, as long as it exists in his mind it is a real threat to harmony in the plant, and it is only by sitting down with such a person and talking things out with him can a solution be found. The honourable member also stated that the small vote in the recent Metro election was a strike of voters. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the small turnout at the poll was caused more by confusion, and perhaps a certain amount of disgust rather than by any planned action on the part of the voters. It's hard to understand the criticism of the Chairman of Metro by the various Mayors of the Greater Winnipeg Investigating Commission, because the report that they made not only recommended that no referendum be held in the setting up of Metro, but that the first chairman of the Metro Council be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.)

I was not surprised to hear opposition to this bill from the Liberal section, because five of the six votes against the setting up of the Metro Corporation came from them; but when I heard the tirade against Metro from the Honourable Member for St. Vital and the concern of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, I had the feeling that some of the members over there on that side are trying to leave the ship that they feel is going to sink. I'll admit she's going through some stormy seas but the only real danger to the ship of Metro is that of being scuttled. Few people realize the tremendous problems which have been left for Metro. These problems, in their solution will pose real problems and will tax the best brains for years to come. I need only to mention two, Mr. Speaker, the problem of river pollution and waste disposal.

Mr. Speaker, I think, in view of the circumstances, that the presentation of Bill No. 100 at this time is a sensible thing to consider. However, in committee I intend to offer an amendment, an amendment which, if accepted, would ensure that the proposed committee mentioned in the bill would include the present Legislative Committee on Municipal Affairs together with advisory personnel as outlined by the First Minister, and I visualize therein would be people like Mr. Fred Gardiner, the ex-super Mayor of Toronto, and other capable people. In my opinion, to appoint a committee solely of people other than the elected representatives of this Legislature would be a mistake. Those of us who voted for Bill 62 believed it was the right thing to do. I think that we have a responsibility to see that, if we have made mistakes, perhaps a full investigation will reveal them and we can make amends.

I would like to again express my thoughts on this matter of a referendum, because many people feel that this has been a violation of their rights. The Honourable Member for Rhineland, along with the Honourable Member for Carillon, have repeatedly deplored the fact that the people were given no choice. I speak for myself here when I say that a referendum would have been a mistake, just as it was a mistake to have a referendum in regard to the Hogg report re Plan C. Plan C was defeated because of an uninformed public. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the citizens today are no more informed about the functions of Metro than they were in 1960. It's not their fault. One only has to read the conflicting statements of the various elected representatives to realize this confusion. I have repeatedly taken the stand, and I reiterate, that an elected representative should know more about the facts for any given issue than his constituents. He should vote according to his conscience and let the next election decide on the wisdom of his decision. A referendum was not held to set up the Government of Manitoba nor to incorporate the City of Winnipeg. It's inconceivable to think that the huge backlog of needs that were piling up in the Greater Winnipeg area would be satisfied by relying solely on resources of the Metro residents, and yet Metro was expected to solve many problems without increasing taxes. We should not have expected this. We should have said we will do the things that are most important but it will cost you money. This government, after setting up the Metro authority and realizing that over 50% of the population of Manitoba is in the metropolitan area, should have made sure that sufficient financial aid was forthcoming.

When dissension began to show between metro and local authorities, I have been told that the Premier called a meeting with the Mayors and Reeves Association inviting them to sit in an advisory capacity to Metro. This was turned down by the Mayors. Now I don't know -- probably they may have been justified in turning it down -- I do not know, because this was a more or less in camera meeting. But what happened then? The Association of Mayors and Reeves is not an official organization. Why were the councils by-passed? Because I have reason to feel that some of the councils would have agreed to sitting in an advisory capacity to Metro. It is to be hoped, Mr. Speaker, that it is the intention of the government to proceed with all haste in setting up this committee. The problems of Metro cannot wait. We will support second reading of this bill, with notice that an amendment will be made in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert-Plains, that the debate be adjourned, unless my honourable friend was going to speak, in which case I'd be --

MR. EVANS: No. I only proposed to adjourn for the benefit of the First Minister.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Flin Flon) presented Bill No. 111, an Act to amend The Mines Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, this Act will facilitate unitization agreements which are being heard before public hearings in Virden at the present time. What it does do in a unit area -- a unit area is generally -- well always affects one strata underneath the unit area itself and, up to the present time, the Act has said that only that unit area could be worked on by the unit operator. The amendments here will allow exploration to take place on the unit area above or below the strata that oil is being removed from in the unit area.

The second major amendment here is that the unit operator, up to the present time, would have to pay the full cost of any default that took place if the working interest owner became delinquent in his prorated share of the expenses involved in operating the unit field. The amendment here will permit the unit operator to collect a prorated share from the other working interested owners for the working interested owner that was delinquent in his responsibilities toward operating the field.

The other amendment is a rather minor one with respect to certificate of work. It's written in there that a certificate of work has to be given to the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. Over the years, a change was made and we have instead a report of work and, as a consequence of the change, a report of work costs much less than a certificate of work. No one has used the certificate of work; they have used the report of work; so we are just eliminating the certificate of work as it is not being used.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. HUTTON presented Bill No. 113, an Act to amend The Predator Control Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, there are two provisions in the Act, one which relieves the municipality in which a poison bait program is being carried out of paying bounty in respect of predators. The other provision authorizes the Minister of Agriculture to pay one-quarter of the bounty in respect to certificates that have been filed after the date they are acceptable, and will obviate the necessity of referring these late file certificates to the Legislature.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to attempt to oppose the bill going to committee, but I must say with all sincerity that I think my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture is making a mistake in this legislation. Not with regard to the poison bait section -- I'm heartily in favour of that provision -- but I think with regard to penalizing the municipalities for the little bit of money that's coming to them under this provision is not worthwhile. I guess nobody will accuse me of saying "what's a few dollars?" I'm conscious of the taxpayers' money, and I think this is the taxpayers' money in this case that we're withholding from the municipalities.

I don't intend to argue at any great length here, but we might have something further to say on it in the committee because I have the feeling that this whole predator control program should be reviewed once again, and I would suggest to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that he should give consideration to a thorough review of this program. He will be aware, I'm sure, from having studied the history of it, that we've gone in different times all the way from no bounty at all to a compulsory payment of bounty by the municipality, and I think we've been in practically every position in-between those two extremes. I remember the occasion, something like 30 years ago, when the bounty was wiped out completely. The municipalities were contacted by the then Minister of Municipal Affairs and very few of them -- very few had any objection to the bounty system being wiped out completely. It wasn't very many years until it was found necessary to bring back the compulsory payment of bounties. Then we got this other system whereby municipalities could declare themselves out from under the payment, and I suggest to the Minister that the time is ripe now for a review, once again, because of the whole question.

Now I don't know what's the right way. I haven't got a program to suggest to my honourable friend, but I do think that there needs to be a continuing program, and I certainly think that the present system -- my honourable friend can say to me with complete truth that we were the government that put this system in -- I do think that it imposes a discouragement -- it poses

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . a discouragement to the municipalities that have a problem and they're trying to do something about it as it stands at the present time. I had some doubts about it when the legislation was presented to the House a few years back and I expressed them, but people who were closer to the program than I, felt that this was a good thing to do and it's been given a trial. I don't think it's working well, so I suggest to my honourable friend that he might consider a review of the whole situation again.

But in the meantime I would suggest, as well as that, don't filch these few dollars from the municipalities, because I've looked back over the record and it's not usual for many of the municipalities to have delayed returns. This year I think there were only two. Through the years it's not been a great problem. It doesn't take us long, as a rule, to just put the bill through the House. I'm sure that it arises through inadvertence and I don't like the thought of our municipalities being penalized, even a few dollars in this way, just because of what is undoubtedly a slip among multitudinous duties that the municipal secretary-treasurers are asked to carry on in these times. We've loaded more and more and more work onto the secretary-treasurers through the years and no wonder that they sometimes slip up on some of these details, and it's not difficult to correct. Now I know my honourable friend's argument, that this will encourage them to get their returns in. Perhaps it will, but if it doesn't, I don't like the system of penalizing them to the extent of half of their payment.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I very seldom, if ever, turn down a second reading on a bill, but I would like to give notice to the Honourable Minister that in committee I will oppose Section 2, because for years and years -- over half a century -- we have had a portfolio, the Minister of Agriculture and Immigration. Now it's supposed to change it to Conservation. I don't know anything that the department did in conservation. I don't make that a definite statement -- I say I don't know. Probably he did, but immigration was the most important item in Canada for the last -- and particularly in the Prairie Provinces -- for the last half a century. I venture to say that half -- at least half -- of the population in Canada are immigrants that came in here between 1900 and now. This will still become an important portfolio. I feel the population in Canada today, of about 18 million, is not sufficient to give stimulus to the growth of the people and the population of Canada. Canada can absorb 50 million people at the same overhead expense. What I mean by overhead expense -- I mean legislators, councillors, managers, members of parliament, members of the legislatures and take in --

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I believe that the Bill that we are on is The Predator Control Act.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, if I would know the rules I would never break them, so can I finish?

MR. SPEAKER: No, I wouldn't think that

MR. GRAY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that it is within my honourable friend's proper rights to discuss this question, because it's well known that some of these predators that we deal with come in from other provinces.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would think that it would be wise for my honourable friend to confine himself to the subject matter of the bill.

MR. GRAY: Well the only thing I would like permission to do is tell the Honourable Member from Lakeside that they are not any worse than what he is fighting for. He's fighting for destruction; I'm fighting for preservation. Am I out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I believe that you are.

MR. GRAY: Well I said what I intended to say anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister is closing the debate.

MR. HUTTON: I assure the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the department is not looking for any sources of revenue. The matter of the penalty appeared to be necessitated when you remove the authority from the Legislature itself and delegate the authority to the Minister to make these payments in respect to these certificates that are filed late. I would suggest that the question of the extent of the penalty can well be considered in committee. We certainly have no desire to try and raise money in this way. I'm not going to go into the question that the Honourable Member for Lakeside raised about our policy in respect to predator control in the province. If we have time in committee to discuss that, that's fine.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. CARROLL presented Bill No. 116, an Act to amend The Operating Engineers and Firemen's Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, this gives authority to the Minister of Labour to allow him to allow certain plants to operate without the personal attendance of an operating engineer and fireman. This deals with plants which are of high capacity and low pressure -- that means less than 15 pounds per square inch; and in plants where people do not reside, providing that plant is equipped with automatic safety controls and connected to telephonic warning system or to an adequate audible alarm system, and providing the equipment is tested each day -- the automatic controls, etcetera. Then when the building is not in normal operation, that is on weekends and possibly after working hours in the day, the building does not have to have the personal attendance of an operating engineer or fireman. It also provides that in the case of buildings in which people do reside, providing they meet all of these other requirements, the operating engineer or fireman may be absent from the building for a period of ten hours in any one day.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. WITNEY presented Bill No. 118, an Act to amend The Fires Prevention Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, this Act in effect moves the Forestry Department into the Local Government Districts for fire prevention purposes. We have, in the first amendment here, a revision of the definition of a fire guardian to make it agree with the department nomenclature since its reorganization.

We have then made certain amendments here to include unorganized areas and to allow us the same powers that we have had in wooded districts to apply to the unorganized areas of the province, particularly in respect to obtaining burning permits. Previously, burning permits were required in organized municipalities and in wooded districts but not in unorganized territory and Local Government Districts, and this amendment will now require them to be had in Local Government Districts also.

We have made an amendment to the section which allowed people to set out a campfire for the purposes of cooking and heating. Up to the present time, they were able to do so without a permit providing that the fire was used for cooking or heating purposes. We now are saying that they can set out an open campfire without a permit, providing it is a case of emergency for cooking and heating.

The amendments and additions to Section 22 allow some qualification to the issue of travel permits. At the present time, we can have it wide open or we can have complete closure or we can allow travel permits from one point to another. Now this amendment will allow us, in the position of travel permits from one point to another, to have some qualification so that if there happened to be a qualified picnic camping spot with proper camping facilities there, that the people would be able to make use of them under the jurisdiction of a conservation officer.

The final section allows us to remove this section from the Regulations Act, which means that on orders such as foreclosure we have to gazette them in the Manitoba Gazette. We are removing that qualification by this amendment. They will be advertised in the newspapers and it will give us much faster action. If we had to wait until the Gazette was printed, we could be into severe difficulties.

MR. GRAY: An individual is a human being. He is given a license to drive a car at 30 miles an hour in the city but he still drives 40 miles. In connection with Section 6, what assurance that the man you give a permit is different from the one you don't give a permit as far as fire hazard is concerned?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I didn't get the gist of the question.

MR. GRAY: I said an individual is a human being. You are allowing in Section 6 one to set fires for cooking or emergency. That's perfectly all right -- very humanitarian. How can you trust a man that you give a permit less than the one that comes around there without a permit as to the danger of fire hazard? Am I clear now -- or should I repeat again? In Section 6 you are allowing a person -- an individual or a group -- to set fires for cooking or other

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) emergencies, which is very very charitable and very good, to those who have a permit -- a permit of what? A permit for setting the fire. That's right. But as far as the forest danger is concerned, it's the same. How do you know that the man who has a permit will put the fire out and endanger a forest fire? Am I clear now?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, where permits are issued, the conservation officers know where these people are going to be doing the burning and, as a result of that, they know where to watch for danger from forest fires and to check on these fires on a regular basis.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

.....Continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department VI - Agriculture and Conservation. Resolution 27, 3 (b) Dairy Branch.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, are you dealing with dairy industry now, (b)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. GRAY: In the first place I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister, is to find out whether this item as I understand it covers the inspection of sanitation. That's question number 1, and while I'm on my feet what I wanted to know the other day has developed, that the government is going to reduce butter by 12¢, and then will perhaps help the industry, but outside of the sanitation end of it which is very, very important, and I don't think it covers anything else for the amount is small, I would like to know whether the department or the government has any plans to support and to see and help the dairy industry to continue. As I have already stated a couple of times here, in my opinion this is one of the main industries helping more than half of the population in Manitoba. As I said, there is maybe a little help to them by developing bigger consumption of butter after we get the 12 or 14 cents from the federal government subsidy, but in general, you have talked about everything else during the debate for the last three or four days -- and I don't think it will probably last another three or four days -- of every part of the department including kosher meats and un-kosher meats; including everything, which is perfectly in order. You have given us lectures after lectures, but I do not recollect -- perhaps you have, and I'll apologize -- I do not recollect you mentioning one single word about another important industry, such as the dairy; living in the city, knowing the situation, knowing the importance of preventative health; knowing the importance of the dairy industry such as milk and other sidelines and other products that comes out of the dairy industry including butter -- not a word, to my recollection, has been mentioned as to what is the government doing to support and help them, either financially or encouragement or promising them there is better days to come, and so while I have not taken any part in the discussion on the calves and cows and everything else, I'm trying to speak to one idea, leaving the others to the other 56 members or 55 members of this House. So my question is firstly, what is the money used for; and secondly, are there any plans of any kind to defend, protect and guarantee a livelihood for the dairy industry in Manitoba?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I mentioned last evening that I would like to get some information from the Minister with regard to the Milk Board. I understand that we now have a new chairman and I believe that recently we also have a new member as well. Seeing that the new member -- recent member, comes from the Portage la Prairie district, I would expect him to be of very high calibre, which he is, and being that the new chairman comes from the environs of Portage la Prairie, I am sure that he is a very capable man, too. It seems to me -- and this is all to the good -- that things have been much more harmonious as far as the Milk Board operations are concerned recently. There used to be a time when this was quite a controversial subject and it seems to me -- and I would like to get the Minister's opinion on this -- that the real turning point in the public acceptance of the Milk Board's functions was when it was decided to place a maximum selling price to the consumer, and a minimum price to the producer, and then let the industry operate within those levels, that it has worked out very satisfactorily. In the process, I notice that in the last five years the number of fluid milk shippers to Greater Winnipeg area has declined by something in the neighborhood of 25 percent. The same type of thing, I have no doubt, is happening there that is happening with the farms in general, but will the Minister give us the present composition of the Board, the present maximum and minimum price -- I think there's probably no change since the last annual report -- and any other comments that he has on the milk situation in general. I have an interest in this because at one time my honourable friend from Carillon and I gave the House some pretty interesting times. We didn't always agree. We sometimes had some argument.

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) I feel that the situation is much more placid now than it was a few years ago. I'm not inclined to give the Minister too much credit for that; I think it's just a kind of a settling down in the industry itself.

MR. HUTTON: I'll answer the questions of the Honourable Member for Inkster. On the question of sanitation, there are inspectors who go throughout the province inspecting the creameries. Manitoba has one of the most enviable records in Canada -- has maintained it over a good many years. I think this past year, very close to 98% of our butter graded Canada First Grade -- the Manitoba Dairy and Poultry Co-op Creamery at Dauphin won the Grand Championship for butter-making at the Toronto Royal this past year. We walked off with something like better than 50% of all the awards at the Toronto Royal. We have every reason to be very proud of our dairy industry in Manitoba. As to the question of what plans we have to help the people who are in the dairy business in Manitoba, I suggest that the Legislature at the last session took a very reasonable step in protecting the interests of the dairy industry when they supported the bill that effected a compromise between butter and margarine and which reserved to butter its traditional trademark. I think that this was a real contribution to the industry and I suggest to the Honourable Member for Inkster that the announcement by the federal government that they're introducing a deficiency payment support program for butter which will not only benefit the industry but which will encourage the increased consumption of butter by decreasing the price to the consumer, that this is indeed a major step forward for the dairy industry.

We, of course, have many programs in the department. Assisting the dairymen to improve their herds by the A.I. program has been of material assistance to the dairymen to improve their herds and their production per animal -- the more milk that they can get out of a cow, you know, the more profit they get out of a cow, and through a combination of improvement in production and increased production per animal, and more reasonable price supports, I think that the dairymen's position today is probably brighter than it has been for some time. This doesn't mean to say that we have reached a plateau and there aren't going to be any more problems, but I think that the dairy industry and the country in general can take some satisfaction in the progress that has been made. The technical revolution that has hit agriculture is reflected in the dairy industry in a very concentrated way, and the Honourable Member for Lakeside has raised the question of milk production and the Milk Control Board as it affects the producers that are producing for the milk sheds in Manitoba. To give you some indication of the impact of technology on the dairy industry -- not too long ago we had about 1,400 shippers to the fluid milk market and as of the first of April 1962, we had 816. A year ago there were 893. So there has been a marked reduction this past year. I don't think it's any secret that Silverwood has given notice that they are moving into the handling of milk in bulk tanks and this, of course, will force more of the small operators out. They don't have to get out but they consider the cost involved in putting in these facilities, and many of them decide that rather than invest the monies that are required to change over their milk-house and install a bulk tank, they prefer to sell their cows at a pretty fair price that they can get for them today, and resort to some other type of production. Maybe they'll go into the business of raising heifers for the milk producers or maybe they'll switch over to shipping cream or ice cream milk or they may, in some instances, dispose of their dairy cattle and purchase beef cattle in their place. But I would say that because of the fact that they can dispose of their dairy cattle under very favourable terms and circumstances, it isn't too much of a hardship for those who decide to discontinue shipping milk to the fluid milk market. But, nevertheless, any way you look at it there has been a very revolutionary change in the handling of milk. Even though it puts some of the dairymen out of business or they elect to go out of business, it has some very favourable effects. One thing, of course, is that through these improvements in the handling of milk it is much easier for the operator to get top grades and produce a top quality product. This question of sanitation that the Member for Inkster has spoken of is safeguarded to a great extent through this new handling of milk. It is refrigerated and the bacteria count is kept down, and all the way around they are producing a much improved product.

The members of the Milk Control Board at the present time are Mr. John Paxton who is Chairman; Mr. Trimble of the Portage area and Dr. Nesbitt of the University of Manitoba,

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)and they have done an extremely efficient job in guiding the industry through very difficult times -- these of transition. I don't want to go into all the details of this because I could speak for half an hour on it. But this transition from the handling of milk by cans to the handling of milk by bulk has entailed a great deal of thought and study and planning, a great deal of juggling of shippers from one dairy to another; of giving them time to get out and making provisions for truckers to dispose of their businesses, because as a result of the bulk handling we expect that from one-third to one-half of the original truckers will be required to handle the fluid milk. The Board has done a good job and I'd agree with the Honourable Member for Lakeside when he says that he doubts if the Minister can take very much credit for it. The Minister can't take any credit at all. It is the work of the Board, working in co-operation with the milk producers and the distributing industry that has resulted in a fairly satisfactory operation.

The price to the producer -- I wish I had these figures right at hand -- I think it is at the present time \$5.00 a hundred, and \$2.40, is it, for surplus production. Quoted production is \$5.00 a hundred and with a bonus for butterfat content over and above 3.5 percent. The maximum selling price for milk by the distributors, I believe is 24¢ a quart.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside last night asked me about production figures. For 1961, the production of milk was 25,278,000 pounds as compared to 24,778,000 pounds in 1960; the value was \$16,014,000 in 1961 as compared to \$15,734,000 in 1960. Fluid milk sales were 253,537,000 during the past year as compared to 252,533,000 in 1960. The total income to the dairy industry in Manitoba during the past year was \$33,936,000 as compared to \$33,586,000 in 1960; the total milk production in Manitoba during 1961 was 1,128,948,000 pounds as compared to 1,127,000,000 the previous year.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, just one comment. The individual dairy farmer population has dropped about 500 or 600 lately, as you say, because concentrating, but I'm glad to hear that the consumptional production has not lessened. Now my question is whether the middle man, the man who buys the milk from the farmers and sells it to the homes, he is forcing some of the individual dairymen either to get out or increase their consumption. Then with the ability of the middle man and I mean plainly, I'll name them, the manufacturers here -- what do you call them, dairymen or Crescent Creamery, or the creameries and so on -- they may be forcing them to do it in order that by having the facilities of delivery of milk in expensive machinery and tanks, they may be in a position to force them to do it, which in a few years would become a monopolistic enterprise. And then the price to the consumers will go up, and when it goes up the consumer, of course, will suffer by paying more for the quart of milk a day at home. But I'm worrying about something else, Mr. Minister. It may compete with the Manitoba Liquor Commission. It'll be cheaper to buy a bottle than a bottle of milk.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, if I may express an opinion, I would like to say that the Member for Inkster is a wise gentleman. There is something in what he has said that this tendency of the numbers of producers diminishing all the time will certainly some day cause an increase in the price of milk. These fewer producers will be able to get to the market more easily; nobody else could come in; nobody else would have the equipment, the bulk tanks. It will not be easy for any new producers to start in the business. I remember very well the old days when the producers were about 1,400 -- very many small ones. It was difficult for them to get together very well and the distributors of that time seemed to like the situation. Now, of course, the number of producers is diminishing. They will be stronger. Their organization, I believe, is stronger now than it was in the old days when I happened to be the President myself of the Milk Producers Association. But this is the trend of the times. A smaller number of farmers, more acreage. The same in the dairy business -- less dairy farmers but each one of them becoming more of a specialist; maybe a better producer in a sense, producing a better quality milk, but this is not, as far as the consumer is concerned, an unmixed blessing. And with respect to those smaller producers who have sold their herds, I agree with the Minister that they have sold at a fairly good price. Cows that had a market value of some \$200 and \$250 in themselves together with the quotas involved were sold for \$500 or something along those lines. The quotas themselves had commercial value of from \$300 to \$400 and \$500 per 1,000 pounds of quota depending on the situation. Now how long will this

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd) last? Nobody knows. But I know that in my immediate area where there used to be maybe 30 in the immediate area around the Village of St. Pierre, 30 milk shippers to Winnipeg, there might be nine or ten now. The same quantity of milk possibly is being shipped to Winnipeg. These people that have sold their cows were able to pay some debts and to take a job in Winnipeg or somewhere else and they have done so. They've been seeding their farms, small farms they had, all of those and coming back for a couple of weeks in the fall to harvest, and they would work long enough in Winnipeg to qualify for unemployment insurance and they would come back in the winter and be able to live without working too hard. This situation was all right for a while. How long will it carry? Nobody knows; but it is not an unmixed blessing to see so many of the young farmers — and many of them were young because to be in the dairy business you have to be a young man. At least it's much better because there's a lot of hard work involved and it's a 365-day work the whole year 'round; but I would agree that as far as the milk board is concerned and the milk producers, there seems to be co-operation and goodwill which was not in existence in the old days. I think that when this Legislature in 1937 passed the Milk Control Act it built on solid ground an edifice that has proven its worth, although at that time there was a lot of opposition from a lot of people. Certain newspapers were claiming that this was giving too much power to the monopoly group -- a privileged ring, they said, of certain milk producers. It has worked out fine for the interests of the consumer and the producer as well. It has given a much better product, better control of the product, which was milk, for the benefit of the consumer most, so that I say that the industry seems to be operating well. We should always be careful to watch for the future and watch for any abuse, and with respect to the transportation I think that the Minister should have his eyes close to what's going on. Some producers are not too happy. I've heard of different complaints about price and conditions but I'm not in a position to say that there should be special regulations passed at the present time, but this is a matter that should be watched very closely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: (c) I think. Would that be the place where the Minister would report on the general water and sewage program for farm homes? That's one that I would like to have a report on, and equally important as far as I am concerned, I would like to get the Minister to tell us what's being done with regard to a particular village regarding its water supply. The only reference that I see in the Annual Report to the question of town and village water supplies is on page 87. One short paragraph there mentions the Neche-Altona pipeline, investigation of a number of surface sources of supply for the Town of Erickson, surveys for well supplies at Hartney and Cartwright. This of course is for a year ago, and at the time of the session last year for the 1961 program the Minister told me that the Village of MacGregor was on the list. I'm aware that it has not been done but I'm very anxious to know how it is progressing, and I must say that I regret the delay because it seemed to me that it was such an open and shut proposition, such a clear field ahead, that I would have thought it could have been completed before this time. I'm sure the Minister is familiar with it -- the fact that an excellent water supply becomes available just because of the dieselization of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They don't need their supply any more and so it's available to that village and to the other village of Austin, and to many farmers in the area as well. Actually in the rural area surrounding there's a great shortage of water now and they're almost as interested in getting the water in as the village people are. Is the Minister able to give us any assurance that that will be completed during this present year?

MR. HUTTON: Are there any other questions? Actually the Honourable Member for Lakeside is involving the Water Supply Board program in the Extension Service and . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: If my honourable friend would rather leave it until . . .

MR. HUTTON: We can leave that then.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I think the second one of those doesn't belong on this item. I'm quite willing to leave it until we come to the other.

MR. HUTTON: All right.

MR. CAMPBELL: Probably we could take both of them at the same time.

MR. HUTTON: I think I mentioned the other night that there are 112 farmers who are taking part this year in the water and sewage program where we give them these courses and

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd) . . . where we give them professional assistance in planning the plumbing for their homes. It's down quite a bit from a year ago but I think that this is accounted for by the fact that the farmer just hasn't got the money this year to undertake an investment in plumbing, but the course has been quite popular, and the assistance that they get -- in spite of the fact that honourable friends opposite consider it to be something in the nature of a pamphlet -- the assistance that they get is quite real in terms of financing because they are enabled to proceed with the guidance of a plumber who is hired by the Department, and it depends upon the response as to how many plumbers we engage each winter. In addition to that they have the services of an agricultural engineer who, during the winter works pretty well full-time on this program, and a good many homes have been modernized as a result of this program. We can number them now, I think, in the, close to the hundreds, and it seems to me that it has been extremely worth while. One thing that we find, where a number of farmers may take part in this course in a district -- they may be the innovator or the early adaptor to the course -- that once the course has been held and certain of the people in the neighbourhood modernize their homes, then others become interested, and in more than one case we have been requested to come back and hold a course the following year so that others in the neighbourhood could take advantage of it; so that we are quite happy with the way it has gone, and there's no doubt in my mind that if it hadn't been for the drought and the financial situation of the farmers, the response would have been considerably greater this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) passed? The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): I noted with a great deal of interest in the last issue of the Neepawa Press that my honourable friend has appointed a home economist for Neepawa, or I think that I should recognize that it was because of his direction and influence that we received one, and I want to thank him very, very kindly for considering the letters that have been mailed to him in this regard over the last two or three weeks. I hope, too, Mr. Chairman, that as soon as is feasibly possible the Honourable Minister will consider establishing more ag rep. districts in the province and to re-define their boundaries in the fashion that I suggested the other evening, because I do feel, Mr. Chairman, that here is one field that we can really assist the farmer in. It has been established that the work that the ag reps and the home economists do is really worth while and I hope that consideration will be given to extending this program as soon as is feasibly possible.

MR. SCHREYER: I just wanted to ask the Minister, under (c), if he could give us the break-down on two counts -- the expenditures for the farm water and sanitation project for this year, and also the amount that will be spent on agricultural council surveys. I understand by the report that the department intends to continue with area or regional surveys, I don't know if there's much expenditure involved. Could he tell us how much is being spent for these surveys and how much for the farm water and sanitation project for this year? --(Interjection)-- Beg pardon? Well, on page 17 of the report for last year there is mention made of agricultural council surveys being made in various districts and I would just like to know how much this costs if you have it readily available.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Before the Minister answers I would like to know if any contemplation is being taken by the Extension Service of providing our area with an agricultural representative. I have been speaking here for an agricultural representative for our area since 1958 and it has been taken under consideration but we haven't got the agricultural representative as yet.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, also in connection with ag reps, I think the Minister is aware of the fact that the Agricultural Society has for some time been asking that an agricultural representative be placed in the Town of Winkler. The society is dissatisfied with the service they have been getting. They feel they're not getting the services from the man that is stationed at Morden. He has a large area to cover and he's tied up in that area so much that he cannot give the proper services to the Winkler area. This matter has been brought to the attention of the proper authorities and they have requested for an ag rep or an assistant in the area. They've even gone so far as offered accommodation -- living quarters and other assistance, in order to get service in the area. I would like to know from the Minister when such assistance can be expected and whether the matter is being attended to.

MR. HUTTON: I have some figures here on the cost of the water and sewage program

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd) but they don't include the cost of the engineer, and I would like you to understand that we don't charge to this program the time that the regular members of the extension staff give to it. For instance, we have three engineers with the department. One of them spends the greater part of the winter on these programs. Mr. Hudeck and Mr. Oatway both contribute a great deal of their time as well, so these services are not charged to the program. The only charges that we have to the program are the costs of the courses that are held and the salary of one plumber. This is for this past 1961-62 season and the expenses in respect to the program are \$3,934.50, but this doesn't take into account at all the regular staff who devote a great deal of their time to it, and one should remember that the program has been reduced to seven communities this year as compared to -- I think it was eleven the year before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) passed, (d) passed, (e) passed?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, under (c) (6), (c) (6) I think is very important. I'd like the Minister to comment on how the program initiated last year has been working out -- it has to do with vegetable inspection. We made a grant of \$12,000 last year. We're appropriating \$12,000 again this year. I'd like to ask the Minister if there have been any complaints coming in to his department or to his attention, as to lack of alternative inspection facilities in the Greater Winnipeg area. The Minister will recall last year, there was voiced here some concern that it would be a matter of great inconvenience to vegetable producers, growers, in the area north and east of the city. He said that we would have to wait for a year and see how things develop. I wonder if he has any short statement to make of that at this time?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, we have not initiated the program inspection because of the late date on which the facilities were completed and in addition it was brought to our attention that there is some interest amongst the growers in establishing a vegetable marketing board, and we are waiting to see if anything develops out of this before introducing the inspection program as I announced it at the last session. The principal reason of not getting it under way was due to the late completion of the facilities.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister didn't answer my question when I asked whether we are getting another agricultural representative in our area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) passed?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think we deserve an answer on those questions regarding the agricultural representative services. This has been asked for more than once.

MR. HUTTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have expanded the agricultural representative service especially in the past four years. There are now 37 offices and some 42 ag reps and assistants, and really our position comparable to other provinces is extremely good. We have aimed at trying to get our areas organized in such a way that we would have an ag rep for each 1,000 to 1,300 farms, and we may have to reorganize our areas a little further before we have the completely satisfactory setup. I suggest to you, however, that to get any more ag reps into the field at the present time is a matter of policy that deserves very careful scrutiny. We are entering a phase in agriculture where it is hardly fair to the ag rep with his training and with the rather wide experience that he has in his everyday duties and his inability to specialize, to ask him today to perform the role that the ag rep did 20 years ago, even 10 years ago.

It appears that the role of the ag rep is changing and that possibly we are going to require more specialists to do the kind of thing that the ag rep used to do, and I am one of those who believe that before we expand the ag rep service very much more, we want to give some pretty serious consideration to the role of the ag rep today, to the methods of extension that we are using, and to the question of where we can get the most results for the dollars that we spend, because we are limited in the amount of money that we can spend. I suggest that because of the fact that agriculture is becoming highly technical and more technical as every day and every year goes by, that we can possibly get more value out of strengthening our staff of specialists who are specially trained and experienced in their given field than to expend more money on men who have a very important role to play but who have a different role to play. I think, for instance, that in the case of the special crops area in southern Manitoba, that maybe their interests can be served better by strengthening our staff of specialists than merely providing another ag rep, because the problems that we're running into in agriculture

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)today in production are those requiring the knowledge and the experience of a specialist, not someone who has a general broad training. I don't want you to think that I am minimizing the role of the ag rep at all, because I'm not. He's got a very important role to play, but his role will be in organizing, in referring, in working with the farm community, not as a man who has an answer for every particular problem that they run into, but a man who organizes and gives direction to the development of agriculture in the rural communities, and I submit to you that when we consider the impact of ARDA and the impact of the community development programs and rural industrialization, that here the ag rep must consider his role in the modern rural community where such things as rural industrialization and a new approach is being made to the problems of agriculture, and so I submit for your consideration that possibly we have reached the stage where we want to give pretty careful consideration to how we expand our extension service and where we are placing it and from where I stand now -- and I'm not going to be dogmatic about this, because there are those who feel that the whole question of extension should be given a thorough investigation -- but from where I stand today and from my limited experience, I would suggest that if we are going to strengthen our extension service that we need more specialists before we need more ag reps because the load on a specialist is growing at a fantastic rate. They are running their heads off all over the province trying to meet the needs, and they're running because the ag reps cannot -- and no one should expect him to in this day of modern agriculture -- to perform the role that he played 10, 15 years ago.

This year we added one new man to our extension corps in the weeds branch -- the soil and crops. Someone to help in the weed control program. Now I know that there is need for more assistance in the field of special crops and that probably a horticulturist could have been put to good use, but one of the newest developments in the growing of special crops is the use of chemical control on weeds in these crops and so we felt that by strengthening our weed control division and getting a specialist in there who knows the answers and who is completely up on this, that he could probably meet the need in the horticultural field, the field of special crops as well or maybe better than to add another horticulturist to the staff at this time. And he'll be able to play a dual role because at the same time that he can work with our special crop growers and our horticulturists on the staff he will be able to make his contribution to our expanding weed control program throughout the province.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, yesterday when I was speaking on the rural development under the Dennis and Fisher Lakes and the community pasture of the Interlake area, the Minister in answering it, he suggested that we want to acquaint the people and we're not going to do what the people wouldn't want us to do so the ag rep here would play a vital role. He would communicate with the people in the Interlake area; he would explain to them and he would encourage them about dehorning cattle and the diseases of cattle, and this could speed up, as the ARDA study is concerned -- I was hoping that we would have had at least some accomplishment by this year but it seems to me it's still under study, and it's a must to have an ag rep in our own area because he can play a vital role by informing the farmers. And I would go a little bit further than that. The farmer, generally speaking, he has to be a veterinarian, a machinist, an agriculturist, a horticulturist and everything and, therefore, the people look upon the ag rep that he would fill a lot of these departments because he has all kinds of bursaries, pamphlets and he's well informed. That would be a great asset to the people in our area.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, with regard to (d), I notice by the report in the paragraph on Bang's Disease, and I realize we had a discussion on this last evening, that the big bulk of the testing now of blood samples is being done by the federal personnel. Where is that taking place? Is that at our lab or have they one of their own for this purpose?

MR. HUTTON: They share the lab with us.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the Minister a question in connection with (d). A news story appeared in the Transcona Paper the other day of a resident of the City of Transcona who was attacked by what was apparently a rabid skunk. The news article reported that the body of the skunk had to be sent, I believe, to Quebec in order to ascertain as to whether or not it was in fact a rabid animal. I wonder if the Minister would verify this and, if this is so, is there any consideration to having set up in the Department of Pathology means whereby the question as to whether or not a skunk or any other animal, for that matter, is rabid

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd)could not be ascertained here in the province?

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I ask this question every year; I'd like to ask it again from the Minister. Have we in Manitoba, as yet, appointed an official provincial veterinarian?

MR. HUTTON: Are there any more questions on this?

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Yes, I think I'd like to make a few remarks, Mr. Chairman. The other day I was remarking on the lack of projects that were being conducted by this department and I was suggesting that the reason why they were not embarking on various projects trying to control some of the diseases affecting Manitoba livestock, Manitoba poultry, was that they were not given a free enough hand to attack these problems. We have an excellent staff out there; we have excellent veterinarians and it's quite possible that they could be conducting, if given the opportunity by this department, a good deal more experimental work. Now the Minister chose to twist my remarks around by saying that I had suggested that the university was not conducting enough experimental work and that I should go out and visit the Animal Science Building which, of course, I have done. I was referring to this department in particular as he knows; I was referring specifically to projects that could be carried on specifically by this department, by the animal pathologist himself and his staff at the university. While their housing is at the university, they come under the direct control of this department -- not of the university -- and any projects that they might undertake would have to come by policy from this department. Is there not work that could be done here?

MR. HUTTON: In reply to the question of determining whether a skunk or any other animal is rabid once it has been destroyed; as to whether it is determined here or in Ottawa I hardly think is too important. The matter is handled by the Health of Animals Division and there is little delay in determining whether an animal is, in fact, rabid. We had a little incident at home when a skunk established himself on our doorstep and wouldn't be moved. I was away and the neighbour came over and lured him away and destroyed him. The Health of Animals Division came out immediately and retrieved the head of the skunk, and it was only a matter of a few days that they wrote to tell us the results of the post mortem, or examination. I think that the facilities for determining whether an animal is rabid or not are adequate and the manner in which the procedure is followed by the Health of Animals in this matter is fairly adequate.

On the question of a provincial veterinarian, we have a provincial pathologist, Dr. Isa. We call him a provincial veterinarian; others may not. Some provinces have provincial veterinarians -- Manitoba, in the sense that they have them out in the field, Manitoba does not do this because we feel that the veterinarian service that is available in Manitoba is at least as adequate, if not more adequate considering the livestock production in this province, as that which is available in other provinces.

On the question raised by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye as to the control over projects that are carried on, I'd like to assure him that the Department of Agriculture does not rule out or tell the provincial lab what it is they will do and they won't do. If there are things that Dr. Isa feels that must be done in the interests of the livestock industry, I know of no move on the part of the department to tell him that he can't undertake them. I would point out, however, that when the facilities -- first of all I want to say that there is a limit to the amount of work that can be done in the lab at the university, and there has to be some priority set on the work that is undertaken, but I submit that Dr. Isa has a pretty free hand in determining the priorities of the different projects. I would submit though, that when the new facilities at the university are completed -- and they have their way of acquiring staff at the present time, building up their faculty or the animal science branch of the faculty of Agriculture -- that they are going to be able to undertake some very exciting work. Their facilities are -- well, I won't go into that again -- they're mighty good. And I think the best indication of how good they are is to go out and ask Dr. Stanger to take you through and just watch the grin on his face as he shows you the facilities with which they will be able to work. I expect that there will be some fairly close collaboration between Dr. Isa and the new animal science staff and their expanding program of research. I hope and trust -- we believe that it will be for the benefit of the livestock industry.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, says that the department has no control over what is carried on in this lab, that Dr. Isa is in charge of the lab. This is perfectly true, of

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd) course, but if there are not sufficient funds voted to purchase the equipment he might require to conduct a certain experiment, then it does fall directly on this department. If he wishes to conduct an experiment in which the microscopes, for instance, cost several thousand dollars in order to conduct the experiment in the manner in which it has to be done and this department doesn't vote the amount of money that he requires to do the experiment, then he cannot do the experiment. This is quite simple, and whereas Dr. Isa's intentions might be of the very best, and I'm sure they are, regardless of how much work he wishes to do, if he has not the equipment to do it and the funds will not be granted to him to conduct the experiment, then it's all fine and good to say that it's up to him how much he does. It isn't. It's up to this department to vote to him the funds required to carry out this specific veterinary studies which he should be conducting. I pointed out cases of poultry diseases and swine diseases which we have in Manitoba at the present time and which the staff of the department at this lab and the pathologist frankly admit that they know not too much about, yet to go into the background of these specific diseases, to study the controls, to study the necessary means of controlling them and what their origin is and so forth, they require further equipment, and the only way to get it is for this department to vote the funds to them.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say this, that one of the limiting factors in the amount of work that can be done is staff; it is very difficult to get qualified pathologists, and there has been a position open in this branch for a good many years which was just filled this past summer, in 1961, and I would suggest that Manitoba isn't the only province, or the only agency that has difficulty in hiring and in finding qualified people, but I don't think that the situation is nearly as grave as the Honourable Member for La Verendrye would indicate. I think our program in this field compares very favourably with what is being done in other provinces.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) passed.

I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.