

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Friday, April 30th, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day I would like to make a statement to the House. On Friday April 30th, in the Winnipeg Free Press I am quoted as having ruled with respect to an Order for Return on the motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. This is incorrect.

Orders of the Day.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lodge an objection with the First Minister regarding a news report today. In today's Free Press it is reported that because of the early morning sittings only 29 of 57 members were present at the 9:30 opening. Further down in the news report it states that only a combined opposition of six were present of which 4 out of the 13 were Liberals. Madam Speaker, I would like this House to know and I would like it to be announced in the future that when a special committee is sitting it be made known to the members of the House and the members of the public at large. At 9:30 this morning, the dental committee was sitting, and had they not been sitting, while I cannot speak for the Member for the NDP, but there were one NDP and two Liberals at that committee meeting and they would have been in their places had it not been for that meeting.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, if it makes my honourable friend feel any better we did mention that matter last night.

MADAM SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee of the Whole to consider the following bills standing in the order paper.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the bills standing on the order paper, with the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

Bills No. 96 and 103, 105, 106 and 107 were each read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 108 was read section by section to Section 13 (4) and passed.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, is it under (d) there was the objection insofar as simply leaving the traffic ticket on the part of a policeman to be deemed to be a summons. Is that the section, or which section does that come under?

MR. ROBLIN: My recollection is that that was changed in Committee was it not?

MR. MOLGAT: ... committee. I understood it was but I don't have any amendments.

MR. ROBLIN: Well it's been struck out of the - there's been a change made to eliminate the objectionable features in that respect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was the new subsection added - (8). Sections 4, 5, 6, 7. Now I'll read the new subsection 8.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): ... that 5 is as amended? 5 was amended, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well the new subsection 8 refers to subsection 5. I'll read the new subsection 8. "Where the summons portion of a traffic offence notice is left by a police officer in accordance with subsection 5 and no person complies with the directions set out in the summons, a Justice of the Peace or a magistrate may issue a further summons for the offence indicated in the traffic offence notice to the person registered as owner of the motor vehicle."

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, 5 was amended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have no record of that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well if you look at your proposed amendments I think you'll see that

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . words were deleted, very important ones too. You are dealing with 105 (c) are you not Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 105 (c) that's right.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well 5, the last two lines and a few words before that were deleted. "and the leaving of the summons portion of the traffic offence notice shall be conclusively deemed to be personal service of the summons. That was deleted Mr. Chairman, and that's very important.

MR. ROBLIN: That's my understanding of the situation that it's deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll delete then "and the leaving - from the last words in subsection 5 of 105 (c) we will delete the words "and the leaving of the summons portion of the traffic offence notice shall be conclusively deemed to be personal service of a summons".

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, out of 7, the words "or 5" in the second line were deleted. That too is very important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first sentence - that is correct, accordingly, we passed subsection 5 as amended. Subsection 6 passed, and in subsection 7 the word "or" and the figure "5" were taken out of the second line. Subsection 7 as amended passed. New subsection 8, which I have already read, passed. The former subsection 8 is now numbered subsection (9) (a) passed, (b) passed, 9 passed. Former subsection 9 is now subsection 10 passed, former subsection 10 is now subsection 11 passed. 105 . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this, I wasn't at the committee unfortunately, but it's definite now is it that with these amendments that we've passed and the new section 8, that there's no possibility that simply leaving a traffic ticket or a summons is deemed to be personal service - there will be no possibility of someone suddenly having an officer of the law arriving at his home some evening and saying you did receive a summons and you didn't reply to it. As long as this is clearly not involved here, I'm satisfied.

MR. ROBLIN: I think that's the situation, Mr. Chairman. A summons must be a personal matter, must be a personal summons and this provides for that.

Bill No. 105 was read section by section and passed, up to Section 16 (d).

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, . . . amendment here, directly after - oh I'm sorry it's section 18 that I'm waiting for - sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 18 is amended not section 16. 16 is all right.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes.

Bill No. 105, section 16, 17 was read and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 18 (15) passed, and there's a new section 16 added. Shall I read it? - "Where a certificate, licence or registration of a motor vehicle a fee for which is set out in Table 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 hereon, (a) is issued for a full registration year or on or after the first day of March and before the 15th day of May for the current registration year, the fee payable under Table 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 shall be the appropriate full fee as set out under column 2 of the Table; (b) is issued on or after the 15th day of May and before the first day of September for the current registration year, the fee payable under Table 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 shall be the appropriate fee as set out under column 3 of the Table; (c) is issued on or after the 1st day of September and before the 1st day of December, for the current registration year, the fee payable under Table 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 shall be the appropriate fee as set out under column 4 of the Table; and (d) is issued on or after the 1st day of December, and before the end of the current registration year for the current registration year, the fee payable under Table 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 shall be the appropriate fee as set out under column 5 of the Table.

New Section 16 read and Section 18 read and passed.

New Section 19 is inserted reading as follows: 19. Tables numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Schedule B of the Act are amended by striking out the words and figures "full fee May 15th to September 30th, October 1st to January 31st and month of February at the head of the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th columns thereof respectively, and substituting therefore the words and figures "column 2, column 3, column 4, and column 5 at the head of the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th columns respectively. Section 19 passed. Old Section 19 is now Section 20. Remainder of Bill 105 read and passed.

Bills 109, 111, 113, 114 were read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 115, Section 1 was read and passed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, rather than take the time of the committee to deal with the sections that I am particularly concerned with, I thought I'd make a general statement and let it go at that.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

At the committee, I raised several points. One was Section 3, subsection 3, which relates to the possibility that a person who carries on business under his family name might comply with the Act by showing his own personal name, his full name, on a sign outside of the business premises and thus comply with the Act. I pointed out - well I repeated what was pointed out by the sub-committee of the Manitoba Bar, that this was an inadequate provision in that many people were doing business with firms that do not actually attend to their places of business and that therefore would not have an opportunity to learn the full name of the actual proprietor of the business. And it was suggested that it would be a rather simple thing for this person to show on his advertising material and his stationery of various forms, the full name of the proprietor. Now if this would be a hardship, it could easily be overcome by the registration of this name, for a fee of \$10.00; and it seems to me that it could well be stipulated that he should give his full name on all occasions, or register for \$10.00 and fill out a simple form, and renew it every five years. Now the Honourable Premier indicated that the government did not have a closed mind on this, except for this session and would look at this again.

So I just note my objection and pass on to Section 13, subsection 3, which gives the Minister the right to accept a declaration of registration, even though there is presently a similar name registered or one of which he has knowledge. If he becomes satisfied by such evidence that he deems sufficient, that the registered firm, or the firm of which he is aware, has been dissolved or is no longer carrying on business. I cannot conceive of just how the Minister could be satisfied by any evidence without giving notice to the person who might be adversely affected, and it seems to me that it should be written right into the law that notice shall be given of the consideration by the Minister before his decision is made. To this point the Honourable Premier made a similar answer that the government is prepared to look at it again on another occasion.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that this bill is really a step backwards from what we have up to now. Because up to now, we have a penalty provision which to my knowledge has never been enforced but is there, and as a practising lawyer when asked by clients whether or not the client need to register a business name, I would advise firstly it's a good idea to do it; secondly, you save a lot of trouble once it's done, so there can't be any question; thirdly, there is a penalty in the Act which I'm not aware was ever imposed, but it's in the Act and could possibly be imposed. Under this present bill, there is no penalty, there is no enforcement and I think there is no necessary - there's no need to register, but rather I think that it could be overcome by writing a letter to the Minister acquainting him of the fact that so-and-so is doing business under a certain name, because under Section 13, the Minister shall accept a declaration provided that it does not confound with, or closely resemble a registered name, or a name that is known to the Minister, whether or not it is registered. And it seems to me that a person could overcome payment of the \$10.00 fee and the renewal needs, and all other requirements of the Act, by simply writing a letter to the Minister and going on record and saying, "I, John Jones, am carrying business under the name of Apex So-and-So Company", and the Minister is now aware of the fact and I think he cannot accept registration of any other name. So I would urge strongly that consideration be given to some sort of penalty being set out in this Act, because it's really not the person who has to register that needs the provisions of this Act for his protection, but rather the person who wants to investigate or what is more difficult, to sue. And here I speak with a great deal of experience. I think every lawyer has a great deal of experience in receiving instructions from some client, and it may well be a client from out of the city or out of the province, saying, "I've been doing business with ABC Company. I want to sue them; please issue a writ." And then we walk down or send our student down to the Provincial Secretary's Office; he makes a search. If the company is registered we know whom to sue. If it's not registered, we're in trouble; we have difficulty. And that protection then is really not for the person who wishes to be registered, but rather with the person who wishes to deal with a company whose name is not recognizable, or with a person who isn't registered, and the bill should be there to protect him. Without the penalty clause, and without any attempt or means of enforcement, there is no real incentive for a person to register his name. And that being the case, I feel that this bill is inadequate and having reflected upon it, I think it's much more serious than my attitude towards it was this morning. So, it's getting late in the session and I don't know to what extent I could persuade the government to look at it again this session. So I only throw it out for what it's worth, and leave it in the hands of whoever is really responsible.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I thank my honourable friend for his suggestions and I think we'll try and not break the Act as it's written now and if it doesn't work we may have to come back

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) . . . and make some changes.

The remainder of Bill No. 115 was read section by section and passed.

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

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has considered Bills Nos. 96, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 111, 113, 114 and 115 and has adopted all these bills without amendments.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the committee be received.

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

Bills No. 96, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 111, 113, 114, 115 were read a third time and passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I had intended to call the resolution on the constitution, but I see that the Honourable Member for Rhineland is not here this evening. I wonder if anyone else cares to speak on that topic.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any member wishing to speak.

A MEMBER: I'd like to but I can't.

MR. ROBLIN: I guess that in that case we'll let the matter stand, although I suggest we ought to consider voting on it tomorrow if the honourable member is not here. Then there is the resolution on individual rights. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition told me he would be ready to speak tonight, I wonder if he's handy? -- (Interjection) -- Well, we'll just not call it at the moment, we'll call the resolution on shared services. My honourable friend from Brokenhead has indicated he's ready to proceed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Education. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, it's with a feeling of frustration that I rise to speak on this resolution on Shared Services because it's only a short time ago that I was able to decide how I would, in the end, vote on this particular resolution. I am certain of the problem, and I'm certain where I stand on this problem, but I was not sure at all how to vote on this resolution which, on the one hand, recommends something which could be acceptable, but which recommends it after a series of paragraphs and preambles which, to me, are entirely unacceptable. In a situation like that, what does one do?

I think honourable members here realize that last year and on the previous occasions when this matter of aid to parochial schools came up for debate that I indicated quite clearly that I was in favour of a measure of public aid to private and parochial schools and I still support the concept of public aid to private and parochial schools and I say so without equivocation. I support it, perhaps not as strongly as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, but I support it nevertheless. I support it because, among other reasons, I feel that what happened here in Manitoba, the famous or infamous Manitoba school question, that incident was a clear violation of the spirit of the Canadian Constitution, and I believe that even if it be 65 or 75 years later, that when an opportunity arises to right a wrong, that we should accept that opportunity and set about to remedy what is an injustice.

I am of the opinion, Madam Speaker, that perhaps not now, but in a generation, two generations at the most, that the men and women of this province will be prepared to end the simmering Manitoba school question by extending to these people the rights which they once held, even if it was long decades ago. I have the distinct feeling that among the younger generation - perhaps I'm moving about in wrong circles, I don't know - but among the young people that I know there is an inclination to be in favour of public aid to parochial schools.

Now then, this - as members are well aware - in other provinces they have been able to live with this problem, they have been able to extend to minorities the education rights that were guaranteed under Section 93 of the BNA Act. In our case here in Manitoba, not just Section 93 of the BNA Act but Section 22 of The Manitoba Act, were supposed to have given safeguards to these minorities for their schools and yet back in 1890 this right was wiped out, wiped off and because of a peculiar combination of circumstances at the judicial level and at the cabinet level, and in the election of 1896 no remedial action ever took place.

I don't want to speak tonight, Madam Speaker, too long on the issue of aid to private and parochial schools as such, but rather to try and deal more specifically with the question, or the issue of shared services, because shared services are, in my opinion, a specific kind of digression from this issue of aid to parochial schools. And in connection with shared services, I want

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) to say that first of all shared services as a concept are rather strange and unnecessary in the Canadian context. The Honourable Member for Wellington is quite right when he said this afternoon that shared services are not new, they are quite old as a concept in the American context, and he made reference to Thomas Jefferson and then to some of the universities along the Atlantic seaboard which did exist by means of private endowments and church support and also by indirect governmental aid, you might say. The only point that I would take exception to, as far as the remarks of the Honourable Member for Wellington are concerned, when he made reference to the current practice in the United States, he intimated that the educational grants program of the American Federal Government were not really of any assistance, or of any substantial assistance to the parochial schools and I think that according to the reports I've read that there will be some substantial, or some assistance of substance.

In any case, Madam Speaker, let me say that I think that in the Canadian context it is really unnecessary to talk about shared services because in no other province, in no other province has it been found necessary to resort to this sort of a digression. In Ontario, this long established practice there insofar as aid to parochial schools are concerned; similarly in Quebec, in the Maritimes -- they have their own arrangement; it's working out to the mutual satisfaction of almost everyone. In Alberta and Saskatchewan similarly there has been an arrangement without having to resort to this shared service, or shared services program - I suppose I'll have to call it a program or concept.

Now it is obvious to anyone who cares to analyse what this government is doing insofar as aid to schools is concerned, that the shared services program which they are putting forward is a compromise. A compromise by itself or in itself is not necessarily bad. Government in a democracy must move along from time to time by way of compromise. But when the compromise shows evidence of being almost entirely devoid of principles then it is time I think to object, and I fail, Madam Speaker, I have looked and looked and I fail to see what the basic underlying rationale or principle in this resolution is. I don't really find any principle. Even compromise is supposed to be based on compromise as between opposing principles but I'm not sure what the principles embodied here are supposed to be.

What am I supposed to say then about this particular resolution, Madam Speaker? We look at the resolution on shared services and it proceeds by postulating certain premises -- it says: "whereas in Manitoba constitutional provisions, juridical decisions, etc., prescribe three general principles of government action, namely, 1. Separation of church and state as that expression is understood in Manitoba." Right off from the beginning, Madam Speaker, I find myself having to object. What does this first so-called premise or principle mean - the separation of church and state as that expression is understood in Manitoba? This is not a declaration of principle. I defy anyone to say, that expression, "church and state separation". I defy anyone to say how it is understood in Manitoba. There is no consensus of understanding on that point in Manitoba. And so I must oppose that particular premise.

And secondly, it refers to this principle, the dedication of public funds to the support of a single public school system open to all children. Is this supposed to be a principle of the constitutional provisions of this province? It may be that some people think it is, but it is clearly in violation of the constitution of this province. Before 1890, in the opinion of the Canadian Supreme Court the dedication of public funds to a single public school system was considered to be a violation of the BNA Act and of The Manitoba Act and I don't accept the premise that this dedication of public funds in support of a single public school system, that it is supposed to be in keeping with the provisions of our constitution. I don't accept that. I reject that and I oppose it. Some honourable members in this Chamber are men learned in the law, others are men learned in some other profession. In my own case I'm not learned in the law but I like to think that I have a pretty good understanding of constitutional history and a pretty good understanding of Canadian political institutions and from all of my reading of Canada's constitutional and political history, from all of my reading, I have been forced to come to the conclusion, I have been led to the conclusion that these first two enumerated premises of the resolution are incorrect. And I can't accept them.

Now then it could be said, Madam Speaker, that even if you cannot accept the preamble to this resolution, at least you who are a supporter of aid to parochial schools could support the recommendations proper where the committee recommends that shared services be offered, transportation, books, and so on. And certainly this is as the Honourable Member for Inkster would say, "half a loaf," and it is pretty difficult to oppose something that offers half a loaf to

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) a distressed group or a group who are seeking to have redress of grievances or restoration of rights.

Madam Speaker, I think it will be understood, because if I support this resolution it will be taken that I accept, I accept the recommendations foundation, which I certainly do not. I also object, and I object strenuously to this government's statement that they do not feel themselves obliged to act until they get a clear consensus of opinion from this side. I think that this is entirely alien to our system of government. It is true that from time to time in some democracies the party in power has solicited the support of the party in the opposition in asking for a bipartisan policy of this kind or that; but it is also true and bears noting that when this sort of a strategy was resorted to the party in power felt obliged to carry through with that solicitation of bipartisan support for a period of time. Then in the United States after World War II it was thought necessary to have a bipartisan foreign policy because of the crisis of the inception of the cold war. But, having committed themselves to a bipartisan foreign policy, both the government party or the majority party in congress felt obliged to carry through.

Now I ask this government - they're asking for consensus and a non or all-partisan approach on this issue - are they prepared to solicit similar consensus on other issues that come up? If they're not prepared to do that, then why in this particular case? Or is it only because they wish to avoid taking a position that might single them out in the public eye? No one here has asked, no one here has asked the government party, the Conservative Party of this province to take a position, and no one could because no party in this Assembly has taken a position. Not having taken one, we have no right to expect that party to take one. However, as the government of the province and as the governing party in this Assembly, they must rule and govern according to constitutional practice and I would ask them to show the precedent whereby they have a right to demand a consensus from this side.

Before I sit down I intend to indicate clearly where I stand on this particular resolution so as to avoid leaving the impression that I am seeking to create some sort of political mischief here, because that is not my intention. But I felt that I must take this opportunity to protest this strange constitutional theory of the Minister of Education and his colleagues that they will decide what they will do upon receiving from this side some indication where we stand. That is not, that is not their prerogative. If they refuse to proceed for whatever reason, it is their decision and their decision only.

Madam Speaker, I think it is unnecessary to speak at length on this particular resolution on shared services and I would say in conclusion that if I voted for this resolution of concurrence, I would have to try to justify it on the ground that I was voting for the resolved part only, that I was voting for the recommendations stipulations, and I would have to make it equally clear that I was opposing the preamble and all that lay beneath it, which I consider to be inaccurate historically and lacking in principle. But how can one vote for half a resolution; in the end you must vote either aye or nay. Therefore I want to say that I'm going to oppose the resolution; but, if the government decides to bring in legislation I give prior notice right now that I will support it because the legislation can be voted on as it comes before us and I shall support it, because - and only because - it is assistance, it is succor, it is aid to a group of people, a group of parents who are finding themselves in a situation that is financially deteriorating. Costs are going up and so on. I think that this should be good enough for this government. I intend to support the legislation but as for the resolution I don't see how I can in view of the fact that half of it is tolerable and the other half is completely, but completely unacceptable.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Member for Kildonan.

MR. JAMES T. MILLS (Kildonan): Madam Speaker, as a member of this Shared Services Committee, I feel as a Roman Catholic on the committee that I have an obligation to take part in the debate, and I feel that I am speaking on behalf of the Catholics of Winnipeg also and their feeling towards this particular motion.

Madam Speaker, I would also like at this time to congratulate the chairman of this committee and the members who served on it for their fairness in allowing briefs to be presented at a late date; to also accept briefs that were not particularly on this particular shared services committee report. They strayed quite a bit but our chairman allowed it to carry on. Mr. Prud'homme also, I feel should be recognized for the amount of effort he put in and efficient manner in which he conducted these affairs so far as mailing out the briefs to the members, and compiling the orders of the briefs and to submit in a form of summarization to allow us to know what each brief carried, whether they were for or against or in-between.

(MR. MILLS cont'd)

In my opinion I feel that this committee did a wonderful job and the resolution before this House tonight, Madam Speaker, is one that can be supported by a large number of members in this House, whether they are champions of aid to private and parochial schools or defenders of the public school system. In our conception of public school there would seem to be a responsibility to render the greatest possible amount of service to the greatest possible number of children. This is also in line, Madam Speaker, with the increasing demand on public schools for greater versatility based on the difference in children and in groups of children. The proper attitude in view of equality of educational opportunity is to take the administrative steps necessary to render service. In this way, Madam Speaker, the public school will do a better job and discharge the task for which it is rightfully esteemed. On the part of private and parochial school supporters, they feel strongly that their kind of institution should be recognized for the work they do in the community. They are not happy with shared services as an answer, but in any solution, Madam Speaker, to their problem they will have to work out some arrangements with relations to public schools. In fact, there is an idea gaining ground in some kind of incorporation of the private school system into the public school system.

The plan before the House this evening is the beginning of co-operation and working together in hopes that this may grow into something worthwhile, each side having deep convictions that there is no danger that either will be carried away with over ambitious agreement. The report is a delicate blend of various points of view, a starting point. It could lead to more as experience leads on but if it does not, little harm could be done. Madam Speaker, it is a practical report leaving aside the historical and sociological arguments that remind us mostly of the mistakes of our predecessors, and I would like to point out that in the submissions that were made from private and parochial schools that they felt that they would like to try shared services and this plan could be welcomed. On the other hand, Madam Speaker, the discussion of Canadian Unity which is going on at all times today in this world, inspires us all with the desire to improve our present community structures. If our public school system can be made more useful, all the better. The actual terms, Madam Speaker, of the report to my mind are basic. Who'd want to stop local arrangements now in existence from continuing? Who would want to deprive local groups of citizens of a chance to agree on some common project and work it out. In these two clauses, Madam Speaker, you have the green light for local experimentation and the exercise of goodwill. This may be helpful to the entire province in due time. It presents the provincial statutes that stand in the way of local understanding and progress on this point; yet local option in other matters have fine tradition in our province; and yet there is also a safeguard which consists of only well established, duly inspected schools and laying down strict conditions for new participation. I am told in fact, that a number of private schools is thus frozen for some time to come, particularly outside the City of Greater Winnipeg. By making this voluntarily and limiting it in to practice to well known institutions already integrated into our community life, we would be giving this plan a chance to work without haste or sudden explosion.

Madam Speaker, with regard to the bus transportation, this is considered in many American States as merely just a public safety feature not related to schools. In Manitoba alone, Madam Speaker, it would only affect some communities on the outskirts because some parish school children attend only the parish schools in that particular area. In some smaller cities the sharing of the bus keeps the parish children enrolled in their own school and thus takes the charge off the taxpayer of the area. This change would also take from us the burden of enforcing our children to attend school. We feel that if we had the bus transportation problem under somewhat our jurisdiction we feel that we could have our children attend school without having to watch them every day. We would prefer that the public school be attractive enough that it does not have to resort to this kind of small blackmail.

Manitoba is now I am informed the last provincial or state jurisdiction on this continent, Madam Speaker, to refuse free textbooks. British Columbia I understand has taken a step and is now giving out free books. This is a small but important point in creating goodwill, because most of the parents of a parish school child has to pay this out of his own pocket without the community picking up the tab. Free textbooks have an advantage also, that they do not affect the number of schools. There are only so many pupils in the province needing books and no matter where they go, an arrangement of this kind also helps. This will also promote a common background of learning among our children, even though they attend different schools.

For these reasons, Madam Speaker, I'm going to vote for the resolution and like everyone

(MR. MILLS cont'd) else, I could find fault here and there. We, Madam Speaker, are dealing with one of the most explosive and delicate questions in the history of Manitoba and we have come now to a possible point of agreement. It may not be perfect but it has something on both sides as a bait and it shows that we are not afraid to experiment a little; and if we prove that we are not afraid and something really effective can be done, at least we will have tried. In other parts of the world, Madam Speaker, people like ourselves are facing decisions on problems that have appeared beyond hope but if we can prove ourselves to be brilliant thinkers and finding perfect solutions to our problem, let us show that at least we are second to none in goodwill.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable member would accept a question. Was he present at the last meeting of the committee when this report was presented and later adopted by this committee?

MR. MILLS: I was.

MR. DESJARDINS: You were?

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, for the last five or six years since the report of the Royal Commission was submitted, I was at that time quite in favour of the province financing parochial schools. I still have the same belief and during the five years I had to act as a referee between my thinking and my heart. The reason for my belief is I'm no longer young. I have served my constituents according to the dictation of my conscience. I feel that I owe it to my constituents now to declare myself and take part in the discussion which I have not yet, since we are discussing it for the last five years, took part in it.

But I have had the opportunity to speak to many leaders of different religions, to intellectuals, to practical men, to the newcomers in Canada and also to Canadians to whom education is a normal thing. I'm not going to take the time now to describe the hardship, the agony that a child goes through or has gone through in many European countries to get a little education. I am a Jew. My values are the values of the prophets and the authors of the Talmud who were distinguished and just legislators. The confession of our faith is followed by the command to teach the children diligently. Education financed by public funds has been an ancient and honourable institution among us. It is not equitable to load the parents of the religious working class with double taxation. But however, I take the same position as my colleague the Honourable Member from Brokenhead, that perhaps I would have acted differently if a recommendation would come to assist, finance and help, but according to this report, many of those who were in favour of the latest suggestion by the government, or by the Premier, have now changed their minds and they are against it. In view of this, while I am a great believer in parochial schools, to give the children of each religion, of all the ethnic groups an opportunity to maintain their support and contribute to the life of Canada and the literatures, which is not in the curriculum of the public schools, in their traditions, in their song, and in their language. I see now in the House that we have suggestions almost annually of recognizing certain languages in our University. But I'm inclined now to oppose this resolution, and if something better will come up, I reserve my right to wait. I am not opposed to parochial schools.

MR. MILLS: May I have the permission of the House? I wish to apologize to the Member of St. Boniface. He asked me a question, - was I at the last meeting. I thought I had, but unfortunately I just had undergone an operation and I was in the City of Victoria, B.C. recuperating for four or five weeks, and I was not aware of this last meeting.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question, then. If, as the honourable member said, he was the only Catholic member on the committee, it is true to say that there was no R. C. representative at this meeting then.

MR. MILLS: I didn't hear the last part.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . out of order, Madam Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, why is it out of order? I asked a question. I was satisfied, and the member spoke and asked your leave to correct an erroneous -- question. This is all. There is nothing out of order at all.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, may I suggest that had the Honourable Member for Kildonan answered differently, I'm sure that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface may have had a subsequent question to this. So I think, while I agree that the Honourable the First Minister on a strict basis may say that it's out of order, but in view of the peculiar circumstances prevailing at the present time in this regard, Madam Speaker, I think that it would be only fair to allow his subsequent question now

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) that the correction has been made. I don't want to enter into any controversy or anything like that, but I just suggest this to you, Madam Speaker, on the basis of the correction which has now been made by the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MADAM SPEAKER: In my opinion, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface asked a question; the Honourable Member for Kildonan answered.

MR. PAULLEY: But erroneously the first time.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I may have leave to enquire whether the Honourable Leader of the Opposition does intend to speak tonight. Did he -- is there any information on that point?

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): It is my understanding he was but I think he got called out and I don't - I can go and look for him, if he wishes.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . and can just proceed to to the Committee of Supply. He can have an opportunity to speak tomorrow. I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that Madam 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.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the First Minister, seconded by the Honourable the

MR. ROBLIN: I'll change that to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Madam Speaker.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 85, 1 (a) -- passed --

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the Minister of Labour speaking about his department. I well remember the day that he became Minister of Labour and I thought that Manitoba was going to go ahead. But I'm very much surprised because I see it's going further in the hole every day. The other day I brought a resolution up on vacations with pay and it was chopped up. So I was looking through this book and just following some of these things here: Cases settled by payment of claim - 146. These are cases that have been investigated and disposed of as follows: cases where claimant failed to qualify, 112; cases where claims were withdrawn, 3; cases still under development at the end of period, 84; 345 - so they say there's nothing here. There's no smoke, no fire. These cases were investigated and disposed of as follows: cases settled by payment of claim, 108; cases where claims found not eligible, 26; cases where claims were withdrawn, 2; cases still under development at end of period, 37 - total 173. So you can see, when we brought this thing up, these are only some of the cases that have been brought in. What about the rest that have not been brought in? So I would say that with this vacation with pay like I was saying at that particular time, and there's no hardship. We go like this.

Vacations with pay are in effect to recognize as the time we have earned over the years according to the length of time served. It is as one day for a month. In other words, a person has worked say five months, should be entitled to a vacation with pay of five-twelfths or a percentage of four percent, similar to construction tradesmen have in effect in some provinces. On the present Vacations with Pay Act, a man could conceivably be on a job up to 20 months or so before holidays. A person whose service is terminated before 11 months' time in any year would, according to the Act, get nothing at all. Employers could take advantage of the above to get out of paying or giving holidays with pay.

Most of our labour contracts pay proportionately. Now I don't see nothing wrong with that at all, and yet this thing was chopped down fine so I would say there are a lot of things we should do here with regard to labour, and I've looked through this book and to me there's not much in it either.

Going now to Fair Wage. Manitoba's economic growth is of interest to all sections of our society. The adoption of a fair wage schedule in Manitoba provides protection against exploitation or workers performing work in categories listed in the Act. The effects of Fair Wage is

(MR. HARRIS cont'd) . . . not applicable to a vast majority of towns in Manitoba because they have a population less than 5,000. Small groups of workers within these towns of a population less than 5,000 are presently receiving wage rates for labourer, equipment operators or tradesmen, even lower than the Minimum Wage Act. We deplore such a situation which is both detrimental to the standard of living, of the process involved and to the economic growth of Manitoba, and we should have one wage rate in all of Manitoba. So I say, with regard to the Fair Wage, we've talked that way all the way through, and I say, we talk about the Inidan and the Metis - what about our white people here? How many wage rates do we have to have in this province? Who are we protecting? When I see these things there -- and I often wonder to myself what's the use of a book like this if we don't get it out straight for the whole of Manitoba?

The Minimum Wage - there's another one. There is a five cent differential between urban and rural areas. There should be an elimination of a differential between urban and rural areas. Due to the high cost of living, the minimum wage is inadequate to maintain a decent standard of living for the wage earner. We ask the government to legislate a minimum wage of \$1.15 per hour and that the Minimum Wage Board be immediately convened and these proposals put before them and acted upon. Well I don't know how people can live at 75 or 70 cents an hour. I don't know how they can live, and I look around this Chamber and I say to myself, how could you live for that money? I don't think any of us could. But there is people throughout the province who have to live on this wage, so that is what is going on right throughout.

Now I'll go on to automation. We have had quite a debate in this Chamber on automation -- both pro and con - and more so on this side than on the other side, I would say. There has been a gradual increase in unemployment rate in the post-war period with each post-war recession having a higher unemployment rate than the previous one. The technological changes in automation are constantly eliminating jobs and creating less employment. There has been very little study and detailed data available to date on the subject of automation and its ramifications. This problem is too complex to be satisfactorily settled through negotiations alone, therefore be it that we urge the government to expedite a concentrated and thorough study of automation so that society as a whole will benefit.

My friend over there to my right, the member for Selkirk, brought up a very good resolution there the other day on Labour Relations Act. Companies are becoming increasingly hard to deal with. Unions are finding it necessary to take more cases through to arbitration. The companies are failing in many instances to carry out the awards of the Arbitration Board. The unions are dropping the cases after the companies fail to honour the award. The Labour Relations Act requires arbitration procedures to be in effect, and that the enforcement of arbitration awards be the responsibility of the Labour Board.

In cases of dismissal that are submitted for arbitration, the setting up of an arbitration board usually takes from one month to five months. The final ruling of these boards takes approximately the same amount of time, that the Act respecting arbitration rules that a time limit be placed on setting up of arbitration boards and also a time limit be placed on the boards in rendering their decision after the hearing in all cases regarding dismissals. Complaints are made that serious delays are experienced in hearing cases before the Manitoba Labour Board. The elapsed time between the filing of an application of same in some cases extends over several months for no apparent or warranted reason. Result - the Minister of Labour is requested to undertake a complete review of the operations and procedures of the Labour Board with a view to effecting a more reasonable and expeditious handling of all matters coming before the board.

In the Province of Manitoba under our Labour Relations Act, there is no provision for the check-off of union dues, voluntary or otherwise. This has had the effect of disrupting harmonious relations between unions and employers in several instances. We would like the government to pass legislation making it mandatory for an employer to check off union dues whenever a union group under an agreement of a majority of members requests such a check-off.

Well I have given you some of my views in there with regard to several things that I feel should be brought up with regard to labour, and so with that, Mr. Chairman, I'll conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a) --

MR. PAULLEY: Is the Minister going to answer the remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. John's?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Chairman, I thought that we would have had many members who had questions on this general area - - it would seem that it might be just a little easier on all of us if I have as many questions as there are and I would

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd) do my best to answer them for you.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm not averse to that, Mr. Chairman, but I want to say to the Honourable Minister of Labour that I was waiting in anticipation of his answers to that particular question lest the Honourable Member for St. John's or myself wanted to carry on some consideration of the subject matter of my colleague's contribution to this debate. I don't want to be repetitious but it may become necessary to, not to be particularly repetitious but to try and add some emphasis to the situation depending on the answer that was forthcoming from the Minister of Labour. So I would suggest to him that if that would suit him it would suit me, but if not, maybe we could lay the emphasis on ahead of his reply and then maybe, Mr. Chairman, a little later we might have to do some re-emphasizing which of course would prolong the considerations of his estimates. I leave it to him which he would like.

MR. BAIZLEY: I think, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to have a few more questions and then we can join them and probably speed up things.

MR. PAULLEY: Well I don't know about the speed up, Mr. Chairman, because while the estimates of the department insofar as dollars and cents are concerned represent only a very small financial amount as far as the estimates are concerned, it nonetheless deals with one of the most important segments of our province, so important, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest, that rather than having roundtable conferences on the government side that they would appear to be interested in labour if they were seated in their seats or if they were outside of the Chamber.

Apparently the admonition fell on deaf ears but it does appear to me by the attitude of members of this House, Mr. Chairman, that at the present time those that are within my eyesight at the present time are apparently not concerned either with the estimates of the Department of Labour or are not concerned with any criticisms, constructively or otherwise, respecting the Department of Labour. May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that these are the very gentlemen who subsequently in caucus may have to make decisions insofar as labour legislation in this province is concerned. I regret having to state this, Mr. Chairman, but I do state it and I mean what I say, and I regret it very very much.

I do not presume in this House to be a spokesman for labour any more than I suggest that the members opposite should be interested. I certainly am not paid in order to look after any particular segment of industrial life, but I do feel that from time to time it is incumbent on me to draw to the attention of the various Ministers of the Crown matters that I think they should take under consideration.

The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce says go ahead and get on with it. May I say to him that it wasn't very many days ago that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce made some contributions about the necessity of labour-management co-operation. How can he this evening just say to me "get on with it." By saying that, he indicates to me that possibly he hasn't got the interest insofar as matters concerning labour is concerned in the Province of Manitoba, at least in this House, that he indicates outside. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

The Minister of Agriculture, he's just made a contribution and I haven't heard what he said. This, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest, appears to be the attitude of most Ministers of the Crown. Here we have the Minister of Agriculture interjecting, and he too will be one sitting on the inner circle, not just in the caucus, who is going to have to cast a decision insofar as labour legislation is concerned. So I say to the Minister of Agriculture, if he has any comments to make respecting what I have to say, let him sit in his own seat where it is permissible for him to make interjections and where he might . . .

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Chairman, will the honourable member permit a question? How many supporters are there from the NDP listening to his speech on labour?

MR. PAULLEY: I am not concerned, Mr. Chairman, I am not concerned with how many members of my party are listening to me because they know what I'm going to say, but I do say -- (Interjection) -- yes, Mr. Chairman, because they know what I am going to say. They know that I am going to raise points in here in this debate that are of interest to labour. But one thing I think I can say, and my back is to my group, that they are not carrying on round-table discussions about any other matter than the matter under consideration. -- (Interjection) -- The former Minister of Labour interjecting in that nature. What type of a government have we got in this province?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): We're impatient to hear what you are going to say.

MR. PAULLEY: A bunch of chipmunks. I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the Honourable Member for St. John's this afternoon regarding the question of the Brown Steel Tank Case of Brandon, and I too want to know from the Minister of Labour what is he, and these people who aren't apparently interested in the destiny of labour, going to agree with him to do or disagree with him to do in respect of changing The Labour Relations Act in order to see that we don't have repetition.

I asked the other day of the Attorney-General a question under a Return for an Order of the House No. 31. I thought my question was a rather simple one. The question was, Mr. Chairman, the reason for the court's failure to convict the defendant in the Brown Steel Tank Case; and specifically any weaknesses in existing labour legislation which affected the court's decision. I want, Mr. Chairman, for you to particularly note the last part, specifically any weaknesses in the existing labour legislation which affected the court's decision.

What did I get? The transcript of the evidence from the magistrate's court and also a copy of the judgment of the Judge of the County Court. No reference at all to any admission of any weakness insofar as the labour legislation is concerned -- a transcript of evidence. By their exhibition tonight I can readily understand why the answer to a question as to the weaknesses in existing legislation was not forthcoming and that the answer was merely a transcript of evidence. I want to say that it's interesting to note in the transcript of evidence that the magistrate dealt with the situation fairly well because the original charges that were made had, as my honourable colleague from St. John's indicated, only been processed after the expiration time under the present Act.

But it's interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the evidence that the Attorney-General did give to me, some of the excerpts from that document. On Page 2 it was stated, "On the evidence oral and documentary, excluding the notation on the back of Exhibit No. 143 which I rule as being inadmissible, there can be no doubt that in 1961 and '62 the company was opposed to the formation or organization of a local of the United Steel Workers of America in its plant or among its employees and was opposed to the certification of such union as the bargaining agent of the company's employees or a group of employees."

The evidence then goes on to say, "An employer does not commit a breach of The Labour Relations Act by being opposed to its employees being organized and becoming members of a union and seeking to have such union certified as the bargaining agent. A breach is committed when an employer does what it specifically prohibits in said act and particularly Section 4 thereof."

Then I think this is most important. The transcript of evidence goes on to say the Crown called witnesses and produced documents, filed as exhibits presumably to show that in the years 1961 and '62 the company did discriminate against certain employees and did thereby commit a breach of said Section 4.

"Such evidence" -- the transcript goes on to say, "Such evidence would have been pertinent had the counts remained as in the original information and complaint. In view however of what is set out in the particulars filed by the Crown which narrow the issues to allegations as to breaches of the Act by the company in the year 1963, it is no longer pertinent as I am not called upon to make a decision as to whether the company did or did not in the years 1961 and '62 commit a breach of the Act by discriminating against employees named, and I make no findings thereto."

I read this part of the transcript into the record, Mr. Chairman, to substantiate the point raised by my colleague from St. John's this afternoon to indicate that the government knew as far ago as 1961-62 of the situation prevailing in this particular case, and that we have had at least three regular sessions of the Legislature since that time and no remedial legislation has been suggested or proposed by the Government of Manitoba.

I may not be a prophet, but there is a resolution forthcoming before the House which will be an attempt to have these matters considered by the government, and I prophesy, if the norm is adhered to, that the members opposite will reject the resolution. So I await with interest and I'm sure my colleague from St. John's does, the remarks of the Honourable the Minister of Labour pertaining to the Brown Steel case at Brandon.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I might say that the situation that I saw in the House as I first rose to take part in the consideration of the Department of Labour roused my ire considerably and I may respectfully suggest justifiably. May I now say what I really would have said, without this situation, the first time that I spoke in the debate on consideration of the estimates of the Department of Labour. I want to join with my colleague from St. John's in paying a

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . tribute to the Deputy Minister, and Mr. King particularly and the members of the staff of the Department of Labour.

I want to say to the Minister that I too appreciate the co-operation I have received from him when I have had problems and drawn them to his attention. I want to say to the Minister too that a few days ago I had an opportunity of discussing labour matters with a group of interested people, and I think without exception they said to me we have in the Province of Manitoba a very good civil service personnel; we have a very good Deputy Minister of Labour. I think this is a credit to that individual and may I say it's a credit to the Minister and to the government that they selected the type of a man that they did to fill that position.

I do want to say to the Minister I have grave objections to the Annual Report of his department, not because of the statistical information that is contained, but I'd like my honourable friend the Minister to take a look at Page 2 of his report headed "Legislation Administered by the Department of Labour", and these departments or sections are broken down. They start out with General, which includes the Construction Industry Wages Act and a few other acts; then we come down to the Safety Division - Construction Safety Act, Workmen's Compensation, etc.; then the next division is Training, and it is the last section that I want to protest because it is headed "Welfare." And what are the sections, the acts contained in this particular section? Employment Services Act, Equal Pay Act - under the heading of Welfare. Well the Equal Pay Act of course, Mr. Chairman, sets up equality of pay at the minimum rates insofar as women and men are concerned. I wonder if our lady friends in the labour industry or indeed in the province would suggest that because we have an equal pay act they're on welfare.

MR. BAIZLEY: I wonder if the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party might not consider that this word welfare is social welfare not in the context or connotation that we recognize.

MR. PAULLEY: No, I would not, Mr. Chairman. All I am looking at is the legislation administered by the Department of Labour, and under the welfare division we have equal pay for women. Under the welfare department we have Fair Accommodations Practices Act. I wonder if those people for whom we found that it was necessary to establish fair accommodations practices in the province of Manitoba would consider it welfare. I certainly would -- (Interjection) -- You keep to your welfare, and Mr. Minister of Welfare we will be considering your meagre welfare in a little while and at that time I hope that you're as vociferous . . .

MR. CARROLL: I hope you're not.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . and as anxious to enter into debate than you are at the present time. Then another section under the welfare department of Department of Labour is Fair Employment Practices Act. So I say to my friend, ere the next year's report comes in, no matter whether my connotation of the word "welfare" may be different than his, let's at least change it.

MR. BAIZLEY: It's out.

MR. PAULLEY: It's out right now? Fine.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I have one or two other specific items that I wish to draw to the attention of the Minister, and maybe there is some connection between welfare and what I now wish to talk about, the question of minimum wages, because I think it has been established, at least it was established by the previous Minister of Labour that minimum wage should be based on a basis of welfare. I want to say to the Minister -- I have been asking him from time to time in the House as to when the Minimum Wage Board was going to start. He informed us this morning, Mr. Chairman, that unfortunately one of the personnel were transferred - I don't know when - it may have been recently. If it wasn't recently, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Honourable the Minister of Labour that the Minimum Wage Board should have been active some considerable period ago.

I say so, Mr. Chairman, because it was well known for a considerable period of time that minimum wages at the federal level were being considered and that we should at least try and have a semblance of uniformity in our minimum wages, because I am sure that the Honourable the Minister of Labour is cognizant of the situation that we have here in Manitoba respecting the hotel employees who are under federal jurisdiction. One of the reasons as I read the situation that the now \$1.25 minimum wage federal-wise -- one of the reasons the employees in the hotels under federal jurisdiction will not be paid that is because of the low minimum wage here that we have in the Province of Manitoba.

This is one of those areas where you have two like industries being under different jurisdictions and yet in competition one with the other.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . .

So I appeal to the Honourable the Minister of Labour to get cracking. He says now that he has a new member for the Board. I trust that he will commence as early as possible to get the Board to hold hearings and remedy the situation; and I suggest to the Minimum Wage Board, through the Minister, that the least, the very least that they can with any justice proclaim, the Minimum Wage of Manitoba should at least be on a par with the minimum wage of the Dominion of Canada.

One other question I would like to ask of the Minister, and I believe that the question of gas equipment in homes comes under his jurisdiction. I've had a considerable number of complaints directed to me, Mr. Minister, dealing with a gas furnace under the name - I believe it was Swiston - and I am informed that with this particular furnace - and incidentally the firm has now gone out of business insofar as the manufacture of the furnace is concerned - but I understand that the problem is that the heat exchanges in the furnace have burned out in far less time than the guaranteed period of ten years, some as quickly as two or three years. I raise this, not to criticize unduly the Minister, but if his department is not at the present time actually inspecting the construction as well as the installation, I would suggest that he should do it.

Another matter I wish now to draw to the attention of the Minister is the question of Workmen's Compensation. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that here the Minister and I have had many discussions on a particular case, and this deals with an employee under federal jurisdiction. You may recall a few years ago, Mr. Chairman, I had a case dealing with a similar situation insofar as the employee being under federal jurisdiction, and it wasn't until after a considerable period of years that the situation was resolved.

In the case that I now mention of another federal employee -- and of course the Department of Labour of Manitoba only acts as the agent -- the Workmen's Compensation Board of Manitoba only acts as the agent for the federal government as I understand it. This particular case has been going on for a few years also. I'm not going to read all the documents that I have before me because just the other day, Mr. Chairman, I received a communication from both the Compensation Board and the assurance of the Minister that this case is now under review, and while I did originally intend to lay the case before this committee, I will not do so now.

But as a result of this particular case, I want to raise a question as to whether or not consideration might be given to changing the act insofar as one aspect is concerned. It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that under The Workmen's Compensation Act the chiropractor is entitled to render services and receive payment for it. In this case, the gentleman attended a chiropractor after having first attended another doctor, so there may be some difficulty here. But from the correspondence that I have received and studied in this case, while under the present act a member of the chiropractic profession is entitled to treat and to receive payment for treatment of an injured person, when a dispute takes place and reference has to be made to what they call a Medical Board of Review on the case, the act at the present time specifically states that it should be a medical board of review and apparently there is no provision for an injured workman who may be under treatment by a chiropractor to have a chiropractor named as his representative on the Board of Review.

Now I appreciate that this might present some problem so far as the act is concerned, but it does seem to me reasonable and logical, Mr. Chairman, that if a chiropractor is able to treat and to receive payment, if there is a dispute, then surely an employee under such treatment should be able to name his representative on the board of review. But as I say, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to pursue the case of John Huta at the present time due to the assurances that I have received.

Dealing with Workmen's Compensation, one other matter that I would like to have the Minister take under consideration is that I think that compensation when paid in respect of a recurring accident should be based on the compensation that the injured individual loses as the result of the recurring accident. That is, if an accident occurred say ten years ago, as I understand it at the present time it is based on his earnings at that time or a proportion of his earnings at that time, and I suggest, Mr. Minister, that it would only be fair and reasonable that if as a result of that particular injury a workman has to leave work for treatment, then he should receive compensation based on the wages that he is now earning, that is after the percentage deduction, etc. is considered. In other words, what I am asking for consideration, Mr. Chairman, is that a worker who is injured 10 years ago and has to lay off work today as a result of that injury, should receive the same treatment insofar as compensation is

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) concerned as though the accident was a new accident that happened again.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think they are a few thoughts I may have given to my honourable friend the Minister of Labour, and I await in anticipation for his reply. In taking my seat, may I again re-emphasize that I wish him the best of luck in a job that is an arduous job, one of the toughest but one of the most important that we have here in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I would also like to oblige the Minister when he invited questions. He seems quite happy to have a goodly number of questions thrown at him, I must say, though when I picked up the Department of Labour Annual Report, I didn't get very much meat out of the first nine pages . .

MR. BAIZLEY: I'll cut that down next year.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well I feel you could save a considerable amount of our natural resources by leaving out Page 6, which has a number on it -- page 6 -- unless there should have been a message. Page 7 has the astounding assertion called Part I, then there are other pages throughout that have other very important announcements - two-word and one-word announcements. But, Mr. Chairman, I didn't get up to chide the Minister unduly on this, but I thought I would draw it to his attention.

However, I do have a question, a rather serious question to put to the Minister and it's more a question to do with his philosophy or his policy on labour matters. I believe it's well known to members of the House that there have been some resolutions dealing with labour matters put on the Order Paper by members of the Liberal Party and members of the NDP. For instance, one is a resolution calling on the government to set up a Labour-Management Committee in co-operation with the University. Another one is a resolution asking to legalize and give the right to workers for a certification so that they may conduct their own affairs with greater autonomy. The other resolution is to do with a secret strike vote, and I believe there is a number of others presented by the other party on my left.

We were told by the Minister when the first one of these resolutions came up that he had already had a Labour-Management Committee and that he was not going to discuss the resolutions; and he was suggesting to the members of his own group that they do not discuss the resolutions and at the time they came to a vote he was suggesting that his own members vote these resolutions down. Mr. Chairman, I'm very disturbed about the philosophy of the Minister of Labour. Does this mean that this is a future policy? Any discussion on labour matters by way of resolution will be treated this way in the future? I really am seriously disturbed. I see the Minister is laughing. Perhaps it's a laughing matter to him, but it is not a laughing matter to labour leaders and people who are concerned with the contents of these resolutions.

If this is a future policy of the Department of Labour in future sessions that there'll be no discussion on any resolutions that may be discussed by a Labour-Management Committee in existence, I hardly think that this is a proper way to conduct labour affairs. Indeed it would be a calamitous outcome of the whole system of democracy if every Minister in every department took the same attitude in any committee he had sitting and they were discussing something of some nature to do with that particular ministry, if the Minister were to tell the members on his side to vote down and to refuse to discuss, we might as well all stay home for the rest of the year until the next election. There would be nothing to discuss if this is the type of muzzle that's going to be put on discussion. So I'd like very much to hear the Minister's philosophy and his future policy when in next session and there will no doubt be other resolutions, will they be treated in the same manner.

I'd like to turn now to another matter, and of course it's one that easily gets headlines and we all know about. Every year there's deaths or fatalities in the construction industry and they catch a headline for a day or two then they sink into obscurity. I'm sure that the Department of Labour are doing their best to enforce safety regulations. I'm not condemning any members of the department, but I have one case here before me that upon close examination it leads one to come to one of two conclusions, and I would like to quote now from the Winnipeg Tribune, Tuesday, February 16, 1965: "Man dies in excavation. Court fines firm \$350.00". The employee in question was a man - I should say he was a boy of 19 years of age. He wasn't an experienced workman whereby he may have taken matters into his own hands and sized up the situation and refused to work on a dangerous situation. Here we have a young inexperienced worker, and although the firm was detected - naturally after the fatality - they were brought to court, and they were brought to court on a number of charges and if I may enumerate the ones that are listed here. The firm failed to give intention to excavate; failed to shore excavation; failed to have shoring at four foot intervals; failed to have shoring within 15 feet of where

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) ...the digging was taking place; failed to keep the dugout earth more than one yard from the excavation, and failing to have the excavation properly supervised.

Now it's easy to have hindsight and criticize, I know, but here is an absolutely astounding case where there's not one violation, it's a whole string of violations, and someone 19 years of age is no longer with us, and is fined \$350.00. Well, Mr. Chairman, we know the law provides maximum fines of \$50.00 for offence, but surely this is not the whole answer. So this would lead one to believe one of two conclusions. One is that the department is not giving enough direction and enough publicity and enough checking and covering all possible sites - and I know here that there was no notice given of excavation - but surely in a case such as this and another case right beside it where work went on for 23 days without detection before it was found to be in violation - this is another job I'm speaking of now where there were three or four violations by another company. Surely there's something wrong here when workmen go on this length of time when so many violations can take place on a job, and someone pays with their life and only a fine can result, surely something more could be done than that. This is almost legalized murder to have a thing like this happen, and I'd be very interested to hear what new steps are being taken to stop any further occurrence of such a matter.

Another matter that I would like to mention to the Minister. As he's well aware the Canadian Labour Code that has just been brought in has some new advances in the matter of vacations with pay, and it is my understanding that after 30 days of employment under the approved work of the Canada Labour Code a worker is entitled to holiday pay amounting to four percent of his work. I think this is quite a forward step in that if a worker is transient and moves from job to job by the nature of the job, that his holiday pay builds up and goes with him, or at least he gets it; and it's my understanding that in Manitoba the workers have to work quite a while longer than that before they receive vacation with pay. I would be very interested to hear from the Minister of Labour on these matters that I have brought to his attention.

..... continued on next page

MR. BAIZLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that I better make a start at becoming involved in this debate. I might say that I appreciate very much the honourable members remarks concerning the staff of the Department of Labour. I can tell you that they are sincerely appreciated. We recognize of course that the problems that all of us have within this area generally speaking are personal problems -- and again I would say to you that we are a service department and if we can help you why bring your problems in directly if you feel you have to see me, or -- and this I am sure is what honourable members now we should get into some of the philosophy on law that has taken just a bit of a beating. And I might say, Mr. Chairman, when I was smiling in this debate it is because I enjoy it. Because in this particular area of human relations, it is the vigor and excitement of a relationship of one individual with another, and for goodness sake, if life can't be exciting and enjoying while we're trying to make better laws and make a better community, why then I for one would like to go home. Sure we have differences of opinion and it's difficult to reach agreement, but I sincerely believe that all of us in this Chamber in this human relations field are trying to do the best we possibly can.

The Honourable Member from Assiniboia brought up the point about the annual report. I would like to tell the honourable member that it's quite obvious that there are ways and means of reducing the size of the report. But I do have to disagree when he says the report is not meaningful, because it was only a couple of years ago when the criticism was that the narratives of this report were too long, the report was too voluminous and this was not meaningful. So I would suggest to honourable members if they would try and look at the tables and give us suggestions as to exactly what information they would like to have in the tables. For instance, the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, if he would look on Page 52 at Table 8, he would get comparisons there on the strike situation over the last few years. And if he would look on Page 49 at Table No. 3, he would get a report on the conciliation services and the number of cases that were handled by that section.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Assiniboia seemed to be disappointed that there was nothing about minimum wages in this report. Well, the reason there was nothing in the report, Mr. Chairman, is there was nothing to report this year. The honourable member is aware the Minimum Wage Board, is meeting at the present time. And while I'm talking about the Minimum Wage Board, I should tell the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party that it was just recently that the resignation was submitted to me and that after some consideration and consultation, a very able gentleman, Mr. Nitikman, has consented to act as a management representative on the Board and they will be carrying on, and like himself, I trust that we will have a report in the not too distant future.

But I think there is one point that I would like to reiterate again concerning minimum wages in the Province of Manitoba: that this is the wage, the least wage, the least wages that an employer can legally pay to an employee. It is not related to fair wages, to going wages, to contractual wages. I don't think that honourable members opposite doubt what is meant in Manitoba by the minimum wage, that the minimum wage is a wage that is arrived at after due consideration which will maintain a single girl at a subsistence level, so that it is not fair wage, going wage or contractual wage.

Now if I can carry on just for a moment and we'll move to the strike at Thompson. For the information of honourable members this situation occurred with the first agreement between the International Nickel Company and the United Steel Workers of America. There had to be an extensive revision over the previous mine mill contract and in addition to this the parties measured each other carefully at all times, and there were some approximately 1850 employees involved. Direct negotiations between the parties broke down and a conciliation officer was appointed on May 25, 1964. The parties failed to reach a settlement and the conciliation officer filed his report on June 10, 1964. A Conciliation Board was established on June 15th, 1964 and handed down its award on July 14th, 1964. The Board award did not succeed in bringing about a settlement so a supervised strike vote was applied for by the union which was taken at Thompson, Manitoba on August 6th and 7th. Now the result was an overwhelming majority in favour of strike. Then it was suggested to the parties that they make another effort to reach a settlement before proceeding with strike action. The parties agreed and a conciliation officer reopened negotiations with the parties on August 10th. Good progress was made and a basis of settlement was reached during the evening of August 11th. A memorandum of agreement was drawn up and signed by all members of the respective committees at 9:30 p. m. on August 11th, 1964. However, the employees elected to carry out the

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd.) strike mandate and the union did not return to work until September 8th, or the men belonging to the union, September 8th, 1964. So the strike was in effect for nineteen days.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia, number of safety inspectors - eight. The number of new inspectors that were appointed at the time of the "disastrous month" if you like, were four. The honourable member had a question about manpower services. I'm sure that he realizes that it is the minimum wage that we would be responsible for, that the individual really is contracted to Manpower Services, or the other employing agency who then in turn contract with an employer for such length of time that the employee is required. I doubt very much and I cannot see any way that the Department of Labour could help the wage situation in this particular instance. There has to be a differential, the Manpower Service or the employing agency undoubtedly would be paying going wages. They may be more or may be less than what regular employees are getting, but the contracting service then has a fee for supplying the labour. So that in fact a person could be working side by side with a regular employee of the company and be getting a less fee or a less wage than the person with the contractual service.

I might say the Honourable Member for Assiniboia had a case and he did bring it to my attention. Mr. Chairman, rather than go into that individual case with the other side of the story I will supply him with the latest information on it to date.

And the Honourable Member from St. John's -- He's very persuasive. We recognize, and have done for some time, that there's dissatisfaction with parts of The Labour Relations Act and particularly with the so-called "unfair labour practices." I was very pleased the other day when he did in fact make a point to emphasize that there were a few cases - that when he was talking about employers and he was talking about union in Manitoba that labour-management relations by and large were good but there were a few problems. I might say that we're seeking procedures that we trust would be effective and acceptable to the majority of both groups. I know that honourable friends opposite say well you know what the problem is, we have told you, do something about it. I think in fairness I have to say that just in the short time that I have been in this office that I am firmly convinced that consultation, confrontation, dialogue, is the best method to arrive at procedures that are generally acceptable and will be observed by both parties.

The Honourable Member for St. John's problem of runaway companies. We have looked into this problem but we will certainly take the honourable member's suggestions and look into it further. He did have a problem of employment standards. The question I believe is, why does The Employment Standards Act apply only to certain specified areas in respect of overtime provision. These provisions were established in 1957 and obviously were thought to be desirable at that time. And I might tell the honourable member that it is only recently that one case has been brought to my attention that are not covered by the Act and that we will be taking a look at these provisions in respect of overtime on more equitable basis.

The Honourable Member for Logan reintroduced his thoughts on the debate for Vacation with Pay. There are areas here that have to be looked at. At the present time an employee is entitled to two weeks holidays with pay after working one year and to qualify it has to be 95 percent of that time. The exception within our area is the construction industry within Metropolitan Winnipeg where the employer pays into the vacations-with-pay account 4 percent on behalf of the employees working for him.

The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party introduced a complaint about gas installations. I know he realizes that I have not the information, I have not heard of these particular complaints, but they will be looked into. That equipment in Manitoba cannot or is not supposed to be installed unless it has had the approval of the Canadian Standards Association, and I believe there are several other standards that have to be met before the installation is acceptable. I will have that complaint looked into.

Then he gets into a compensation case and I appreciate him drawing this to my attention. I feel quite sure that it is thought because chiropractic was introduced in this case that this was the problem. He and I both know as we review the information on this case that the individual did in fact change doctors without permission of the Board and that there is some conflicting evidence. We trust that this will be resolved by the Board and that we will be as successful in accomplishing fair treatment for this individual as we have for many other individuals in the past. I appreciate his suggestion on the recurring injury and compensation. I think I've finally got the message. I have heard this argument before, I hadn't been too

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd.) impressed, but he drew the message quite well and we will look into that.

The Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie talks about a policy for the Department, attitudes of myself and my government. I think in this particular area if the honourable member would read my statement, consider what has been said, what is being attempted, he can realize the concern that I had. And I say that I had because I have not been deluged with any resignations from the committee as I felt might have occurred; in fact I believe that the debates in this House will serve as a stimulus to this committee. If this is so I'm sure that all of us will be pleased to have that type of progress.

I can't comment for too long a time on safety and \$350 for a life. I couldn't talk too long on that if it was 350 million or anything else. I don't believe, as I'm sure every other member of this committee does, that you can balance dollars and life. The honourable members of the committee realize I am sure that The Construction Safety Act has been amended, that \$50 a day is now \$500 a day for each offence. The other thing I think that is going to make a terrific impact with attitudes towards safety is the new Employment Safety Act which we passed at this session. I'm firmly convinced that with proper attitudes again and co-operation that this consultative approach can make a big impact on industrial accidents. If it doesn't, if it doesn't then we have to find other techniques because we just cannot have industrial accidents increasing faster than the work force. So all of us will increase our labours I know to improve this situation. We have every evidence though, gentlemen, to indicate that the consultative technique will work. Now we'll have to wait and see.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I have answered the questions that were asked.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to inform the Minister, that not only do I think that he has not answered the questions, but I'm somehow inclined to think that we have almost been conned, lulled into a feeling of satisfaction, because the Minister has, in his friendly smiling way made it appear as if we had really accomplished our duty in opposition by stimulating him with ideas to proceed and do a better job than he has been doing up to now. He was even sort of complimentary to what I said in terms of my persuasiveness but then he proceeded to ignore many of the questions which I raised.

I feel bound therefore to come back and be specific, and I'll say, No. 1, Canadian Brown Steel Tank as an example of an unfair labour practice that took place in 1961 and was brought to trial in 1964, I presume has thus lost out, way out from a six-month limitation period. The question, the direct question was and is still, what about that six months limitation period? Does it make sense if the enquiry commission appointed by the government was appointed six months one day 'after' the breach took place, does it make sense to have a six month limitation period. No. 2, what about this question of onus of proof of unfair labour practice. No. 3, the Minister indicated that he is a firm believer of confrontation and dialogue, and I must therefore ask, what do you mean by dialogue, between what two people - dialogue implies two people - which two confront and which two carry on a dialogue and what do they discuss when it comes to unfair labour practice when as I pointed out the employees' representative can't prove an unfair labour practice because of this lack of onus. No. 4, I think it is. What about the suggestion that the board be empowered to hear these matters of unfair labour practice rather than the police court so there could be a confrontation and a dialogue in front of an independent body which has certain powers. Next item. What about this question of application for certification and decertification and strike vote in relation to the right of the employer where questions of employees are involved. Are those specific questions then that we could possibly get answers to?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister four questions, and I believe he hasn't answered any of them. I asked him what his future policy was with respect to resolutions that may come on the order paper in a future session while a labour-management committee is sitting. I don't believe we received that answer. A committee may sit for months or years. We've had a livestock committee that went on for three years. Does this mean for as long as the labour-management committee is, I was going to say active, that's not the word, but as long as a committee is sitting as constituted, what is your policy with respect to future resolutions or anything that they may be discussing or may mention? Surely that's a plain statement and question and can be answered. After all the Minister started this 'dialogue', which is one of his words, by his statement that he was not going to, he was advising his members not to speak on a labour resolution and he was advising them to also vote it down. Now I want to know what is your future policy on this, are you still of the same mind? Yes or no is

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd). sufficient. Also I've - although this question I did not ask - but when did this \$500 per day violation fine come into effect, per violation? If we could have that also.

And also I asked if the Department of Labour were considering amending their Vacation With Pay Act to be in line with the Canada Labour Code. I'd also like an answer to that question.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might speak and give the Minister a few moments in which to gain his poise there.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to wait till the items but I feel that I should say a few words at this time. Much has been said about the format of the annual report and I should say at the beginning that there appears to me to be something wrong. I believe sincerely that there is a great potential in the Department of Labour. When the Honourable Minister was appointed I was very optimistic, and he willingly conceded at the beginning that he knew very little about labour, but because of his attitude because of his willingness to listen, I thought that here Manitoba is about to get one of the greatest Ministers of Labour for many years, and I believe that. I believe too that he has some of the most dedicated people in his staff that we could find anywhere in the civil service. This I sincerely believe. But there is something wrong, Mr. Chairman.

The Honourable Minister talked a few moments ago and he said that the statistical approach was not enough. Perhaps I'm beginning to put my finger on it because when I look at the annual report it is nothing but statistics. There is nothing warm about it. I just got through reading a little pamphlet by a psychiatrist called "The Worker in a changing World", and he mentions this very thing. He says that whether we are discussing high wages, the problem of leisure, the effect of automation, wage differentials, or the relationship between government and individuals, the problems of the skilled craftsman in an assembly line society, we are still ultimately concerned with the hopes and fears of people. But perhaps - in looking at the annual report it's a pretty dry statistical set up. Not a picture, no new approach, it's getting smaller too, but what would be wrong - and I'm setting this out as, I try to project myself, Mr. Chairman, not in a sympathetic way with the Minister but in an empathic way, trying to project myself into your position. What would I like to see so that my suggestions will be, I hope, constructive.

I borrowed a pamphlet from our Canadian National Library on industrial safety in regard to excavations and I was surprised how much information was there in the 12 pages, and the pictures. I visualized some of those pictures being shown in the Department of Labour report, showing you the picture of an excavation where two men died. What would be wrong with that? Would that not be educational? Would it not spice up this thing or make it a little bit more human? I believe it would. You heard me say before that I disagree that with safety you can have all the hard hats and safety boots you like and all the coloured posters, but you're never going to each - without a safety program, without an educational program, a program of training of supervisors - you're never going to reach the goal that you seek. And I speak from experience here. I believe that we should go back to the days when we had lectures in the winter-time on industrial safety. We have all kinds of supervisors, young fellows coming up in the building trades who would willingly go to these classes. I can remember going three winters in a row when the late Mr. Trevor Davies conducted the classes and we had some wonderful sessions there. This would cause people to take much more interest in safety. I believe too that we could set up an information, we have a tourist information bureau here. What's so wrong about in the Department of Labour setting up a bureau where young people could apply and get information on training. They just don't know all the angles about how they can apply for further training, what the requirements of industry is.

In the Department of Education debate I mentioned that of the 643 millions of dollars that the Federal Government put up for vocational training, private business only asked for 16.6 percent of that. This is staggering. \$56,000 was applied for by private industry out of \$643,000,000.00. Even the "barons of industry" do not know what's available to them in the matter of manpower training. I quoted at length in that debate, "Crisis in Craftsmanship" put out by the metalworkers union, a terrific piece of information about automation and training for the future. I would suggest that perhaps in the Department of Labour estimates we haven't got enough money and I don't think that there is enough money there in the Department of Labour estimates, \$765,000 total vote, to do a real job in this day and age of automation.

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd).....

It's been said that government now is a counterbalance between big labour and big management. And I think this is true. I think that government has to take a far greater interest. It is not good enough every year to put out a report similar to this one because you'll never get people to read it. True there is a lot of information in there, but happened to the report when we named the people who violated the labour codes, where we told about the names of the contractors who resorted to unfair practices; it's not here any more. As I said before we have some of the most promising material in your department Mr. Minister. I think you have to take a more positive approach to this business of labour. As I said before there are thousands of young people now coming out of school, not every one of them can go to university. In tonight's paper I was very pleased to see Mr. RoBERT Bend criticize these people that are continually drumming it into our young people that they must get a university education in order to succeed in life. And while it's very desirable, he was very wise in saying that this is not the proper thing to be doing with our youth, but we must encourage them into this business of training themselves. You cannot be mediocre in this life, it doesn't matter whether you're going to be a plumber or a professor, you can't afford to be mediocre. I think the Department of Labour is failing in its job of dispensing information to our young people. Even the question of summer work for students is a serious question, Mr. Minister. In the United States that have an organization called YES, Youth Employment Service, where there is a department that makes a specialty of trying to encourage young people in summer work, telling them about the vocations that will be coming along in the future.

I thought I should rise now before we get into the items and suggest this because I sincerely believe that the approach to safety has been wrong. It was only after we had a few deaths that the Department finally went about appointing new inspectors, and I don't blame the Minister for this. I think it's just the old saying again that nothing is done until something happens. I don't believe there's enough money in the estimates for the Province of Manitoba to do a real job of labour. As I said before I think you have the personnel to do a real job, but you must take a more positive approach and I would look forward next year to see a more colorful report from the Department of Labour than the one that I have in my hand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a) passed.

MR. BAIZLEY: I think Mr. Chairman that I should answer the question of the Honourable Member from Portage on the matter of labour policy. I think it's fair to say that our policies will be flexible and adaptable to improving good labour-management relations in this province I think has been sufficient indication that we will give due consideration to debates and propositions that come up in this House.

To the Honourable Member from St. John, I believe that the Labour Board is, in fact, dealing with the management rights appearing before it for certification in as effective a way as they can and I understand that what the legal profession terms "natural justices" - what they base their decisions on. In the strike vote situation that has been tagged up with recent changes in the regulations where the Board grants or takes a strike vote on application.

MR. CHERNIACK: What about the..... situation and the time limitations?

MR. BAIZLEY: They will be considered, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a) passed; (b) passed.....

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we pass the Minister's salary, I believe that a question was asked of him or some comments made by the Leader of the NDP regarding the use of chiropractors under the Workmen's Compensation and I may have missed it while I was out but I didn't get a reply on that. Is it the intention that this be done?

MR. BAIZLEY: This is a very interesting question, Mr. Chairman. I think if the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party will read Hansard he will find it there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a) passed (b) passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the general question asked by my colleague from Portage la Prairie, was also one that I didn't quite understand the Minister's reply, because what the Member from Portage la Prairie was asking was the policy of the government regarding suggestions coming forward in the labour field, and as he indicated in his speech a number of resolutions have come from our particular group and some have come from the group to my left. The Minister has taken the position on the resolutions that he is simply going to oppose them and he has instructed his members to oppose them as well and not speak on them. Now this appears to be a definite statement of policy. The Minister now says, as I understand him,

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)..... that he is going to continue with progressive policies or something of the sort. Well how does he exactly tie in a statement like the one he made in the House some weeks ago that he was simply going to oppose holus bolus any ideas and now tell us that he is going to continue with progressive policies. I don't see how those two points of view can be held together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 85-- passed; 86--passed; 87-- passed; 88--passed; Resolution No. 89 5 (a) passed; 5(b) passed; 5(c) passed; 5(d) pass.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the Minister in view of the increase here for fees, can he indicate whether this is because he anticipates that there will have to be more conciliation boards in the ensuing year or is it due to some other circumstances?

MR. BAIZLEY: There is an increase for board fees here, Mr. Chairman. The policy of the department is that when both parties jointly request a Conciliation Board it will be granted, and we're anticipating that this will require a little more money than.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5(d) (1) pass; (2) pass. Resolution 89 passed. 6(a) pass...

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on this one while it's true that there are no expenditures, that is none chargeable under this item, I wonder if the Minister could indicate where the balancing figure comes from. Is this from municipal contributions or from federal contributions or what exactly is the receipts.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, these receipts come from two-thirds of one percent of the policies that are written for this particular protection. Page 2 of the Fire Commissioner's office from the Insurance Association.

MR. MOLGAT:..... insurance association that is paying for the operation of the Fire Prevention office branch. What correlation is there between the work of the Fire Prevention office and the Emergency Measures organization? I think that in a number of cases Emergency Measures do supply fire-fighting equipment -- I believe they have something to do with the training of fire-fighting personnel. This office here, I understand is particularly concerned about the prevention of fires, but must as well get involved in some of the training aspects. Now how are these two departments correlated?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, they are involved in the training aspects as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has stated. The Fire Commissioner is the ...controlling officer of fire-fighting apparatus in the province. Emergency Measures Organization have certain equipment in rural areas that are at the disposal of the Fire Commissioner's office for training purposes. They have regional training schemes and every year the Fire Commissioner has a Fire Chief's College to bring them up-to-date on the latest methods of fire-fighting and fire prevention.

MR. MOLGAT: Is he in charge then of any of the fire-fighting aspects of the Emergency Measures Organization. Do they come under his control?

MR. BAIZLEY: Yes. That's right.

MR. MOLGAT: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6(a) passed; (b) passed; (c) pass

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question that I missed on the Minister's salary and that is in connection with lime that is left by contractors or road building contractors. In my constituency last year I did have quite a few people call me and there were some children that had their hands and feet burned by lime powder left uncovered. Is this a common practise by road builders to leave this lime powder uncovered? -- because it is dangerous.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable member would repeat the question ?

MR. PATRICK: It's in connection with lime powder that is left uncovered by road building contractors in construction of roads or paving of highways. In my constituency last year there were some children that got burned on this powdered lime. Is it a common practice by the builders to leave this uncovered or do they have to cover it up?

MR. BAIZLEY: No, I would not think, Mr. Chairman, that it is a common practice and that it should be covered. I believe I know personally what the honourable member is talking about, having had some experience with the situation. I will draw it to the attention of the Inspectors.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6 (c) passed. Resolution No. 89 passed. Resolution No. 90.....

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, what is the difference between Research Division as in Resolution No. 90 and The Employment Standards Division which is also a Research Division?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, this year we have moved the Labour Research from the other area. The increase that you see here is due to moving the annual wage and salary survey under the Research Division which accounts for about 50 percent of these costs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 90 passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Before you vote, could the First Minister give us an outline what the -- how we'll proceed with the rest of the Estimates?

MR. ROBLIN: We will proceed right through the book and when we come to the end we will then take up agriculture.

MR. GUTTORMSON: So it will be Industry and Commerce, Welfare and Agriculture?

MR. ROBLIN: That's right.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions and requests leave to sit again.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Saturday morning.