

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 24th, 1963.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health -- I wish to present the first report of the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources beg leave to present the following as their first report:

TO THE HONOURABLE THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA:

YOUR STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UTILITIES AND NATURAL RESOURCES met on April 2, 1963, and appointed The Honourable Stewart E. McLean, Q.C., Chairman.

The attention of the Committee was directed to certain allegations which had been made on March 6th, 1963, by the Honourable Member for St. George, and reported in Pages 43 to 45 inclusive of the Debates and Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba (Hansard) with respect to arrangements which had been made for the transportation of construction materials and supplies from Selkirk to Grand Rapids in connection with the Grand Rapids Hydro-Electric Development. The debate on this topic on March 6th, 1963, is fully reported in Pages 43 to 54 inclusive of the Debates and Proceedings.

Your Committee met on the following dates: Tuesday A.M., April 2nd, 1963, Tuesday A.M., April 9th, 1963, Tuesday A.M., April 16th, 1963, Tuesday P.M. April 16th, 1963, Tuesday evening, April 16th, 1963, Wednesday A.M. April 17th, 1963, Thursday A.M., April 18th, 1963, Wednesday A.M., April 24th, 1963.

Your Committee after discussion understood and agreed to adopt as its Terms of Reference: To enquire into, and report on, all matters and circumstances surrounding the entering into by The Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board with Drake Construction Company Ltd., and Pearson Construction Company Ltd. of Agreement dated September 16, 1960, for water transportation, handling and storage of construction materials, Selkirk to Grand Rapids,

Court reporters were present at all meetings and a complete transcript was taken of all evidence and discussions, copies of which have been filed with the Clerk of the House.

The following counsel were in attendance: Mr. J.A. Thompson, Q.C., Counsel for Manitoba Hydro, Mr. R.S. Bowles, Q.C., Counsel for Mr. Elman Guttormson, Mr. G.R. Hunter, Q.C., Counsel for Drake Construction Company Ltd. and Pearson Construction Company Ltd.

All meetings were open and were attended by representatives of the news media. The following witnesses appeared before the Committee: Mr. W.D. Fallis, General Manager, Manitoba Hydro, Mr. D.H.S. Tuckwell, President, Oil Industry Suppliers Ltd., Mr. D.M. Stephens, Chairman, Manitoba Hydro, Mr. J.R. Rettie, Director of Engineering, Manitoba Hydro, Mr. L.A. Bateman, Director of Production, Manitoba Hydro, Mr. J.H.C. Wilson, Project Manager, - Grand Rapids, Manitoba Hydro, Mr. R. Josephson, President of Pearson Construction Company Ltd., Mr. D. Coulter, Manager, Drake Construction Company Ltd.

All witnesses gave their testimony under oath and were examined by Members of the Committee. Counsel also made statements to the Committee and were questioned by it.

Copies of correspondence and documents relevant to the Inquiry had been tabled in the House pursuant to an Address for Papers and by this means had been made available to Committee Members.

Your Committee inquired into all matters which it considered pertinent to this Inquiry.

Your Committee was informed by officers of the Manitoba Hydro of the circumstances surrounding the entering into of the agreement in 1960 referred to in the Terms of Reference. Your Committee was also informed of the necessity for arrangements to provide dependable transport facilities for the construction materials and equipment and supplies required for the construction of the Grand Rapids Project, not only during the period that the Gypsumville-Grand Rapids road and the associated bridge over the Saskatchewan River were to be under

(Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources - First Report - Cont'd)... construction but also as a means of assuring thereafter continuity of supply to the project in the event of prolonged adverse summer road conditions. The Committee was further informed that the arrangements for water haulage under the contract also included the necessary docks, loading, unloading, and storage facilities required for the handling of the large tonnages of cargo involved.

In this regard your Committee received convincing evidence to the effect: (a) The decision by Manitoba Hydro to proceed with the physical construction of Grand Rapids Project could not have been economically justified prior to November of 1959. (b) That based upon the still valid forecasts of power requirements in the province it was essential that Grand Rapids power plant be capable of delivering power into the Manitoba Hydro system before December, 1964. (c) That in order to meet the November, 1964 commissioning requirement with respect to Grand Rapids plant it was essential that major work on the project be put under way during the summer of 1960. (d) That substantial water haulage facilities were essential, and the only feasible means, of transporting material, equipment and supplies to Grand Rapids during the summer of 1960 in the absence of road or rail facilities beyond Gypsumville. (e) That as of 1960 there were no assurances a completed road would be available for heavy transport during the summer of 1961. (f) That irrespective of the date upon which the road from Gypsumville to Grand Rapids was completed, Manitoba Hydro, based on experience, could not assume such a new road could be depended upon as the sole means of summer transportation up to the present. (g) That the transportation arrangements made were necessary for Manitoba Hydro to protect the province against the risk of any power "black out"; resulted in more favorable prices being tendered for the general construction contracts; and reduced the risk of substantially higher interest and other costs that would result if completion of the project were seriously delayed.

Your Committee is satisfied that with respect to water haulage, Selkirk to Grand Rapids, Manitoba Hydro (a) called for public tenders for the work in accordance with normally accepted practice, (b) received five tenders and four proposals for such work, (c) accepted the lowest tender submitted after having satisfied itself that the contractor was capable of performing the work and that the said lowest tender was reasonable under all the circumstances.

Your Committee considers that Manitoba Hydro acted prudently in entering the agreement dated September 16th, 1960, and related agreements.

No allegations of improper conduct on the part of Manitoba Hydro or any of the parties to the contract were made during the course of the Inquiry.

Your Committee denied the request of Counsel for Mr. Elman Guttormson for the issue of subpoenas calling for the attendance of the auditors of Drake Construction Company Ltd. and Pearson Construction Company Ltd., and officials of the Income Tax Department of Canada, and the production of the accounts, records and income tax returns of Drake Construction Company Ltd. and Pearson Construction Company Ltd.

Your Committee did so on the ground that, in the absence of improper conduct, or of contractual requirements and in view of the fact that the contract had been let as a result of a public call for tenders, it would not be in the public interest to employ the far-reaching powers of the Committee to require persons or corporations to make public their private affairs, merely because such persons or corporations had business relationships with the Government or a department or agency of Government.

Your Committee further finds, with regret, that at its meeting of Thursday, April 18, 1963, Mr. Guttormson followed by Messrs. Molgat and Hryhorczuk withdrew from the committee room after statements were made by Mr. Guttormson which reflected on the integrity of members of the Committee. Your Committee deplores this action on the part of the aforesaid members and brings the matter to the attention of the House.

Dated the 24th Day of April, 1963

Stewart E. McLean
Committee Chairman

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health that the report of the Committee be received. In doing so I wish to say that the Clerk

(Mr. McLean, cont'd)... has kindly arranged for printed copies of the report to be distributed to the members of the House and I wish to give notice of motion with respect to concurrence of this first report of the Committee for Friday, April 26th, 1963.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HON. J.B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas) in the absence of the Minister of Labour introduced Bill No. 96, an Act to amend the Steam and Pressure Plants Act and Bill No. 95, an Act to amend the Operating Engineers and Firemen Act.

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 24, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (1).

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 127, an Act to amend The Testator's Family Maintenance Act, and Bill No. 126, an Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 121, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2).

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Itterville) introduced Bill No. 125, an Act to amend The Rivers and Streams Act.

MR. LYON introduced Bill No. 131, an Act to provide for the Repeal of The Debt Adjustment Act; and Bill No. 132, an Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 135, an Act to amend The Health Services Act; and Bill No. 138, an Act to amend The Psychiatric Nurses Training Act.

MR. M.E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) introduced Bill No. 137, an Act to validate By-law No. 4-63 of The Village of Crystal City.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions.

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 with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. HUTTON: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends them to this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1, Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Animal Husbandry Act by providing for the compulsory vaccination of certain calves against Bang's disease and the consequent increase in the number of cattle owners entitled to claim a grant under Part IX of that Act.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, at the present time every rural municipality and every Local Government District with the exception of Victoria Beach and Park North have passed a by-law requiring Brucellosis vaccinations. At this time there has been something well over a million dollars spent by the Federal Government in carrying out its test-slaughter program, and the cost of this program has not been confined to the Federal Government. A great many of the cattle owners in the Province of Manitoba have gone along with this program and in many cases it has been at the cost of economic hardship to themselves, because although the incidence taking the province as a whole is very small, it can hit an individual very hard with consequent economic loss to that individual.

The Provincial Government at the present time is making grants of a dollar per head where vaccination is carried out and there are well over 100,000 heifer calves being vaccinated in the province each year. We feel that in the light of the tremendous investment that has been made in this program by the Federal Government, by the Provincial Government and by the farmers and ranchers who have been affected by this program that it is time that we made through the moral support, if you like, of the Provincial Government, behind the local governments, in an effort to see that no one is failing to vaccinate these animals because we do know that here and there across the province some municipalities have difficulty in enforcing their

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)...by-law, and we know that here and there there are pockets where these animals are not being vaccinated and, of course, where this is not done these pockets represent a chink or a weakness in the total program, and we feel that in light of the tremendous investment that has been made in this program over the years on the part of government and the farmer, that it is in the public interest to see to it to the best of our ability that we have a hundred percent program.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister for his explanation on this. Did I understand him correctly to say that there are only two municipalities that at the present have not gone into the program? I wonder if he could tell us as well whether all of the unorganized territories and disorganized ones are covered. I wonder, too, if he could tell us why it is that these two municipalities have not been prepared to join in the program and whether we could not get them to do so voluntarily rather than pass an Act forcing them to do it?

MR. HUTTON: The two municipalities that I referred to haven't passed a by-law but they have been included in the Federal Government Program of Test and Slaughter, so there is no municipality in Manitoba at the present time, or Local Government District, where the first test has not been carried out. As of March 31st, 107 designated areas have been certified as Brucellosis control areas. Every rural municipality and Local Government District has been tested at least once. During the last fiscal year 23 new areas were certified; 16 areas whose three-year certification had lapsed were re-certified through spot checks. During the last fiscal year 166,650 doses of Strain 19 vaccine were shipped to veterinarians, an increase of 8,625 over the previous year. 123,480 vaccination certificates were received by the Live-stock Branch.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could explain to me though why it is that the two municipalities have refused to do this on a voluntary basis and why it is that we have to pass an Act to force them doing it.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, we're not passing the Act in respect to two municipalities. We are passing this Act to lend our moral support to the municipalities and Local Government Districts that are already in this program; but from time to time we have been approached by municipalities who had a problem in enforcing their by-law and we feel that now that it has the wholehearted support of all the local governments throughout the province that we should move in and give our support to them. I would like to emphasize that in spite of the fact that the two municipalities I mentioned have not passed a by-law, the Federal Government has been carrying out the program.

MR. MOLGAT: Is it the intention then of the Provincial Government to see to the enforcement of the by-laws from now on, if it passes this Act?

MR. HUTTON: Yes.

MR. M.N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that is of vital concern to the livestock industry in the Province of Manitoba and as the Minister indicated there are some farmers that have suffered very serious losses in connection with this program. The first tests are not conclusive in any manner and I understand the Minister to say that most of the Province has been covered, or all of the province has been covered in these first tests. That's when the reactors show up, Mr. Chairman, and we've had, well, I could almost say hundreds of cattle sold early in the year when they had a very small market price by farmers in order to come within the range of this particular test which is all important to the industry. Now I understand that the first test has been taken throughout the province. I would like to ask the Honourable Minister, whether all the reactors after this first test have been tested again, because the first test has no meaning unless it's followed up. Are there any portions of the Province of Manitoba where the first test has been taken and the reactor is not dealt with; and I would like to know what areas of the province this is in because in my particular area the losses were exceptionally heavy and although the farmers were at first somewhat reluctant to enter into this particular test because of the losses, they did so and they're glad they have, but they want the assurance that adjoining herds are going to receive the same treatment, because if they took the losses without a follow-through on the second tests and getting rid of the reactors those losses were hopeless, that is, there will be no returns for them because the disease can come back into the other herds. I would like the

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd)...Minister's assurance that this program is going to be followed through to the end and that all reactors that appeared on the first test are going to be looked after in the usual manner.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, before the Minister answers, I'd like to ask another question. If my memory serves me correctly, I saw by press notice sometime ago that the Federal Government has announced that from now on the carrying on of these tests will be at the local owners expense. Is that correct? As a matter of fact the announcement that I saw dealt with T.B. as well as Bang's Disease so far as the federal program is concerned. I realize that this is a federal part of the program to which the Honourable Minister referred in his remarks, but inasmuch as the Provincial Government is connected with it too, I thought his department would be informed.

Then, I'd like to ask the Minister also to give us the figure of the amount of money that has been spent on the calfhood vaccination program by the province. I understood him to say that upwards of a million dollars had been spent under the federal program. Would he have the figures as to what has been spent by the province?

Mr. Chairman, I can defer my more extended remarks on this subject until the Bill is before us, but I'll be glad of the opportunity to speak once again on the question of Bang's Disease, even if the Honourable the First Minister doesn't enjoy the discussion of that subject at my hands; but he can't blame me for bringing it up this time; he'll have to blame his honourable friend and colleague, the Minister, because as a lot of people know, and I'm sure the Minister is aware, this is one of the programs -- one of a group -- that I'm compelled to mention at times, where I think that the co-operation -- I'll put it the other way -- where I think the initiation of the federal program was unnecessary. We had a good vaccination program in the -- why, the First Minister is coming right over beside me while I talk about Bang's Disease, I see. We had a good program on calfhood vaccination and in connection with the remarks that my honourable friend and colleague from Ethelbert Plains made a moment ago -- he's anxious to see the federal program followed up -- but I continue to ask any livestock man who is practical in these matters, if you carry through your calfhood vaccination campaign year in year out and get full vaccination, what is the need of the federal program? What's the need of it? Because it's true that there will be some cases where the vaccine doesn't work as effectively as we want it to; it will be true that there will be some animals that will contract contagious abortion; but if the remainder of the herd and the other herds have been made immune by calfhood vaccination, it will do, in my opinion, very little harm. This is a case where the Federal Government muscled in on the Province of Manitoba, where a program was in effect that was working well and it's not the only case that I could mention where that has happened, and I'm a great believer in avoiding duplication as far as possible. I know these programs are different; I know that they're quite different; I know compensation is paid in connection with the federal program; but I still say compensation was paid with the other one too if they decided that because of the act of abortion or blood tests or any other reason they decided to send the offending animals to market. So I'm not friendly toward the federal campaign. I'm less friendly toward it if the announcement that I saw sometime ago in the press is correct, that they're now, having started the program and having performed the blood tests that they have around the many herds in the country and put farmers to tremendous expense and loss, because in many cases the compensation didn't begin to equal the damage that was done by the upsetting of the herd that is entailed in these two or three, or I think in some cases even four blood tests. However, if they're dropping out of it now after having gone this far to the extent of not carrying the cost of the farmers' tests, I think it just points up that it's been even worse than I thought it was.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I can agree to some extent with both the honourable gentlemen that spoke. I agree with the Member from Ethelbert Plains that it would be just plain tragic if anything stopped the program now. I can agree with the Honourable Member for Lakeside when he is skeptical about the approach of the test and slaughter program and when he questions the cost of it. However, we know that for instance in the European countries that they don't follow this kind of a control program; they can't afford to; they can't waste their cattle herds over there in the same way that we have. But one must remember that we have a continental market here, as I've pointed out before, and that Canada's ability to compete lies largely upon our maintenance of quality, and I believe that Manitoba producers had little alternative,

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... or no alternative, but to go along with this Federal Test and Slaughter program, in the sense that unless we move towards a brucellosis-free area as a province, we would be endangering or jeopardizing the acceptability of our cattle to -- especially to American buyers, U.S. buyers. Now I know that even though we are not a brucellosis-free area at the present time and even before we started on this program there were certain controls and safeguards that were utilized and are still utilized in the same way to make sure that the cattle moving across the border are Bang's free, but we know that the cattle interests in the USA have a lobby at Washington and it is not in their interests that Canadian cattle should move freely, or at least they feel at times that it isn't in their interest that Canadian cattle should move freely into the USA because from time to time it does affect the prices available in the U.S. cattle market.

Now, if we neglect to clean up our herds we stand the chance of risking this very valuable market that we have in the United States; but even if we don't go beyond our Canadian borders, all the provinces in Canada are undertaking this test and slaughter program and we would be in a very unenviable position if Manitoba were the only province in Canada that hadn't availed themselves of this program to clean up the brucellosis in our herds and to get certification as a "brucellosis free carrier." So I feel that the economic pressures demanded that our Manitoba farmers and ranchers go along with this and certainly there can be no turning back at this time.

We have had some difficulty in the northern ranching area of the province, because it's one thing for a farmer to round up his cattle when they are closely confined, or relatively closely confined, where they are used to being handled. It's another thing for a rancher to go out and round up his cattle that have been running free and at large on the range and there have been some real difficulties. We have tried to iron them out; we've tried as best we could to use our good offices here to try and reach arrangements that I know weren't always satisfactory, but as satisfactory as we could get them to reduce the impact of this program on the ranchers who found themselves faced with problems that are not associated with the cattle business in other parts of the Province of Manitoba. But we certainly are going to proceed now; now that we've set our hand to the plough we're not going to turn back. But let us recognize that this has been -- when we are a brucellosis-free area as a province this has been accomplished at some sacrifice by ranchers, farmers and at some cost to both the Federal and the Provincial treasury. The estimate for vaccination this coming year or this current year is 135,000 calves; last year we received certificates for 123,480 calfhood vaccinations. I think if one looks back to the time when it started that you can see that the Province of Manitoba has made a substantial investment in clearing up our herds as well.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister overlooked one of my questions. What areas of the province are not free at the moment?

MR. HUTTON: I can't tell you that. There are 23 -- 107 designated areas have been certified as Brucellosis control areas, 16 areas whose three-year certification had elapsed were re-certified through spot checks. I can't give you a comprehensive picture right now of the number of municipalities that are certified as free and I can't tell you at what stage the others are at, but all of them have had one at least. Many of them now are certified to be free; many more are on the verge of getting that certification. I would like while I'm on my feet to say that I have no information which would lead me to believe that the Federal Government is going to discontinue their compensation program. This might be true of the T.B. program because we are relatively free of T.B. in our herds today as a result of the program that was carried out some years ago. But this does not apply to Brucellosis.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to serve notice on the Minister that when the Bill comes up for second reading I'm going to pursue this particular subject and I'd like him to have that information for us then.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister undertake that before the Bill comes up for second reading that he would ask the folks in the Department to check on this article that I mentioned. It certainly seems more logical time that it would be T.B. than Bang's Disease, too, but if I remember correctly both were covered, and I would think that the statement coincided pretty well with the time that the veterinarians were having their association here and it seems to me that the name Doctor Wells was connected with it. Is Doctor Wells one of the federal district men in this connection?

MR. HUTTON: Yes, he's Veterinary General for Canada.

MR. P.J. McDONALD (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, I think maybe there's a question here that the Honourable Member from Lakeside could be referring to, and that is accredited herds. This has been turned over to the individual cattle producer. He has to pay the veterinarian; he can still have an accredited herd but he has to pay the veterinarian himself; they will not do it for you. That has just happened in the last month.

MR. CAMPBELL: I believe the honourable member has given the right information; now that I hear that I think it was accredited herds that it was referring to. I believe that's right. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted. Passed. Resolution No.2. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Veterinary Services Act by authorizing the Provincial Treasurer on order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to pay in each year, to each veterinary services district, in addition to the grant of one thousand dollars for which provision is already made, a further grant equal to any additional amount which the municipalities comprising the district may make in that year and which they will now be authorized to make; the additional grant so to be authorized to be made by the Provincial Treasurer not to exceed \$800.00 to each district in each year.

Resolution be adopted? Resolution No.3. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act by providing, among other matters, (a) for increases in the compensation that may be paid by The Workmen's Compensation Board as compensation to members of municipal volunteer fire brigades and to children of deceased workmen; (b) for allowing the board to reopen certain claims for compensation that have been or may be refused and allowing the board to hear certain claims that previously were not allowable; and (c) for increasing the amount of money that the board may use in each year for vocational training of injured workmen.

MR. CARROLL: This Bill raises the limits upon which compensation payments are based for voluntary firemen, from the \$4,500 old limit to \$5,000.00 Somehow or other this matter was missed in the amendment that took place a few years ago. It also makes possible the inclusion of farm labourers and domestics upon application to the Board and with the approval of the Board, and at the same time excludes them from the common law doctrine of common employment. It's permissible under the Act at the present time that this old archaic section of the doctrine of common employment has not been -- they have not been relieved of this obligation and this section of the Act is being amended to provide for that. I believe that this was one of the recommendations of the Law Reform Committee. It also increases the vocational training fund from \$10,000 to \$30,000 and this is the amount that can be paid out in any one year.

Changing the names of our three full-time members of the board to Chairman and Commissioners. This is to make it uniform with several of the other Workmen's Compensation Boards in Canada. It also restores the old class titles for those who are self-insurers. This is a matter of administrative convenience that causes great difficulty each year because this was changed a few years ago and seriously complicates their bookkeeping methods and their reporting. It also increases the benefits to dependents of deceased workmen over the age of 16 who are still attending educational institutions from \$25.00 to \$35.00 for dependent children and from \$35.00 to \$45.00 for orphans.

I think the most important part of this Bill deals with Silicosis sections of the Act. At the present time Silicosis cases -- claims at least -- must be made within one year of exposure in a silica dust hazard industry, and in addition to that a workman must be in continuous residence in Manitoba for five years preceding the application for silicosis. This amendment merely relaxes the above provisions and makes it possible for the Board to consider applications and deal with deserving cases which were previously excluded by virtue of these sections of the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Passed. Resolution 4. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Housing and Rehabilitation Act, by providing, among other matters, (a) for the enlargement of the objects and purposes of the Act to include payment from and out of the Consolidated Fund towards the cost of acquiring and clearing land by municipalities; (b) for the incorporation of limited dividend housing companies for the

(Mr. Chairman, cont'd)... purpose of constructing low-rental housing projects for families of low incomes and payment from and out of the Consolidated Fund for the purpose of purchasing common shares of limited dividend housing companies by the government of Manitoba; (c) for loans by the government of Manitoba from and out of the Consolidated Fund to local government districts for the purpose of constructing low-rental housing; and (d) for the application of the provisions of Part II of the Act to private limited dividend housing companies and for the payment from and out of the Consolidated Fund for the purpose of purchasing common shares of private limited dividend housing companies by the government of Manitoba; and (e) for the establishment of The Manitoba Housing Commission and for the payment from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the remuneration and out-of-pocket expenses of the members thereof.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one short word of explanation about the general nature of this Bill. It is intended to provide for limited dividend housing corporations to be sponsored municipally and to provide rental accommodation for families of low income. Under the amendment the province jointly with municipalities, local government districts or private limited dividend companies may share equally in the equity capital of the project and also under certain circumstances may guarantee other parts of the loan capital. Such projects must be eligible for a limited dividend housing loan under the National Housing Act.

I would like to refer, if I may, to one item of detail and that is paragraph (e) of the resolution which seems to infer that this is establishing the Housing Commission for the first time. This is not so. The Housing Commission is already established and the action taken in this amendment is merely to transfer it from one part of the Act to another.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the proposed resolution follows what has been in practice in some of the other jurisdictions in the country, does it not? I wonder if the Minister could indicate to us if there are differences here between the proposal that he is making to the House and the bills for example that have been in effect or the Acts in effect in other provinces? This I think ties up with the urban renewal project that was passed through the House last year, does it not?

MR. EVANS: I think the essential difference that I would point out is that in this the municipalities are enabled to take part in low rental accommodation -- I don't mean that -- I mean limited dividend accommodation companies. I think at the second reading stage I might be rather better prepared to discuss the differences between this and other jurisdictions and this and the provisions that have already been made. And if that's agreeable to my honourable friend I'll be glad to take it up at that time.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd appreciate if the Minister could give us that information then. It'll suit me to wait until the second reading.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, may I direct a question in comment to the Honourable Minister. As I read the (a) portion of the resolution, it seems to me that there will be money expended by the government for the acquisition of land. I am wondering whether this will be in the form of an outright grant to municipalities or whether the government itself will -- well the government won't because it says municipalities -- I am wondering whether it's an outright grant or if it has tied to it a loan or other form of participation agreement. Other than that it appears to me that the government is planning to go into the limited dividend housing business with private partners or otherwise and I was wondering about Clause (d) which seems to give the government the ability to purchase existing private limited dividend housing from private companies. I'm wondering if the government is prepared to go so far as to start purchasing existing limited dividend housing companies? Finally it appears to me that there is no provision for subsidized housing in this for the government participation except by way of loans to municipalities; and if I am wrong about that then it seems to me that the government is only planning to go into that limited field of limited dividend housing which does not bear with it any contributory or subsidized portion and which is just stepping into a field which private enterprise has not gone into because of the fact that the returns are not commensurate with the requirements or demands of private enterprise.

MR. EVANS: Answering the last question first, Mr. Chairman. Provision for subsidized housing will be found in other parts of the Act to which is an amendment. As my honourable friend will know we're already in the Burrows-Keewatin project.

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd) . . . My honourable friend suggested that certain moneys will be expended. The amendment is only to give the power to the government to take such action if they wish. No present plan has been announced and I have nothing in my estimates for any specific project. It is not provided that there should be an outright grant under this section of the Act, that is to say, the Limited Dividend Housing Corporation section. There is such a provision under the Subsidized Housing section. I am not aware that the wording of the Act provides for the purchasing of any existing limited dividend housing corporations. Certainly it is not the intention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted. Passed. Resolution No. 5. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act by providing, among other matters, (a) for additional types of insurance on crops and in respect of the cost of summer fallowing certain land to be granted by The Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation; and (b) for deposit of the revenues of the corporation with the Provincial Treasurer to be credited in the trust and special division of the Consolidated Fund and to provide also for the payment of the moneys so deposited from and out of the Consolidated Fund to the corporation or as it may direct.

Resolution be adopted. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

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

MR. W.G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, the Report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. HUTTON introduced Bill 111, an Act to amend The Animal Husbandry Act, and Bill No. 120, an Act to amend The Veterinarian Services Act.

MR. CARROLL introduced Bill No. 129, an Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 124, an Act to amend The Housing Rehabilitation Act.

MR. HUTTON introduced Bill No. 123, an Act to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Could he tell the House when we may expect to receive the report of The Firearms Safety Commission?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Flin Flon): Yes, Madam Speaker, within a day or two.

MR. MOLGAT: address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it correct that the department is reducing the grant that it gives to local agricultural societies for capital purposes on a yearly basis?

MR. HUTTON: No, not at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: There have been no letters sent out from the department advising local societies that their grant will be reduced.

MR. HUTTON: The only letter that has been sent out that I know of is a letter in respect to the prize list for the horse shows, in which a revision was made in the prize list available there.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I think that the Honourable Member for Selkirk might oblige us by moving the Committee of the Whole.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider and report of the following Bills for third reading, namely Bills No. 14, 16, 17, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 37, 38, 42, 49, 52, 53, 65, 66, 75, 76 and 79.

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, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are three Bills dealing with the Statutes of Limitation and they are being left until we come to the end. So the first bill that we will call is Bill No. 16.

Bill No. 16 was read section by section to Section 13.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I didn't know just the proper moment, but I think just at this stage I'd like to make a very brief statement. In the Committee when we were discussing these Bills I pointed out that the Committee and this House and this Committee are dealing with some eight similar bills affecting the enactment of loan companies. I think the one before us creates a loan company within the province; I think all other seven permit some seven other companies from other provinces to do business in this province. I would point out that this is the only province in Canada which requires companies of this type to be brought into being through private bills to this House, and I understand that historically there was a reason for the change that was made in The Companies Act which took this type of company out of the Act and brought it into the House. But I've come to the conclusion after a great deal of inquiries that the historical reason is no longer known to members of the House or of the Committee and that the Committee is not aware of the safeguards which it is required to take; or the questions which it ought to ask in order to ensure that bills which measure up to this House's requirement are met. And therefore I made the plea that the Legislative Counsel and the Attorney-General or whoever ought to be charged with this problem -- possibly the Provincial Secretary -- ought to within the next year make a study of this problem with the objective in mind to attempt to enact an amendment to The Companies Act to enable bills of this type to be dealt with through The Companies Act in the regular way by application for letters patent-- and possibly this would involve certain inquiries which might be more properly made by The Securities Commission -- I don't pretend to know. But I do feel that it takes up the time of the House and of the Committees and that it is not time which is well spent because neither the House nor the Committees pay attention to the nature of the bills but rather accept them because they are informed by the Legislative Counsel that he is not aware of any reason not to accept them.

So I make this strong plea to the Provincial Secretary -- probably he most of all -- to look into this question and be ready next year to give us either ground rules or a blueprint by which we ought to deal with bills if they come into the House, or remove them from the business of the House and take them into The Companies Act; and I'd like to feel that next year we won't be wasting the time which I think we have wasted in perfunctorily dealing with some eight bills that have come before us.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I thank my honourable friend for a constructive suggestion. I agree with him. We have had this matter under review for some time and if he is aware of the historic reason why this was brought into the House in the first place, I'd be glad to know it, because I really haven't been made aware of that -- (Interjection) -- Well I would think that privately would help me and we needn't take up the time of the House. But we have been delayed really waiting for a uniform draft of the Companies Act which might well be adopted across the country -- my honourable friend shakes his head and knows some of the difficulties involved. I doubt if we could undertake to prevent the recurrence of these bills by next year because that would have to be done only after a revision of The Companies Act had been adopted. It may be necessary by next year to accommodate some further corporations of this kind. But as soon as practicable, I would like to see if we can adopt measures such as suggested by my honourable friend. I'm aware of the problem and will do my best.

MR. CHERNIACK: only say that I would plead with the Minister not to wait for the uniform Companies Act to be adopted by the ten provinces. I'm under the impression they meet once a year for a week-end, I'm sure they would -- well maybe more often -- but they're making very, very slow progress and I would hate to think that we wait for that because we may wait an awfully long time. I don't quite understand the reasoning for the need to revise the present Act before amendments can be made, but I realize that this may be something that the Honourable Minister knows more about -- probably knows more about than I do. The history is so uncertain that I'm prepared to give my version privately rather than make a formal statement.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that this is a subject with which I am not very familiar. I have been interested to find that for the first time in all the years I have been in this House, that I have been appointed to the Private Bills Committee; I had never had the pleasure and privilege of serving on it before and I am quite enjoying the experience. And speaking from that lofty eminence of having attended about three sessions of the committee, I would like to say that I find myself in at least partial disagreement with the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) statements that have been made by the Honourable Member for St. John's. Not that I disagree with him on matters of law, because certainly I'm not competent to argue those with him. And I wouldn't want you to think that this is just being tied to a tradition that has existed, because quite frankly I wasn't aware of the tradition myself, but I think there is some advantage in these bills coming before a Committee of the House. I'm one who has a very high opinion of the senior civil servants of this province and the Provincial Secretary's department is certainly no exception; but I think there are good reasons why some bills -- and I would suggest that perhaps financial ones are definitely in that category -- should come before the scrutiny of the Legislative Assembly so at least that we get the opportunity to take a look at them. Now, it may be true as the honourable member has said, that our examination of them has been rather perfunctory. I think that if you have a series of bills all dealing with the same basic matters perhaps our attention to them does tend to become perfunctory; but I think that is rather because we come to rely on the good offices and the excellent work of the Legislative Counsel and other people who take part in the preparation.

But good as our civil servants are, I still have an abiding faith in the representatives of the people as they come and sit in this Chamber -- of course I'd draw the line at giving some of them too high a rating -- but taking us by and large, taking us by and large, I think we're pretty fair representatives of the people that send us here that I think there's something to be said for submitting a good many bills to us for scrutiny. If we don't scrutinize them carefully it's our fault, not the fault of the system. And the Honourable Member for St. John's, who thinks that we have wasted time. I don't think this is a waste of time, because in a day when a lot of people -- and I notice that the Honourable Leader of my honourable friend's Party is one who is inclined to be rather skeptical to say the least of the financial institutions expansion in this province, that that being the case, and I think a lot of the rest of us should be at least interested in the way these finance companies and other so-called financial institutions are growing up. The best guarantee of the public at least being apprised of the situation in my opinion is for them to come before the Legislative Assembly rather than just running through the mill of a departmental bureaucracy -- and I use that word not unkindly because I'm certainly not trying to criticize any of the people in there -- I think the technical job would be equally well done, perhaps better done, by the other method, certainly more quickly; but I think from the point of view of the public knowing what's happening that maybe the traditional system is better.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm bound to point out to the Honourable Member from Lakeside that we had a series of eight bills before the Committee on Private Bills and before us this afternoon, and in those eight bills, at Private Committee, there was no scrutiny I suggest of any kind to all eight bills. And as I recall it, there were no questions asked regarding particulars of any of these eight bills and I suggest the reason there were no questions asked is that none of us knew what questions we ought to ask. So it might be very well to rely on the good judgment of the elected people, and I certainly do; but only if the elected people know what it is they're looking for, and I'm suggesting they don't know, and I appealed to the Provincial Secretary to either acquaint us with that which we ought to be looking for or take it away from us. I would also suggest to the Honourable Member from Lakeside that the Legislative Counsel only took the responsibility of telling us that these bills were no different and had nothing different about them than have previous bills. I do not think that the Legislative Counsel would be prepared to state that he has investigated the background of the bills; the personnel behind them; the financial backing for them; the method in which they will deal with their assets, nor with their shares; and that this type of protection is only given -- would only be given -- under The Companies Act. Once we removed it from The Companies Act there is no government administrator, that I'm aware of, who is charged with the responsibility of doing that type of investigation.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, as sponsor of this bill and as sponsor of several other bills of the same type, I took it upon myself to look into the reason why it was necessary to make application to the Legislature by way of a private act. I find that the only authority for that is Section 16 of The Companies Act. Now as to the reason why that section was enacted I haven't been able to find, but I have found this, that Section 16 of our Companies Act was enacted just about the same time as the Federal Government passed its Loan Companies Act and they had a section in their Act which is similar to ours. Now it's quite possible that we

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd) may have had certain reasons at that time for enacting into our legislation, the same provision as the Federal Act had. On the other hand though, it's only under federal law and under Manitoba law that a loan company must be incorporated by private act before it becomes registered under the respective Companies Act. Now the Provincial Secretary has mentioned the fact that perhaps it would be impossible to amend this until there was another meeting of the Committee on Company Uniformity, but would that reason hold by reason of the fact that the other nine provinces in Canada do incorporate loan companies by letters patent of incorporation or by memorandum of association under their respective Companies Act.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I hadn't meant to indicate -- I forget just what I said -- that it would not be possible to do so. My reference to the uniform Companies Act was our hope that it would be available before we went into quite an extensive revision of our Companies Act, and then I think I referred to my honourable friend's fear up here that we would have more of these cases to deal with next year and he hoped to avoid that. I said "I didn't think we could avoid that, if we hadn't already revised our own Companies Act and that we would have to proceed perhaps next year in the same way that we have this."

MR. HILLHOUSE: I think another reason too, Mr. Chairman, why they insisted on a special act, although quite frankly I can't find the logic behind it, was due to the fact that loan companies do sell shares to the public, and in 1931, I don't think we had a Securities Act in Manitoba; but we have that protection now, so that is another reason why the jurisdiction of the House could be taken away and it could be given to the Provincial Secretary.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to comment on what the Honourable Member for St. John's had said and I certainly do not wish to be taken as being wholly against the suggestion that this matter be investigated. I'm all in favour of that being done and perhaps a better procedure will evolve; but I must say in reply to the Honourable Member for St. John's that on the most of these bills a legal representative of one of the firms of this area came before the committee and appeared to be perfectly ready to give any information that he was able to give and certainly it seemed to me that the committee members had the opportunity to delve more deeply into it if they wished to do so. What I looked at myself was simply the fact that, in the heading of one of the company's, that this one was incorporated in New Brunswick and another one or two in Ontario and so on and so on, and I was quite willing to take it on that basis with the provision that my honourable colleague mentioned a minute ago here, that we already know that if they're going to indulge in any sale of shares that then they do have to run their gamut of the appropriate board here -- I always forget the name of it now that the jurisdiction has been divided. So I think that we have at least some advertising value to the public by the bills going before the committee, because the press is there and there's some attention paid to the fact that these various financial institutions are expanding in this way. I appreciate the points made by the honourable member. Like myself, he's a new member on the committee; like myself, I think he's a good member of the committee; like myself, he's inclined to have quite a little bit to say and maybe

Bills No. 17, 26, 28, 29, 30 and 31 were read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 32 -- Sections 1 to 6 were read and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 7 -- there's an amendment here.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, may I enquire at this point as to the numbering of these paragraphs. I seem to see Section 2 on Page 1 and Section 2 again on Page 2. -- (Interjection) -- That would then be as amended.

The balance of Bill No. 32 was read section by section and passed.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): It might be a good idea for the benefit of the members of this committee to indicate where there is an amendment. There are some of these bills that were amended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. The point was that I just read the new 11, and the old 11 as it was printed in the Bill was deleted.

Bill No. 37 was read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 38 -- Sections 1 to 4 were read and passed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Section 5. I might say that I'm honoured that the Honourable Member from Lakeside included me in his category of people who do quite a bit of talking. I

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd) consider it an honour. I would imagine that the majority of the members of this House may not think of it in that sense. Nevertheless, I would like to make this statement on this Section 5. This is a company-owned hospital and I want only to state that I was sorry that the applicants rejected my suggestion that there be provision made for the inclusion in the Board of Directors in the future of a minority of members of the board who would not be necessarily employees of the company but rather representative of the community and the people that are served by the hospital.

The balance of Bill No. 38 and Bills No. 42, 49 and 53 were read section by section and passed.

MR. EVANS: deal with Bill No. 52?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No -- (Interjection) -- This is the Bills across the end. Bills No. 65, 66, 75, 76, 79 were read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: These are the Bills that we left until the end. Bill No. 14.

MR. GROVES: Before we proceed with these Bills I thought that I should, as Chairman of the Committee, just make a brief statement on what the Committee did with these three Bills. These three Bills are all applications by individuals to the Legislature for relief from provisions in their Act which, because of the passage of time, prevents them from taking an action into the court. The Committee, although not finding the individual members thereof to support the treatment of these Bills in the House, did agree on two things. Firstly, that there should be removed from the preamble of each Bill any statement of fact or matters of evidence that it was thought should be decided in the court. The Committee also decided that it would recommend to this House that in each of these three cases the applicant, despite the time limitation, should be allowed to go before a County Court Judge and to have the court decide whether or not his action should proceed. These three Bills were passed by the Committee without amendments, but they were turned over to the Legislative Counsel with instructions to amend or redraft each of them in order to take into consideration the recommendations of the committee. So in each case the preambles have been quite drastically changed and each Bill has had inserted a clause allowing the applicant to take the matter in the Bill before the court and have the court decide whether or not he should be allowed to proceed with his action. I understand that the Legislative Counsel has spoken to the sponsors of each of these Bills and that they will read the necessary amendments to the Committee with the exception of the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne, and I'm prepared to do that job for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 14 as amended. Section 1 --

MR. HILLHOUSE: read the amendment, Mr. Chairman. Section 1 of the Bill has been amended to read: "Notwithstanding the provisions of The Limitation of Actions Act and notwithstanding that more than one year has elapsed since the injuries to which reference is made in the preamble occurred, Leslie Lidstone of the City of Port Alberni in the Province of British Columbia and Lucienne Marie Lidstone of the same place, an infant, by her next friend, may apply by way or originating notice of motion to Her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench for Manitoba, and on the hearing of the said motion the court having regard to the real questions and controversy, the very right and justice of the matter and all the circumstances of the case, may enlarge the time allowed under Clause (j) of Subsection (1) of Section 3 of The Limitation of Actions Act for the bringing of an action or actions by the said Leslie Lidstone and Lucienne Marie Lidstone against Ste. Rose Hospital of Ste. Rose du Lac in the Province of Manitoba, to recover damages arising out of the accident to which reference is made in the preamble. I therefore wish to move that Section 1 be amended by substituting what I have read, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

MR. D.M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Chairman, has the preamble been amended in any way?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The preamble at the end, yes. We have Section 1 now. Agreed. Section 2.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, it's been amended and I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that Section 2 be amended by striking out the present Section 2 and substituting therefor: "2. No such application shall be made after the expiration of 30 days from the coming into force of this Act."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Preamble.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Preamble. I wish to move, Mr. Chairman, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that Paragraph 1 of the preamble be amended in the following respects: By striking out of lines 7 and 8, the words "severely burned" and substituting the word "injured"; and by striking out of the lines 8 and 9 the words "when she rolled over unattended and"; and in the 11th line, by putting a semi-colon after the word "Manitoba" and striking out the words "and as a result suffered grievous injuries". I also wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that Paragraph 2 of the preamble be struck out.

Then there is a new paragraph to the preamble which will be substituted immediately after the third paragraph as it appears in the printed bill, and I wish to move that this be added by amendment, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside: "And whereas no action was commenced against the Ste. Rose Hospital of Ste. Rose du Lac in the Province of Manitoba within one year after the cause of action arose." I also wish to move that paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of the preamble be struck out, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I further wish to move that Paragraph 7 of the preamble be amended by striking out from lines 37, 38 and 39 all of the words starting with the word "authorized" down to "father" and by substituting "afforded relief as hereinafter set forth".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. The title -- passed. Bill be reported. Bill No. 27, Section 1 -- passed. Section 2, Section 3 is deleted, Section 4 becomes

MR. STANES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that Section 3 be deleted and Section 4 be renumbered 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Preamble.

MR. STANES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that in the preamble, line 18 from whereas, starting with the word "due" be deleted up to the last name on line 20, "Harvey Chezick"; and in line 23, from the word "and" be deleted for the remainder of that paragraph.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Preamble, title -- passed. Bill be reported. Bill No. 52.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pembina, that Section 1 of the Bill be struck out in its entirety and substituted with the following: "Notwithstanding the provisions of The Limitation of Actions Act and notwithstanding that more than one year has elapsed since the medical treatment hereinbefore mentioned was administered, Mytro Mandybura of the Town of Dauphin in the Province of Manitoba may apply by way of originating notice of motion to Her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba, and on the hearing of the said motion the Court having regard to the real question of controversy, the very right and justice of the matter and all the circumstances of the case, may in its discretion enlarge the time allowed under Clause (j) of Subsection (1) of Section 3 of The Limitation of Actions Act for the bringing of an action or actions by the said Mytro Mandybura against the Dauphin General Hospital in the Town of Dauphin, and its officers, servants and employees, or any of them, to recover damages arising out of the medical treatment to which reference is made in the preamble."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Section 1 -- passed. Section 2.

MR. GROVES: I would move, Mr. Chairman, that Section 2 of the Bill be renumbered Section 3, and that the following Section 2 be added to the bill, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pembina: "No such application shall be made after the expiration of 30 days from the coming into force of this Act."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Section 3 -- passed. Preamble.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pembina, that the words "severe and permanent" in line 5 of the preamble be struck out; that all of Paragraph 2 of the preamble be struck out; that all of Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the preamble be struck out and substituted with the following: "And whereas no action was brought against the said hospital or its officers, servants and employees, or any of them within one year of the medical treatment mentioned above."

I would also move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pembina, that Paragraph 6 of the bill -- in Paragraph 6 of the bill, the words on line 30 from "authorized" to the word "injury" in line 31 be struck out and substituted by the following: "afforded relief as hereinafter set forth."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Preamble, as amended -- agreed. Title -- passed. Bill be reported. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has considered certain bills and asked me to report as follows: Bills No. 16, 17, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 37, 38, 42, 45, 53, 65, 66, 75, 76, 79, without amendment; Bills No. 14, 27 and 52 as amended, and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

..... Continued on next page

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that Bill No. 14, An Act for the Relief of Leslie Lidstone and Lucienne Marie Lidstone as amended, be now read a third time and passed.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I wish to record my opposition to this bill. We passed a law, the Statute of Limitations, stating that action must be commenced within one year of the cause of action arising. That is the law which we have obeyed in this province, that we follow, and here we have an application to vary that law in respect of an incident that took place five years ago next month. The law requires that action be taken within one year of the incident arising on which the action is based. Now if we pass this bill, Madam Speaker, we are inviting everybody -- very many people, to apply to have a bill passed in the Legislature in the hope that the Court will approve of it so that they can go ahead with their action even though it be years and years old; even though the time has expired for almost four years, as in this case. And I don't think that we should encourage such actions. The Limitations of Actions Act is an old, old Act, been on the books of the British in England for years and years before it was brought to Canada, and there should be some time limit upon which an action should take place, and if we are going to pass this bill we are more or less saying that really there is no time limit whatsoever.

Madam Speaker put the question.

MR. O. F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): Madam Speaker, in Committee I voiced a concern over the length of time that had elapsed in this particular bill in placing myself in the defendant of any action where the limitations are more or less waived, in that if a person were the defendant in some action and he sought the advice of counsel and he was told that he would only have a year to worry about whether an action was going to be taken, and then he suddenly finds that this is not so because it's taken before the Legislature, and I contended at that time that I had concern for people that were dependant and that they would wait for even such a long time as 365 days, and that at expiration of that time that they would not be relieved of this worry, and taking into consideration the fact that it is not nearly four years as the honourable member who has just spoken, it's almost five years, that this should come up at a time and that the defendant should be subject to this continual worry that no matter what happens, at some later date some further action might be taken against the particular defendant under certain circumstances. This has been a deep concern to me and one that I thought I should mention to the House.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Yeas and nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the third reading of Bill No. 14.

A standing vote was taken with the following result:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Campbell, Carroll, Cherniack, Evans, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Roblin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Smerchanski, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Bjornson, Cowan and Groves.

MR. CLERK: Yeas - 49; Nays - 3.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, rising on a point of information, I'd like to ask if the rules might not be so construed that a standing vote would be sufficient, rather than the recorded vote in a matter such as this.

Bills No. 16, 17, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 37, 38, 42, 49, 52 as amended, 53, 65, 66, 75, 76, 79, were each read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 89. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: I wonder, Madam Speaker, if I might have the indulgence of the House to allow this item to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Second reading of Bill No. 88.

MR. EVANS: May I have the same indulgence, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Second reading of Bill No. 99.

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 99, An Act to incorporate The Manitoba Centennial Corporation, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think that at the time of the resolution stage on this matter, I made a fairly complete statement of the general aims of the legislation, but that was so long ago that perhaps I might just repeat and elaborate on some of the comments I made then.

I think that we are all looking forward with keen anticipation to the preparations that will be necessary to celebrate the centenary of the nation on July 1, 1967, and perhaps it is a happy coincidence that not too long after, as these things go, on July 15, 1970, we will be celebrating our own centenary of the province. Those are two occasions which deserve indeed to be marked, because we can look back at the experience and the achievement of the past and derive from it, I think, a certain inspiration for the job that lies ahead of the people of Manitoba in the days that lie ahead. I think it is quite right that the Legislature and the public in general should wish to approve of the idea that we should hold a "high festival", one might say, to mark these events, and that as well as that that we should plan for some continuing and permanent form of commemoration of these two centennial anniversaries so that they will benefit, not only the present generation, but we trust generations to come.

In order to carry out this purpose, I am asking the Legislature of the province to approve the establishment of a body which may take the lead, or at least provide a means for co-operation with other levels of government and with private individuals in achieving the general end that we have in view. The legislation will provide for the establishment of a corporation, and it is intended that the governing body of that corporation should be broadly representative of the people in all parts of the Province of Manitoba, and that it should have very considerable powers, dealing with the matter of implementing and organizing and co-ordinating the plans that the citizens of the province may wish to develop for these important anniversaries. It will provide, of course, for some form of local celebration on the day, so to speak, in which we certainly expect to receive the advice and suggestions and co-operation of municipal levels of government, indeed of private groups. There will be the necessity of co-ordinating the activities in the province with those that are being planned on a national scale, and as well as the celebrations on the day there will be, I think, a general desire to establish various sorts of permanent memorials in commemoration of the anniversary in the capital city of Winnipeg, and I'm also quite sure in other parts of this province as well.

The Board of Governors of this body will be 15 people, and I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that provision is made for a member of the Legislature -- and here it is thought a member of the Executive Council -- to sit on this Board along with the citizens whom we hope to interest in this form of activity, because we think in this way that we may achieve a useful means of co-ordination between the government of the province itself and the citizens who will be working on this particular board. Provision is made, of course, that the board will make an annual report which will be available to the members of the Legislature so that we may keep some track and take some account of the progress that they will make over the next few years in the task that is placed in front of them, and also, authority will be sought for the government representing the people to make financial contributions as may be decided from time to time from the reserve for post-war emergencies, a fund which is at the disposal of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council at the present time. I think it advisable, however, to ask the permission of the Legislature to use that money for this purpose when suitable proposals are developed. I think that we will expect the corporation to devise its own program and its own plan in general, for the kind of celebration about which we speak, and I'm sure that we can count on the enthusiastic co-operation of people all over Manitoba in providing material upon which their proposals may be based.

But there is one specific proposal which we are including in this bill, because we believe it will meet with general approval and that it perhaps should be specifically stated, and

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . that is that there should be as part of these celebrations and as one of the permanent memorials to which I referred, an Art Centre, for lack of a better term, to be established here in the capital city of the province. I am certain that there will be proposals to do something of a permanent nature in other major centres in Manitoba. We anticipate that; but we do think that this is one proposal about which we should consult the House, as I think it is something that we would desire to place our seal of approval on. Because, in Manitoba, I think it would be well if we were to mark, at the time of these centennials, something of our interest in the cultural and artistic development of our community as a whole. I think in recent years -- indeed, based on a foundation of many years -- there has been a development in artistic and cultural fields. I've mentioned perhaps theatre, ballet, music, our museum, to say nothing of the contribution of the various ethnic groups made in such a spectacular way to the cultural development of our province, and it is I think appropriate that perhaps we should pay a tribute at this time to the leadership that has been given by private citizens in this form of artistic endeavour and of cultural development in our province. I think very good standards have been set and that we ought to reinforce and to recognize this cultural contribution towards the life of our citizens in the province. I think we can do this very appropriately under these proposals by providing suitable modern facilities that are, I think, generally necessary to help in that work and in that development. The details for such an art centre I would hope would be reviewed by the corporation when it is established, and that they should have the responsibility of arranging the priority and the program and the general line of conduct by which this artistic centre should be developed, and to lay out a general plan with respect to financing and all that matter, which ultimately will be dealt with by those who are supplying the money and this Legislature will certainly be one of those. And I would expect that those plans and those ideas would be developed in the fullest co-operation with the interested bodies who are concerned in this province.

There is an interesting side aspect, perhaps, of this idea which I should like to refer to again, and that is that it would be our expectation that a location would be selected in the general area of the older part of Winnipeg, where we are now concerned with urban renewal and redevelopment. It would be expected that some location fairly close to the new City Hall site on the east side of Main Street would be selected for this purpose. And thus we would be able to complement -- among other things -- we would be able to complement the efforts of the City of Winnipeg itself, in its urban renewal efforts and also to co-operate with the work that we trust will be put in hand, although it's a much longer term proposition, by the Civic Development Corporation of which I spoke a little while ago and about which there will shortly be a bill presented to the House. So that as a by-product, you might say, of this general idea, we can do something to emphasize and to underline our support for the joint effort that's being put in hand by so many for the redevelopment of the centre of the City of Winnipeg. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that while there may be some difference of opinion as to the details of the legislation which are before us now, and we certainly expect that will be a matter for discussion in committee, that the principle that lies behind this bill will receive the general support of the Legislature, and I hope it will receive general support throughout the province. I certainly solicit the co-operation of municipalities and citizens generally in this work, and with respect to the Art Centre I certainly solicit the co-operation and the ideas of those who have interested themselves in the artistic and cultural side of our provincial growth. There will be means provided here, I think, for that necessary co-operation between the activities of the Federal Government, the province, the municipalities as well as those private citizens who take their part in these developments.

I am looking forward with expectation that this new corporation will be happy and anxious for the widest public consultations in all that it has to do. It is given the specific project as regards a permanent memorial for the Art Centre of which I have spoken, but it also will be charged with the responsibilities for reviewing the larger situation throughout the province and considering proposals for permanent memorials in other centres of the Province of Manitoba. And it is our hope that by this means we may mark these double centennials of '67 and '70 in a manner that is worthy of their significance and in accord with the sentiments of our people.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Acting 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 presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department XIII, Item 1, passed

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a few words about the Compensation Board in relation to the rehabilitation of injured workers. One of my constituents was injured on August 3, 1961. This young chap was lifting a chesterfield at his place of employment when he suffered what the medical men call an intravertebral disc lesion. I am not going to enter into all the complications he had with the Board because that's beyond me, but the fact is that after considerable correspondence with the Board it wasn't until February 26, 1963 that he was given a border of reference and in the meantime he'd had an operation, his own specialist believing that his injury was caused by the action that he suffered at work, but the point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that after 1-1/2 years of being kept in the dark as to whether or not his claim would be allowed, he feels that he could have been rehabilitated because the injury has left him in a condition in which he will never again be able to do the kind of work that he was used to, and being a young man he feels very keenly, apart from the fact that his claim was turned down, he feels very keenly that this period of 1-1/2 years was a vital one in which he could have been trained in some other kind of work, and I just wonder if the Minister could give me some idea as to why there should be a delay of 1-1/2 years from the time that this young man was injured until he was finally notified that his claim was disallowed.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I just wish to direct a few words to the Minister at this time. Not being too conversant with the labour unions and so on, I still feel that I should have a few words regarding Labour though, and more so in connection with farm labour. First of all, I'd like to correct a statement that appeared in the paper last week-end -- the Free Press I think it was -- where a certain Mr. Rubin mentioned some things that I had said, and I think they were rather misconstruing what I'd actually said because I, for one, am for -- that Labour does receive a just reward for its effort and that I am not for low wages at all, not by any means. I feel that Labour in general should be rewarded well and farm labour also.

While farm conditions have changed very much over the last 20 years or so, I still feel that there is room for improvement. We know that conditions have changed very much on the farm. Twenty-five years ago our farms were not mechanized; the people working on the farms had long hours of work and they had to work with teams -- four-horse teams. These had to be fed early in the morning; they had to be dressed, combed and harnessed, and then when you had done all this -- for the farmers, at least in southern Manitoba, had their farms a distance from where they reside -- so that you had to drive probably an hour or so before you actually reached the place of work; so that the farmer and the farm worker had a lot of work to do before they actually got to the fields where their main work was. They, in addition to that, had to do much of the hard labour such as shovelling grain and then also walking behind harrows whereas today you get on the tractor and you ride all day. Naturally there were also advantages to this I suppose. One would be that you kept physically fit, after walking behind the harrows day after day for weeks on end. Then there were other hard jobs such as pitching hay, and come threshing time pitching the stooks, and you had long hours to work. Generally the work started very early in the morning and continued on till late at night. Today with the new threshers, the combines, you generally start around 10 or 11 in the morning and carry on till sundown or so if the weather permits, and if you want to extend the hours you have to have very favourable weather as dry winds and so on so that you can continue on. So that the farm worker today has a more pleasant job -- one that is more enjoyable.

But I still feel that farm labour should be better paid, and one reason it isn't better paid than it is today is because of the cost price squeeze. The farmer would pay more if he had a better return on his investment and also a better return for his work that he puts into farming, and I hope that this government will do everything in their power to get better returns for the farmer for the grain that he produces, for the special crops and so on, so that the farm worker

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) . . . will be able to receive a better pay.

I, for one, think that farm labour today would like to stay on the farm and doesn't want to actually go to the urban areas. I know for a fact that many a person that has moved to the city perhaps would want to come back and spend their time on the farm and work on the farm, but this mechanization -- there is less work on the farm and fewer men are needed, so that we have a certain amount of migration to the urban centres. I also feel that farm labour is least organized and we have the least trouble with it, so that they are causing very little work for the government as such.

Another matter I would like to touch on is the matter of needle trades and the people working in those industries. We now have several of them in the rural parts of this province and I would like to know from the Minister what is the turnover in staff in this connection. Is there a large turnover or is it fairly stable? And do these industries retain the experienced help or is it a matter of just retraining and using the lower-priced help in this -- for this industry. I think the industries presently operating in this connection in the rural parts are paying fair wages, and that they probably compare quite well with what is done in the city, taking into consideration that the cost of living is lower in the rural areas than in the city and urban places. I, for one, don't think that Labour in any way is looking for hand-outs, and generally I feel that they are quite prepared to do a good day's work and they are conscientious in improving their performance.

There is another problem, and that is winter employment, and here I feel that something should be done, although it's hard to say just what you can do in this respect. Quite a number of feed lots have been opened this last year, or last several years, to provide employment for some farm workers. Now I think this is a good thing. It provides employment and naturally we also produce at the same time. We also know that quite a number of farmers are opening up workshops of their own so that they can provide some help for the farm workers during the winter days in making the necessary repairs and so on, so that it's spread more or less over a longer period of time and also during the wintertime. So that I think in this respect that probably the government could give some leadership and provide and encourage more winter employment for the farm worker.

Then the other matter is unemployment insurance. Up to the present time farm labour is excluded from this Act, and I would like to see the government petition the Federal Government to make provision under that Act so that farm labour could also be provided for. We know that the fishermen are able to get the unemployment insurance and this is on a voluntary basis -- they may do so if they wish. They may also decide that they do not want to come under this and they have a free choice in the matter. I think if we had that provision extended to farm help it would be very useful, and I would sure appreciate hearing from the Minister whether anything is done in this regard.

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to direct to the Acting Honourable Minister of Labour a complaint that I've had from some of my constituents, and it is to do with two reputable firms of Portage la Prairie who are in the television repair business, and they are quite incensed, to say the least, to receive a letter I believe it was, from the Department informing them that they were going to have to take an exam to be able to qualify and stay on in their business. Now these two firms in particular have been in the television repair field for approximately nine years and they feel quite strongly that unless there has been serious complaints against their work, and I'm speaking now for other firms in the same category, they feel that they should not be required to write an exam at this date but rather that there should be some provision for firms who have been in this business for a long period of time. They feel also that it is discriminatory in the fact that this is only applying to television repair people in -- Winnipeg, Brandon and Portage la Prairie, I believe, are the three places affected. They feel that this should apply province-wide; it shouldn't let anyone else away without having to comply to the same law. For instance, a person a half a mile or a few hundred yards outside the limits of any one of these cities would be exempt and could carry on business with the customers of the firms that are already in business and having to fall in line with this new type of exam. They are not unreasonable, I think, in asking that if this must be enforced that there should be a clause put into this where firms who have given up to five years' satisfactory service should be exempt from writing this theory examination. After all, these people

(Mr. Johnston, cont'd.) . . . are in business; they're working all day and every day, and then this is almost adding insult to injury that they should come home at night and have to study up on a theory exam on something that they have been doing and doing quite successfully, for years.

Also, something else that has them a little bit steamed, is the fact that they have to pay \$10.00 to write this examination. This is more in the nature of money collecting; it's not the cost of an examination, I would suggest, and I would ask the Honourable Minister to give us the thinking of the department on making these suggested changes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I was interested yesterday to listen to what was said by all members, and particularly to the representatives of the Conservative and Liberal Parties, and I was intrigued by their interest in the department that we are now dealing with and in the people whom this department attempts to serve. It interests me, and I don't particularly care to get into a quarrel about it, although I'm quite prepared to state that as far as I can see the interests of the other two Parties have been motivated by a desire to keep industry going and happy and to prevent difficulties as between Labour and Management.

There is, of course, a great tradition in our law which has been accepted by all Parties and all people, and that is, to make sure that individuals who are placed in the position where they cannot defend or protect themselves, should be protected by law, and our Child Labour Laws and our various laws relating to standards of employment have come about as a result of the Industrial Revolution and have come about because of the fact that people in the free enterprise system were justifiably concerned with a profit on their investment and on their endeavours, and were not automatically concerned with the welfare of the people who worked for them as long as they were alive and could continue to work. And gradually it was found necessary that there be protection for those people who are exploited. Well we've gone a long way, a long way from those days, and all the laws that have been enacted have been enacted by either the Liberals or the Conservatives, and as far as I'm concerned it's a good thing we have them, otherwise we'd have had revolutions and bloodshed, which was prevented to some extent. There has been bloodshed in the problem of the exploitation of the working man, and I don't suppose we're entirely through.

But with the progress that has been made we find now that protection is still required, really for two classes of labour. Protection is required for that group of labour which has been able to organize itself and to speak in one voice for a group of people and to attempt to work out their rights on a bargaining basis; and the other group are those people who are not in a position to be able to bargain because they are not able to organize for various reasons -- geographic, economic, nature of work -- not able to organize into trade unions which would fight for them and for their bargaining position, and that is why we have, in the main, two major fields of work for this department. The first is the Labour Relations, which deals with organized labour; and the other is the Employment Standards Act, which deals with the rights of the individual.

Now, I have read as much as I could with the time that I have had, portions of the COMEF Report, and I have read in greater detail that portion of it dealing with labour, and although the Committee points out that its view of the problems in the industrial expansion of this province relating to labour are looked at only from the standpoint of "it's the cost of labour as it affects the doing of business in Manitoba." It becomes an interesting document. It is not interested in the social aspects of the problem; nor is it interested in the returns to the individual working man. It is interested in seeing to it whether Manitoba is in a competitive position with other provinces in its attempt to attract industry to Manitoba. And what I found interesting throughout this section in the COMEF Report, is the comparison, not from the standpoint of "What are we doing to protect the individual working man?" but rather, "Are we doing something in attempting to protect the working man which will be harmful to our attempts to bring industry here?" And throughout the report mention is made, "well, in this respect or in that respect, we may be a little worse because the cost goes up, but in other respects" -- and I would point out in the majority of respects -- they point out that the situation as far as labour cost is concerned of which we want to be proud. I am not sure that we should compete on the basis of the lower or cheaper cost of labour, but rather compete on the basis of materials available, raw materials available, opportunities for organized industry to come in and work, stable labour relations, specialized labour qualifications which could be offered to industry.

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd.) . . .

I think, however, that it is fair to say -- and this may be challenged -- that the attitude with which the COMEF Report looked at the problem of labour is also the attitude of both of the major Parties, both of the larger Parties in this Province. In other words, can we keep Labour sufficiently happy to have a stable labour relations setup in our province, and if so, then we've accomplished a great deal. The Minister of Industry and Commerce, of course, is most interested in being able to say, "We don't have labour unrest; we do have all sorts of available labour. Bring in your industry. We will provide you with the man who works there to do it."

Now this COMEF Report indicates to me that the legislation that we have on standards of employment and on labour relations are such which are so minimal that the actual bargained-out position is greater than the Acts themselves. In other words, they say, "It is true that our minimum wage is 66 cents, but that isn't really a strong factor because actually there are very few people who are working at the minimum wage. Most of them are working at a higher wage." And, therefore, to me they indicate that the position of Labour as a cost factor is one which is fairly remotely related to the legislation that we have, because our society has gone way beyond the minimal requirements of our labour legislation. And I imagine that as we go along we will deal with the specific sections with which I do not wish to deal at this time.

I was shocked -- I think that's a correct word, Mr. Chairman -- when I heard something that the Acting Minister of Labour said yesterday, and I was glad that Hansard arrived early enough for me to confirm what I heard him say. He was talking about what the government have done and he then read a list of statutes: "that this government brought in. We brought in The Vacations with Pay Act, Tradesmen's Qualifications Act, Fair Accommodations Practices Act, and continued," -- end quote -- and he was then interrupted and he then answered and said, "They've been brought in since this government came to office. I am going back over the last four years."

Well, the very first Act he mentioned, The Vacations with Pay Act, was one that I thought I was familiar with for a longer period than four years, and having heard him say that "We brought in the Vacations with Pay Act," I thought that my memory had suffered badly, so I went back to seeing the year when "We brought in The Vacations with Pay Act", and it seems that that was in 1947, and I wasn't sure just what government that the Honourable Minister was a part of in 1947, but lest he suggests that in the last four years this government has so much enlarged and contributed so much more to The Vacations with Pay Act that they have practically rewritten it, I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that other than the construction worker, it is still necessary to work 11-1/2 months at a job in order to qualify, and as far as I can understand in The Vacations with Pay Act, a person who is in a seasonal trade, other than the construction trade, who works let us say, seven or eight months in the year and gets laid off and possibly then is rehired by another -- not rehired, but hired -- by another firm, I think that person never qualified under The Vacations with Pay Act. And I would suggest that if my interpretation is correct, then this government which has had four years of pride in bringing in The Vacations with Pay Act, has certainly not covered what I think is a serious omission in the Act.

In dealing with the construction worker, and being an urban dweller and not being a member of the construction trade, I was shocked to learn that The Vacations with Pay Act stamp provisions apply only in the Greater Winnipeg area, and I wonder why that is so? It seems to me that a person who is working in Brandon or in any other centre of the city and spends full time in the construction industry -- that is, full time on a seasonal basis as applies in the City of Winnipeg or Metro Winnipeg -- should too qualify for the Vacations with Pay Act, -- under the Vacations with Pay Act -- but apparently they don't and why they don't I don't know, except that I feel that it is part of the thinking of this government that there has to be a difference -- a distinction made -- insofar as the returns for their labour of the construction worker who works in the Greater Winnipeg area and the one who does not work within the Greater Winnipeg area. I am coming to the conclusion, and it wasn't too difficult to arrive at that conclusion, that this government, which has within its departments of which ministers are proud -- and I want to give full credit to the reviews that we have made of the Department of Education, the Department of Health, where ministers got up and spoke with pride of the work they have done and the job they have done of selling their program, and I mention these two ministers, but I

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd.) . . . don't limit it to those two ministers -- there are others -- who spoke with pride of the progressive measures that have been brought in and not only spoke with pride, but I know actually went out to sell the progressive work that they have been doing and that this government has been doing, that have been doing what is now considered acceptable as welfare state works, whether they like the term or not. But, it seems to me that when we come into the field of the Labour Department, we are not influenced by this form of pride of making progressive steps, but I think we are more interested in the field of industry and commerce, to do what we can to make our economic offerings, in terms of labour force, more acceptable to industry and to commerce. And I think I'm justified in saying that. It seems to me that last year there were amendments brought in to the Labour Relations Act which did nothing but harm to the attempts of organized labour to bargain fairly for their work. I think that this year we've already been faced with an attempt, which no doubt will succeed, to reduce their income, to make their industries competitive on the basis of labour costs, and to me this is retrogression and a form of reaction, and it's completely inconsistent with the foresight which is shown in other departments of this government, as specifically I mentioned already, Health and Education.

Now to me this is an indication of the trend that this government is taking, and it surprises me not one bit, because it is still the Tory Party that is in control of this government, and there have been times and there are times when my definition of "Tory" and "Conservative" becomes confused with my old definition of "Liberal" and "Grit" and there are times when I feel that the Tory Party is left of the Grit Party, but when it comes to the attitudes towards labour legislation, I am forced to think that the Tories are where they always were, and that is not very far removed from where the Liberals always were, and in this field I feel that we still see a nice sharp cleavage in the political attitudes of the Liberal and Conservative parties on one hand and the party which I have the honour to be a member of, on the other.

Now I feel that when we start dealing with the specifics of employment standards and the specifics of labour relations, we will find that the method by which the organized labour is able to bargain fairly has been whittled down. We will review cases where the legislation which appears to be one to provide for a fair bargaining right is difficult to deal with -- I think its already been mentioned by one of the speakers yesterday -- that it's all very well to have a law saying to an employer, "You shall not do so and so" if in the end, after prosecutions and delays, that employer is compelled to pay a fine of, let us say, the magnificent sum of \$100.00, but the union which has tried to enforce its rights has been broken through that period of time that it took to deal with it. There is no provision that I'm aware of that entitles the worker who has been affected adversely by the employer's attitude which has proved subsequently to be illegal, for that worker to recover his rights in terms of reinstatement as of the date of, let us say, his firing, as of the date when he ceased to be a member of that employment group. And this type of attitude, this closing of the ears to the requests of labour, to me is an indication of an adverse attitude on the part of the government, but one which, as I said before, hardly surprises me.

I would like to think that we will have enough time to deal with the matters that are the responsibility of this department, so that we will be able to reveal to the former Minister of Labour what features of the work which he is responsible for have become and are adverse to the interest of that working force which is such an important part of the industry of our province. I would like to feel that when he and other members of his government try to interest industry in settling into this province, that it will do it on the basis of saying, "We have a labour force here in the province which is properly paid, properly protected, and whose rights to bargain are guaranteed by this province." He cannot say that now, in my opinion, in all honesty and the proof of it, I believe, is the fact that labour has come again and again to this government with a suggestion that this government start passing legislation which will enable it to be in a stronger bargaining position than it is now.

I want to touch briefly on the department itself and suggest to the Honourable Minister that the Labour Relations staff is not adequate enough to meet with what I think are the requirements of the department. I feel that the people who work there are people who are most sincere in their attempts to conciliate. I have dealt with several of the Conciliation Officers. I've had an opportunity of dealing with them as solicitor for unions, also as solicitor for employers.

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd.) . . . I have been on both sides of that fence and I've always been satisfied that the conciliation officers are sincerely trying to do a job, but I must admit that I have come to the conclusion that they are too busy; that they're unable to give sufficient time to the job, and I also have a feeling that they do not have satisfactory qualifications which will enable them to do the job and command the respect of the people with whom they are dealing. Now the Honourable Minister himself mentioned how they work late at nights; how hard they work. I'm sure they do. I would suggest that they ought to be eased in the job, because in conciliation the one thing they mustn't have is a pressure of work on them. To do an adequate job they have to be able to discuss the problems in a relaxed manner and this is not what I have found. I think, too, that something must be done, and we'll deal with that a little later on, in the field of the conciliation board structure itself. I have found that although the Act reads that "The Minister shall appoint, in cases where he must appoint, members of an Arbitration Board", that there has been considerable delay beyond the time in attempting to have, let us say, the employer appoint his arbitrator even though the time in which he should have done it had long gone by, and I feel that that is the kind of a thing that can only be carried out if the department is expanded to the size where it can adequately handle the job that it is doing. I see the Leader of the House wishes to rise and I will

MR. EVANS: Thank you, I'm afraid we've time. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 o'clock. The House will now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Thursday afternoon.