

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, April 25th, 1963.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing & Special Committees

MR. JAMES COWAN Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, your Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs begs leave to present its first report.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs beg leave to present the following as their first report. Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Cowan as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that for the remainder of the Session the quorum of this committee shall consist of six members. Your Committee has considered Bills No. 8, an Act to amend The Local Government District Act; No. 13, an Act to amend an Act to erect the Village of Beausejour into a Town Corporation; No. 15, an Act to validate By-Law No. 32-1962 of the Town of Killarney; and By-Law No. 12-1962 of The Rural Municipality of Turtle Mountain and to add certain lands to The Town of Killarney. No. 23, an Act to amend The Municipal Act. No. 62, an Act respecting The Rural Municipality of Ste. Anne; No. 77, an Act respecting The Rural Municipality of Coldwell; No. 84, an Act to amend The Portage la Prairie Charter; No. 105 an Act respecting The Town of Steinbach; No. 106, an Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act No. 1; No. 109, an Act respecting the Village of Glenboro; and has agreed to report the same without amendment. Your Committee has also considered Bills. No. 6, an Act to amend The Municipal Board Act. No. 9, an Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act; No. 12, an Act to amend The St. James Charter. And has agreed to report the same with Certain Amendments. All of which is respectively submitted.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report be accepted.

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

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

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I am not a member of the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources. I was not present at any of the meetings held by that committee and anything that I have to say I hope will be said in an objective way, without rancour and without heat.

I feel, Madam Speaker, that if the Honourable First Minister, was of the opinion that the charges made or the statements made by the Honourable Member for St. George were irresponsible, and I take it that that was his feeling from a reading of Hansard, that the Honourable First Minister should have ignored these charges. If, on the other hand, the Honourable First Minister felt that these charges were so grave and represented a matter of such public importance as to demand an inquiry into them, I submit that that inquiry should have been instituted in a proper manner and according to the rules and procedures of this House.

I take it, Madam Speaker, that according to the rules of this House, a Special Standing Committee can only deal with such matters as are referred to it, and it can only deal with these matters in the light and according to the terms of reference. This matter which was under investigation was not referred by this House to the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources, but was brought to that Committee by the government. And I submit, Madam, with all sincerity that that Committee had no right and no authority, either to deal with that matter or to set up its own terms of reference as it did. I also feel, Madam Speaker, that once that matter was before that committee and whether it was before that committee legally or illegally that that committee should have been the body to conduct the inquiry, and I do not think that that committee should have been turned into a court of law where the Honourable Member for St. George became the "plaintiff" and the government became the "defendant". I feel that that matter, assuming that it was properly before the committee, should have been dealt with by the committee itself, the committee should have conducted the inquiry and that committee should not have placed the onus upon the Honourable Member for St. George to conduct the inquiry.

As a precedent for what I have to say, I refer back to the year 1956, where as a result

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd)... of what is commonly known and referred to as "The Bracken Commission", a special select committee of this House was set up to study the question of beer prices. Now that committee was set up by this House as a result of certain statements contained in that Royal Commission, to the effect that Manitoba was paying the breweries of this province too much money for beer. The Campbell administration immediately passed a resolution of this House referring these charges in the Bracken Commission to a select standing committee of the House. The terms of reference of that committee were debated in the House and after debating were amended and finally the matter came before that committee.

I had the honour, Madam Speaker, to be the chairman of that committee. I was not a cabinet minister, I was a backbencher, and although modesty forbids me to refer to whether or no that Committee was conducted fairly or impartial line, all I can say is that I never had any complaint from any of the members who were on it. I think every opportunity was given to all members of that committee to suggest to the committee the names of any witnesses who should be called and any material that should be produced. And as a matter of fact Madam Speaker, immediately following the organization meeting of that committee, we suggested to the members of the opposition, on the committee, that they should give to the Attorney-General the names of four firms of chartered accountants and that we would choose two firms from the four names given to act as chartered accountants for the committee. We even went further; we asked the members of the opposition to submit to the committee the names of lawyers from whom the committee could choose one lawyer to act for the committee. Now these requests were fulfilled and two firms of chartered accountants were employed by the committee to investigate any and all matters which were referred to them by the committee or referred to them by any member of the opposition who was on that committee. A lawyer was chosen; that lawyer acted on behalf of all members of the committee and I'm quite satisfied that his services were used by the opposition members of that committee.

The proceedings of that committee were not conducted in the same manner as a court of law. And as a matter of fact, Madam Chairman, during the course of these proceedings, I became a little worried over the fact that a great deal of the evidence which was being given before the committee was evidence which would be considered "hearsay" in a court of law. And as a result of feeling that way, I did suggest to the committee, that if any member of the committee felt that by reason of the fact that some of the evidence which was being given there was "hearsay" in nature, the committee would call any witnesses who would be required to be called, so that the evidence would lose its aspect of "hearsay" evidence and become known as the best evidence available. That was the lines upon which that committee conducted its investigation. We never placed the onus of proving anything on anybody. The Committee itself investigated all of the matters which were referred to it in a free and impartial way; and I submit, Madam, that if the matter of the charges or statements made by the Honourable Member for St. George were of such a gravity that in the interests of the people of Manitoba they should have been investigated; I submit that they should have been investigated by a committee, properly constituted by this House, with proper terms of reference and that the Honourable Member for St. George should not have been placed in the position where he was a plaintiff in a court of law.

Madam Speaker put the question.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): If nobody else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks.....

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): I wish to speak on this.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yesterday afternoon, Madam Speaker, the Report of the Committee was tabled in this House. The contents of this report are not surprising. We had an inquiry into allegations which I made in this House on March 6th, and when the hearing was held we heard only one side of the issue. On March 6th when I made my remarks in this House, I made them because I knew what I was talking about and I knew if I had to prove it, I could do so, given any fair opportunity to do so.

When the First Minister spoke and replied, I was just naive enough to believe him. He made the remark that the people of Manitoba would be given every opportunity to find out the true facts of the case and the opportunity would be given to everyone to see the full facts and nothing would be hidden from anyone. In other words, we could go to this hearing with the full

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd)...knowledge that everyone could speak; all witnesses could be questioned; and consequently all the facts would be heard. I regret to say that this was not the case. After I made my remarks I asked this government to table certain documents and I even went so far as to accept amendment by the Minister of Public Utilities for my Order to assist them in providing me with the information. But unfortunately when that Order for Return was tabled-- and it had been accepted by the government -- many documents were missing. Many key documents were missing. I brought this to the attention of the government and some apologies were made and I was assured that the missing information would be provided. Then after I received additional information other key documents were found to be missing. At one point in the committee the Minister of Public Utilities said -- when I pointed out on one occasion that some information was missing -- he assured the committee that the information I mentioned would be brought forth -- I'm specifically referring now to the Capital and Operating Costs.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege that is not an accurate statement.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I suggest the Minister read the transcript of evidence to see what was said and what wasn't said. Then the hearing got under way. Mr. Thompson acting for the Hydro, appeared and told the committee what steps we were going to proceed with -- spoke for 50 minutes. We didn't object, although I felt we had an objection because the committee, I felt, had the right to determine the course of events in that committee. We listened to all the government witnesses. We never objected to any of their evidence although much of it went far beyond the terms of reference; and we questioned those witnesses as the hearing proceeded. Then when my witnesses were to give evidence the government using its overwhelming majority prevented me at every turn to question the witnesses that I had subpoenaed. The ironical part of it is, Madam Speaker, is that the questions that I directed for confirmation were figures that were provided to me in the Order for Return. Yet when I tried to get the answer from my witness, oh no, the Chairman immediately said it was out of order and he was supported by the entire government members and the NDP. At that point we became frustrated and we asked for an adjournment. The following morning we called another witness; the same tactics were used. They used their majority in throttling my efforts to produce evidence to substantiate my charges.

It was at that point, after every effort had been made to question the witnesses on evidence that was vital to this case, that I decided to leave the committee. And I have no regrets about it. If I ever was subjected to that same kind of treatment I would do it again. The Premier said I ran away because I couldn't prove my charges. Part of that statement is right. I couldn't prove my charges, is correct. Why? Because none of my witnesses were allowed to speak. Madam Speaker, I could have substantiated every word I made in the Legislature of March 6th had my witnesses been allowed to speak; but if you throttle evidence and prevent it from being heard, how are you going to get at the root of what the real truth is? I was unable to get one tittle of evidence into that hearing. I don't deny this at all. And why? Because no witnesses were allowed to speak. As I said earlier, I thought the government's sense of fair play would allow me to speak to my witnesses after we had allowed them to question theirs to the greatest extent.

Madam Speaker, any time a government awards a contract for total revenue of approximately \$3,300,000 and allows that contractor to make a profit of nearly \$2 million it's in the public interest, and if I had've been afforded the opportunity to question my witnesses as I had hoped I would, I would have had no trouble to show the committee that I stood on solid ground when I made my remarks in the Legislature. We had an independent witness at that hearing, a Mr. Tuckwell. Mr. Tuckwell appeared at that hearing on his own; he wasn't subpoenaed by anyone. At the beginning of his remarks he told the hearing that he was there on a non-partisan basis. He told the committee that he was a Conservative. He told them he was a member of the Conservative Executive. He said: "I am a personal friend of Premier Roblin." He told the committee about the talk that was going on in the business circles about this contract and he was very concerned about it. He said, "in an effort to put the Premier right because he was a friend of the Premier's, he went to him to right the situation." It was Mr. Tuckwell who referred to this contract as a nefarious contract. It was Mr. Tuckwell who said, "the government's actions in handling this contract was a blot." These were his remarks.

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

Since this subject has been under way in this House and in the committee, the government has made every effort to blame the Hydro. This is typical. The allegations in this House were never made against any officials. They were made against the bad deal the government had made, because the government is responsible for all activities in this province -- that's Crown corporations and what not. It was the government who planned the building of the road, and say as what they might, they had no knowledge that the road would be built in 1960, will not stand water. In April of 1960 the government signed a contract with McNamara to build a portion of that road and the completion date given to that contractor was 100 days; and the contractor when he signed that contract knew that he was given 100 working days to build that road. This is in April of 1960; and the road was built in 1960. I well remember remarks being made at that time that this road would be built in 1960. There was no doubt in anyone's mind. The engineers spoke about this openly that this road would be completed. This was a crash program and it would be done; and it was done. Then for the government to sign a four-year contract for water haulage when they knew that the road would be built, under their own conditions, in one summer, is just ridiculous. And to make matters worse they called for tenders of 135,000 firm tons and after they awarded the contract they increased the tonnage by 10,000 tons; an outright bonus of nearly a quarter of a million dollars. Because, Madam Speaker, those people that bid on this contract did so on the assurance of only 135,000 firm tons; and when I made the remarks in the House I had received very definite information that this government was ready to sign a new contract with this same firm without putting it up for tender. It was this point that I spoke in the House in an effort to stop this secret contract dealing without it going to tenders.

I have been accused many times by the government, and some others, for what I have said on this matter in the Legislature, Madam Speaker, any time a government awards a contract as juicy as this one it's in the public interests that it be brought out. I suspect that never in the history of this province have we had a contract that was so juicy as the water-hauling contract from Selkirk to Grand Rapids. The figure mainly dealt with in this contract was \$23.10; but that isn't the real figure when you consider that the government had to pay roughly three and a half dollars a ton to get that material from Fort Whyte to the dock at Selkirk. They roughly paid \$27.00 a ton to haul the material. Why was the road to Grand Rapids built? It was announced in this Legislature that the prime purpose of this road was to haul supplies into Grand Rapids. They spent millions of dollars on that road. This was the reason it was built, to get the supplies in for this project at Grand Rapids. And then to issue a contract to this firm so lucrative is just beyond any man's comprehension.

Madam Speaker, when I made these allegations in the House on March 6th, I knew what I was talking about. I have not changed my mind one iota despite the whitewashing that I got in that committee. I left that Committee only when I was throttled from presenting my side of the case. Had I been given a fair hearing and allowed to present my witnesses and question my witnesses I would never have left that Committee. But to think that you hold a hearing and the government with its overwhelming majority allows only one side to be heard is an affront to this House.

Another very interesting issue arose out of this hearing was when I questioned one of the government witnesses about another contract. The government gave a contract for approximately \$7 million to Mannix-Brown, Root and McNamara, commonly known as the grouting contract. After the contract was awarded an additional contract of \$2.8 million was given to this same firm without being put up for tender. But again the overwhelming majority in this Committee prevented us from exploring why this contract had been awarded without being put up for tender.

Madam Speaker, I'm not going to speak any more on this subject. I made the allegations because I knew they were right. When the Premier called for the hearing, as I said before, I was foolish enough to think that he would give it a fair hearing. It never dawned on me that the government would use its majority to prevent witnesses from speaking. As I said, I knew that what I said was right then; it is right now, in my humble opinion. And all the efforts of the government to whitewash me, as they have done, quite successfully with their majority, will not change anything in my mind or minds of a lot of other people.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for

(Mr. Peters, cont'd)... Seven Oaks 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. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 136, an Act to amend The Psychiatric Nurses Association Act.

MR. LYON introduced Bill No. 139, an Act to amend The Prearranged Funeral Services Act.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into 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: Mr. Chairman, 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 Agricultural Credit Act by providing, among other matters, (a) for the making of loans by The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to farmers for certain purposes, including the purchase of beef cattle for breeding herds and for certain pasture improvement; and (b) for making changes in the rate of interest on loans granted by the corporation; as a consequence of which the amount that may be payable to the corporation from the Consolidated Fund may be increased.

Resolution be adopted? Agreed. Resolution

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, this amendment to The Agricultural Credit Act will provide for loans to a maximum of \$10,000 for the purpose of purchasing beef cattle for breeding herds and where it is carried on in conjunction with a herd expansion program, for hay and pasture improvements of a permanent or semi-permanent nature, and also includes provisions for loans for the purpose of developing water supply and for fence construction.

This is rather a major step forward in the credit program here in Manitoba in that we are venturing into a field that hasn't been explored in a practical way before. These loans, the term of these loans will be up to ten years and provision will be made for, as is in the existing Act, for the deferment of principle payments beyond the second year and their amortization over the final eight-year period.

I should make a statement in respect to the interest rates. I would like to inform the House at this time that I am recommending to the Board of the Agricultural Credit Corporation that they raise the interest rates in respect to the young farmer loans from four to four and a half percent, and that they increase the interest rates in respect to other farmers from five and a half to six. I am not prepared at this time to indicate to the House what the interest rate will be in respect to these loans on the security of a chattel mortgage on cattle. We have given the matter a great deal of thought and consideration and we are still not prepared to make a statement. There are certain aspects that must be taken into consideration; that of risk involved; the question of the amount of supervision that will be required. We want to get a rate of interest that is as low as possible and consistent with the farmers' welfare, and we want to get a rate of interest that also takes into account the interests of the people, the taxpayers in Manitoba.

The reason for raising the rate of interest in respect to the other two classes is simply that the cost of the rate of interest in relation to the cost of money has been much greater than anticipated and we feel that the four and one-half percent still grants to the young farmer a substantial advantage over any other rates of interest that are available; and the reasons for the increase of the interest to the older group is to keep it also in line with these changes. I would like to point out that the group that we find are making use of our -- the group over 31 -- that are making use of our loans, are those who find that they can get a much more useful kind of a loan from us than they can from the Federal Government. As you know, anyone over the age of 45 can only lend money from the Federal Government on the security of a mortgage on their

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... real property. The Federal Government does not grant any loans to farmers over the age of 45 on the security of chattel mortgages. The provincial program, The Manitoba Credit Corporation makes no distinction in this respect, so we are in a position to make a more useful kind of a loan in many cases to the farmer from 45 to 60 who cannot get an adequate loan under the conditions of the Federal Government program. But we do feel that when we are extending credit in respect to a chattel mortgage that the interest differential should be something greater than it is at the present time and take into account the risks that are involved. In the case of the Federal Government loans they have annual charges associated with the loans that they make. In our case we have a clear-cut interest rate; there are no hidden charges of any kind. We think that the interest rates that we are recommending to the Board are realistic and take into account the best interests of both the farmer who is borrowing the money and the taxpayers of Manitoba who are putting up the money.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his advance information on the Bill. I was hoping he would be able to tell us what the rate of interest is going to be. I think I understood him correctly to say that, "these loans would be completely on the value of chattel," there would be absolutely no relationship to the value of land. This is a matter on which we spoke when the bill was first introduced in the House by his predecessor, the previous Minister of Agriculture; because many portions of the province and in particular the areas where ranching is the main activity, under the previous rules of the Act, many of the ranchers were excluded from the benefits. This will certainly be an improvement for many of them. I wonder if the Minister could indicate to us, what supervision he intends to have, if he is going into this expanded type of loan? Because quite obviously his risks are going to go up substantially once he moves into the straight field of chattels, and presumably his rate of interest will have some relationship to the increased risk. But then there's also the matter of supervision. The VLA arrangements after the last war I think in general were very successful; not only did the supervision provide some guarantee for the money that the government had advanced, but I think, by and large, the supervision was very much to the advantage of the individual who was under the VLA contract and the success of our settlement of return soldiers after the Second World War -- particularly when compared to that after the First World War -- is certainly something that we can be proud of. I think there that the supervision was an important factor. I wonder if the Minister has any intention in this particular case of making particular provisions for supervision?

In his comments regarding the other matters that could be covered, in addition to the breeding herds, did I miss the matter of actual improvement, that is, the removal of scrub and brush; the use of the ball and chain which has been up in the Interlake for some time now? Will this be included as well in the type of improvements that can be considered? I didn't notice him saying that and yet in many parts of our province, the marginal areas, this is one of the urgent needs -- the carrying capacity now of a good deal of our lands is not what it could be if there was some improvement in removal of the scrub poplar and brush that is presently there. It would seem to me if that is not included that he should give consideration to including this type of improvement as well.

MR. MORRIS E. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, before the Honourable Minister replies to the previous questions, I also would like to know, One, the rate of interest; and secondly, if this is an improvement to the legislation we have now; and I'm prepared to accept the word of the Minister of the Crown.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, as regards to the new interest rates of 4 1/2 for the young farmer and 6 for the farmer 31 and over, I suppose that these new rates will apply to new loans only; that is, will the old contracts be affected by the new rates?

MR. J.M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, in a way I welcome this legislation, because it will give added credit to the farmers who are desirous of obtaining credit. We know that under The Farm Improvement Loans Act there is limitation too, and if they use some of that credit for other purposes that very little is often left for purposes of this kind and I welcome it from that point. However, I feel that there will be difficulties in the matter of supervision. From practical experience in other work, I know that taking chattel mortgages on livestock is a very risky way unless the persons are very reliable. So I just wonder what the government has in mind in the way of supervision?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I mentioned the fact that it was for the purpose of pasture improvement of a permanent or semi-permanent nature, including provision of adequate water supplies and fence construction. I'll be speaking on this aspect at second reading in greater detail, but any program which would fall under this general provision, I believe would qualify. Insofar as the specific practises or projects that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition referred to, I'm quite certain that they would qualify. It is aimed at this sort of development.

In respect to the matter of the effect of the changes in interest rate, they will not affect any of the loans which have been made in the past. The cut-off will be on those loans where an appraisal has been made. All applications where an appraisal has not as yet been made, will be affected by the change in the interest rate.

On the question of supervision. This is a very important aspect of these loans and I will be speaking about this at second reading also. We recognize that increased supervision will be required and this is the part or a great deal of the reason why we are undecided at this time about the rate of interest in respect to the loans on the security of livestock only. But as I said, we are concerned that whatever decision we come to that it is going to leave the program useful to the farmer and at the same time protect the interests of the taxpayers in the province. But supervision is a very important aspect of this program and has received a great deal of consideration by us. We feel that it can be provided and I will speak on that point at greater length on second reading.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I'm not rising to oppose this Bill. In fact I think it is a step in the right direction and I'll support it. In the past, The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation was of very little value in southeastern Manitoba, where it's marginal -- we call it the marginal land -- where it's not too productive and as all the members know that in the past you had to have your land quite valuable to be able to get a loan. I'm not going to argue the point, whether it's fair or not, but I think this Act kind of erases this iniquity since any farmer who wishes to go into cattle and can prove that he's an able farmer, he will be able to get a loan.

Now there's one question I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture. Shows poultry as livestock. I don't think -- unless I missed it -- I don't think I heard him mention "poultry". I'm talking about chickens, turkeys. I, myself, I'm not pleading my own case, because I do not need help from the government, so far. In fact all my friends to the left like to refer to me as a "Capitalist". Maybe that's why some of them don't like me. I don't consider myself a capitalist, I'm just getting along. So I'm not pleading my own case because I don't intend to ask for credit from the Manitoba Credit Corporation. But there's quite a few turkey raisers in southeastern Manitoba who have to apply for credit and in the past some of them did obtain credit, but at a very high rate of interest. I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to explain and tell us whether this will cover poultry just as well?

MR. HUTTON: No, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is aimed specifically at the beef cattle industry. The purpose of the Act is set out specifically to provide loans for the purpose of increasing our beef cattle herds and for programs that are associated and complimentary to that purpose. I think that if a dog got into a cattle herd it might come off second best, but if it got into a turkey flock any security that was represented in that turkey flock might not last too long. I want to say this, at this time about this amendment, that it is double-barrelled in this respect, the brightest spot in the agricultural horizon right now is the cattle industry. There is a real problem facing the province and facing the farmers to meet this challenge if more adequate credit facilities are not made available to enable them to do so. It is to enable this growth in the industry to take place for the benefit of the individual farmer and for the benefit of the province as a whole that we are bringing in this amendment.

MR. P. J. McDONALD (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to rise at this time. I think that this is a very important bill and I would like to congratulate the Minister for the work that he has done on it. I certainly intend to support it and I feel that it is going to go a long way to help the young farmer get started in the cattle business. I do believe that it is very unfortunate that we have so few cattle breeders in this House and I would just like to say at this time that I'm sure the government will make every effort to see that the interest rate is right and in the best interests of all the people of the province. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 2. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Surrogate Courts Act by providing, among other matters, (a) for increasing the remuneration of the Surrogate Court judges; and (b) for a method of establishing further Surrogate Courts as a consequence of which further court facilities and officials may be required.

Resolution adopted. Passed.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, is the Minister going to say anything on this?

MR. LYON: There are only two minor matters here, Mr. Chairman, of a financial nature. The one is the increase to the Surrogate Court judges of their stipend. The increase that is forecast in this resolution is from \$1,200 per annum, the present figure, to \$2,500 per annum. The second matter merely deals with the establishment of Surrogate Court Districts. At the present time the Act provides for each Judicial District to have its own Surrogate Court District with the exception of the Eastern Judicial District which has two Surrogate Court Districts. The financial provision is that other arrangements will be made for the establishment of these districts by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council consequent upon the alterations in the judicial districts themselves, a bill for which is presently before the House.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I understand that these learned gentlemen have already full-time jobs as County Court judges. This is more or less a part time job. I am associating this in my mind with the part-time work of a juror, and if a juror has to prove need in order to get the extra \$3.00 a day, I'm wondering why the same logic doesn't apply here.

MR. LYON: I don't think the jurors have the same good precedent working for them that the Surrogate Court Judges have, because I am informed that the last adjustment made in their salary was 1932; whereas the jurors at least was adjusted in 1957, I believe.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, this was the point that I was going to raise because naturally it isn't so much the proving of need that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks mentioned, as the percentage of increase that appeals to me and while I can appreciate what the Honourable the Attorney-General has said, that there has been no increase here for a long time -- actually since depression days apparently -- I can easily see why this would not be done during the term of the previous administration -- the last preceding administration. But I would wonder why this administration that prides itself on acting quickly on matters that are in the public interest would have taken five years to find out that a raise was necessary to the extent that it had to be more than a hundred percent. It's the percentage of the increase that strikes me as being quite noticeable. I suppose that my honourable friend would prefer to not put on record the salary that these gentlemen get in their other capacity, but I'm always a great believer in hearing just what salary we're dealing with, and the fact is that this is a full-time job -- I mean their other work is a full-time job -- and this seems to me to be a pretty remunerative side line.

MR. LYON: It is indeed a remunerative side line for the provincial government, Mr. Chairman, because of course the amount of work that passes through the Surrogate Court has increased tremendously over the period since an adjustment was last made on the salary. My honourable friend the Member for Lakeside says that the proportion or the ratio of the increase rather intrigues him because it is just \$100.00 more than double what they are getting at the present time. I can only plead in defence that they were getting so little before from his administration that everything appears by those terms of analogy to be large, but really we're just trying to bring them up to what is a reasonable figure, and I suggest that it is a reasonable figure, \$2,500 when one considers -- naturally one looks at other provinces to gain whatever guidance and direction we can. In the Province of Saskatchewan the figure is \$2,000 for Surrogate Court Judges. In the Province of Ontario it is \$2,000, but in addition to that they receive an extra \$1,500 as a general payment for work that they do under designated statutes of the Provincial Legislature of Ontario. The Province of Alberta is \$2,500; New Brunswick I believe it is, is \$2,000 and in the other Maritime Provinces the Surrogate Court work is done by registrars or by the High Court of those provinces so there is no stipend for the Surrogate Court work to the County Court Judges.

My honourable friend from Lakeside also asked a most proper question: what other salary do these judges receive? Of course they are federally appointed judges and the surrogate

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)...portion of their work is given to them by the province and by long tradition in the western provinces the County Court judges have taken on this dual role. They receive at the present time for their federal responsibilities as County Court judges \$10,500.00. Their present total salary -- that is at the present time before this Bill passes, is \$11,700 per year which I might say is just under what we are paying at least two Police Magistrates in the Province of Manitoba at the present time. So comparisons sometimes are invidious that sometimes comparisons are enlightening and it is getting to the point -- it was getting to the point we felt -- where some adjustment was needed. I can assure my honourable friend from Lakeside that it was not -- the government didn't react immediately to the blandishments or to the suggestions of the Surrogate Court Judges because they did make a suggestion to us some years ago that the salary should be reviewed; we did at that time and thought at the time that there was not a need and of course at that time there was -- and I'll explain that -- because there was some considerable talk at Ottawa about their County Court salaries being raised. They waited five years for that and that didn't come about so we thought that we should meet our obligation to them and increase the salary which I think all members on all sides will still regard as a reasonable salary, having regard to the importance of the work and having regard as well to the fact that we have gentlemen of the quality that we do in the County Courts of Manitoba, carrying out this public function on behalf of our people.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Attorney-General when this Bill comes up for second reading, provided he can do it without too much trouble, could give us a list of the Statutes of Manitoba wherein a County Court judge is either a *persona designata* or the County Court is designated as the court to which certain matters are referred; and also what fees are provided in those Acts?

MR. LYON: I'll attempt to do that if I can find someone in the Legislative Counsel staff who isn't otherwise busily engaged at this particular time of the year. I'll certainly attempt to get some information. If I can't get it before the Session closes we can try to give it to my honourable friend even after.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution adopted. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: I'm not interested in the wages they get and the pay they get. I am just interested if those who are appointed in the opinion of the Attorney-General or the government, are they qualified men for the job?

MR. LYON: The County Court judges of course are all appointed by the Governor-in-Council at Ottawa and by practice and by Statute these persons -- all of whom I would say -- are persons of ability and are extremely capable of carrying out their duties. These persons in turn by Statute are appointed Surrogate Court Judges for the districts that they serve in the Province of Manitoba; but the Surrogate Court Judge appellation is a provincial one and the Surrogate Court is a provincial court as opposed to a federal court and hence we have to make provision for a provincial salary for this provincial work.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I shall not comment on my honourable friend's suggestion that we paid them so little because that would be to be expected, I suppose. But I was glad to hear him admit that this government had hoped that it could shelve its responsibilities on to the Federal Government and that the sound practice -- but the question I really got up to ask was this: I know that the two higher courts do not enter into this present discussion so I shall ask my question only with regard to the County Court judges, with the understanding that I have that the same Act applies to both of them. My understanding is that the judges are prohibited by the Federal Act from accepting salary other than that is paid to them. Yet we make provision in our Election Act for paying the County Court judges for certain responsibilities that they undertake as Appeal Court Judges and I think some other things as well, and judges of other courts have frequently been employed -- and perhaps County Court judges too -- to perform other work. My recollection is that though they're very learned in the law, that they accept remuneration for those other jobs that they undertake. Is this correct; and is it according to the Act?

MR. LYON: My honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, is quite right in saying that there is a prohibition in the Judges' Act, whereby judges -- County Court judges -- in fact for that matter all judges -- are forbidden from receiving extra remuneration. But it is a qualified prohibition because it says -- and I'm speaking now from memory which I repeat is a bad

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)... thing to do when there is a Statute in existence -- as I recall it though, it says that they are not entitled to receive fees or payments for other functions or duties that they carry out except where those fees or payments were made payable to them prior, I think it was, to 1920, and there is a provision whereby if a Statute had been in force -- say it started out in 1910 -- which said the County Court Judges could receive \$2,000 or \$3,000 for certain duties that were assigned to them by the Provincial Legislature or by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council that -- and this is my understanding of the Judges' Act -- they could continue to receive those fees even after the prohibition or the qualified prohibition was enacted in the Judges' Act. And as I understand it, it is by virtue of that saving clause in the qualified prohibition that we are enabled quite lawfully to make payment to Surrogate Court Judges in the manner that we do here.

I am not aware myself of the judges taking fees in cases where there would be any conflict between the Judges' Act and the Statute under which they are allowed to take fees. My own -- I'm just going now on the basis of hearsay information -- but my own impression is that the amount of fees, aside from Surrogate Court salary that County Court judges receive in Manitoba is extremely small.

MR. CAMPBELL: I certainly am not well acquainted with the Act myself, but it's an interesting point and I would appreciate it if the Minister would check this up by the time the Bill comes up for second reading, because frankly I'm just as interested in the higher court judges as the County Court ones. I think the same principle applies in each case and I've sometimes wondered whether the public interest is served when we use judges of our higher courts, or County Courts, on commissions or investigations, or some line of activity where it could, to some extent, rob them of the complete absence of prejudice that they should in every way have. I would guess that that is the reason that a prohibition against them accepting salary from other quarters has been put in the Act and I'd be interested to hear just how far it reaches.

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

MR. W.G. Martin (St. Matthews): 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.

Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that 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 No. 119, an Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Act.

MR. LYON introduced Bill No. 128, an Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the Speaker's Gallery where there are 35 members of the 4-H Club from Treherne and Holland seated with their Leader, Mr. Hamilton and their driver. This group is from the constituency of Cypress which I have the honour to represent. We hope that your visit to the Legislative Assembly this afternoon will be interesting and enjoyable. As you watch the proceedings that go on in this Chamber we hope that you will see our democratic system of government as it is in action. We trust that from your observations you will be inspired and it will help you in your studies. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health. In the last couple of days I have noticed headlines in the American papers with an SOS call for more students to the medical profession and the article states definitely that we are on the downgrade of medical men in the next day or two, or month or year. This is something to worry about and as a member of the Legislature of this Province, may I direct a question to the Minister of Health to let us know, not the world situation, but particularly how do we in this province stand with the medical profession, as I understand that many of them in view of many reasons, which I do not intend to mention now, are not taking up medicine as a profession.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I think the question is a little vague but I think what the honourable member is asking me is: "What is the medical situation re doctors?" There's a shortage of doctors to my knowledge in the United Kingdom, in the United States and in rural parts of Canada. We have isolated instances in this province where there may be a shortage of doctors but I think Winnipeg City proper is well supplied. The statistics are all in the submission of the Manitoba Medical Profession to the Royal Commission on Health Services a year

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd). . . ago, and also we made some comments, and I just haven't got the precise data at my fingertips. However, the honourable member would be happy to know that the Medical College here will take any student with, I think, a fair average of around 60 or 65 percent, after third year pre-medical, into the college. The college can hold 90. In the past few years there have been a shortage of graduates applying to medicine. In Manitoba I think we do have the facilities to train sufficient numbers of physicians, but we train them so well here that the rest of the world takes them away from us.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Is it a fact that the Agricultural Societies Construction Grants are tied in with the amount of prize money paid out by the society in a given year?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, in this sense that they don't become eligible for any grant unless in the one instance they have a prize list exceeding \$1,000 or in the other category, exceeding \$2,000.00?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question then. It is a fact isn't it that the government has cut back on the amount of prize money payable for horses at agricultural fairs of all kinds in this province? And isn't it a fact, too, then that this could affect the Construction Grants?

MR. HUTTON: It is not a fact that the government has cut back on the percentage of the prize money that we will pay. I expect that my honourable friend is referring to a meeting that members of the staff had with the Advisory Board of the Agricultural Societies of Manitoba where the matter was discussed, but no firm decision has been made.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister for Agriculture. I requested the correspondence between the Red River Exhibition and the government sometime ago and I would like to know when it is going to be tabled.

MR. HUTTON: As soon as it's ready.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a subsequent question to the Minister of Agriculture on the statement he just made regarding the prize list. Yesterday in reply to one of my questions he said, "The only letter I know of is in respect to the prize list for the horse shows, in which a revision was made in the prize list available there," and I took it, a reduction. Is that not correct?

MR. HUTTON: I think that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition -- I should check Hansard -- but I think that I said, "No, not yet, or not at this time" in respect to a revision in the prize money. And I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition inferred that a letter had been sent out to all the -- certainly not to my knowledge -- and I'll be very unhappy if such is the case.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I will refer the Minister to Page 1595 in Hansard and when he said, "No, not at this time" he was referring to a reduction in the construction grants -- centre of the page roughly, bottom half of 1595. He was referring "No, not at this time" to the construction grants, but then he proceeded to say there had been a letter out regarding the prize list for horse shows and I assumed that that meant a reduction in the amounts for these; and if it's true that there's a connection between the amount of prize list and the capital grant then it would seem that it would be possible, would it not, that some of the construction grant will be reduced?

MR. HUTTON: I must have misinterpreted the question put to me by the Leader of the Opposition, Madam Speaker, but I'd like if I may to explain what the situation is on Construction Grants.

The Construction Grants are made to a society provided it qualifies on the approval of the Minister -- and it is true that a particular agricultural society may apply for a grant and in respect of its prize list it may qualify -- but that doesn't necessarily mean that the Minister automatically approves it just on the basis of its prize list. Because after all, the government is providing 65 percent of the prize list so in that sense we are not revising any of the grants that are available, we're exercising our discretion as to who and where they will go. We are still able to provide up to \$750.00 in the case of a Class C fair that has a prize list over a thousand. We are still providing capital grants, as we have, of up to \$1,500 in respect to an

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... agricultural society that has a prize list of over \$2,000; but we may also say "no" or we may say "We won't give you \$750.00, we'll give you \$500.00" depending upon the project that they have in mind. That's in respect to this matter. I've already answered the question, I think, in respect to the matter of making prize money available.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question then just to take a particular case in point. Let us assume that a society is receiving a grant of \$750.00 capital because it has a prize list of say \$1,100 -- let us assume that part of that prize list is made up by a horse list, which is now being reduced, and that the prize list now becomes, say, \$900.00 for sake of explanation. Will the Minister then reduce their Construction Grant? This is the nub of the question.

MR. HUTTON: The Construction Grant is based upon the prize list of the prize money paid out in the year previous, so that if the agricultural society, this hypothetical agricultural society, reduces its grant this year, or its prize moneys paid out this year to \$900.00, it would mean that in the following year they would not qualify for a grant. But what the Department is trying to do is to see to it that the moneys that we are expending as a Provincial Government are used in the area which we feel is most beneficial to agriculture.

MR. MOLGAT: correct then that there is conceivably a reduction in Construction Grants tied in with this reduction in prize list?

MR. HUTTON: I think that this is not our objective if this is what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition means. It is not our objective. It may be that as a consequence of our policy in respect to revising the prize list for horses, that unless the Agricultural Society puts emphasis in other areas, that their prize list would be reduced; but not necessarily so.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to lay on the table of the House, as I undertook to do when asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition during estimate debate on Public Utilities, copies of the three Reciprocity Agreements between the provinces of Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Province of Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister for the material. Has he also included the original proposals that they made to him?

MR. LYON: No.

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, may I have the leave of the House to allow Bills No. 89, 88 and 87 to stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Second reading of Bill No. 94. The Honourable the First Minister.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley) Presented Bill No. 94, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, Manitoba 1962, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, this is one of these difficult bills in which no discernable principle can be discovered for discussion at second reading, except the fact that we never seem to get our income tax legislation completely satisfactory, because every year as I stated at the committee stage, the Government of Canada send to us a fist full of amendments that they require us to make with respect to the Income Tax legislation, and that is what we have before us now. And I should point out that under the terms of the Tax Collection Agreement with Ottawa, we are in the situation of having to comply with their request in incorporating this legislation into ours, otherwise the former agreements will fall through.

If members will look over the bill they will see that there are some ten sections in it, no one bearing any relation to the other to any great extent, which make provision for a variety of changes in the taxing legislation. I think it's fair to say that there is no change of major importance or principle involved, but I merely wanted -- it appeared to me to be based on the administrative necessity of the tax collector in Ottawa. If there are any questions on detail, I think perhaps they can best be dealt with in the Law Amendments Committee stage.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill 112. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Securities Act for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, again we have one of the difficult bills where the principle somewhat eludes the average reader, but I can say here that the main purpose of these amendments which are difficult to fathom, unless one fits them back into the existing Act, the main purpose of the amendment is to permit the Board to have control over short-term paper. At the present time, any promissory note, paper of that kind, is exempted from the control of the Board under one of the sections of the Act, which can be explained in more detail when we get into committee, and the purpose here is to permit the Board to have an area of jurisdiction and control over this type of offering, because of unfortunate experiences which have occurred among public buyers in a number of the provinces of Canada. I may say that these amendments arrive by virtue of certain recommendations made by the various commissioners across Canada and the particular ones that we are putting forward for the House's approval have, I am told, already been enacted in the provinces of Saskatchewan and British Columbia and are under consideration in the Province of Ontario and in Alberta as well. I would be only too happy to give further detail where we can get down to the specifics of the sections themselves, when we reach committee stage, but I can tell the honourable members, Madam Speaker, that the main purpose is to provide this degree of control, which is not present at the present time, over short-term paper; and secondly, to give the Board some intermediate power to cause brokers to cease and desist from trading. At the present time they can either trade or they must cease and disist from trading, some intermediate power was required by the Board whereby they could, for instance, require the issue of a prospectus or take some other investigative procedure before certain issues were put to the public, and the purpose of the last section of the bill is to make that now possible under The Securities Act.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I was pleased to hear from the Minister that part of this at least, if not all of it, is a move towards some tightening in our securities regulations and also, some establishment of uniformity across the country. This, it seems to me, is a very, very desirable move and one that the Minister should press forward as quickly as he can. It doesn't seem to make sense that we should have different security regulations in the various provinces of the country. A good number of our corporations now operate right through in every province, certainly our stockbrokers and our major insurance companies, the people who do deal in securities, are largely national concerns. It seems to me to be highly desirable from the standpoint of control as well as from the standpoint from ease of handling and uniformity across the country, if we could get together with the other provinces, establish a standard Act and see to it that the enforcement then can be followed through from one end of the nation to the other. I'm sure it will be in the interests of everyone concerned; those who are shareholders; those who are in the business of selling stocks and bonds and that the whole procedure would be vastly improved.

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.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): before you put the question, I would like to bring up on this motion a grievance and I would like your permission to stick fairly closely to my notes -- the notes that I have written. At the last session of the Legislature this House passed an amendment to the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act. The effect of this amendment was to set up a commission of inquiry two years ahead of the time required in the original Act. It is the job of this commission to investigate all matters under Metro's jurisdiction and particularly to look into the matter of the apparent public dissatisfaction with the new form of government and its apparent poor relations with the elected representatives of the area municipalities. The chairman of this commission is now in Winnipeg and the commission is readying itself for a series of public hearings into the matters referred to it by its terms of reference. I have information to the effect that Mr. Bonnycastle, the Chairman of Metro Council, is by written invitation, entertaining at his home this week-end at a reception the chairman and members of this inquiry commission. The mayors and reeves of the cities and municipalities of Greater Winnipeg have also been invited to this reception.

We would, Madam Speaker, be most concerned about our impartial administration of

(Mr. Groves, cont'd) justice if we knew that our judges made a practice of being entertained on the eve of hearing of their cases by one of the sides of an action that he was to hear the following day. We, in the Legislature, should also be concerned about preventing this same sort of thing when it concerns boards or commissions that we set up to judge matters of public interest. In my opinion, on the eve of public hearings to investigate the complaints about Metro, it is most improper that the chairman of the level of government to be inquired into should be entertaining those persons whose job it is to do the inquiring. It is also, in my opinion, most improper of the commission, whose job it is in the public interest, to make it a needed inquiry, to be accepting this type of hospitality on the eve of their hearing. The public of this Metropolitan Winnipeg area are entitled to a fair, unbiased and uninfluenced hearing of their grievances. They are not going to believe that they are getting this when in the background of the public hearings this sort of thing goes on. I thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker put the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved into a Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

..... Continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department XIII, Item 1 passed. . . .

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, we're still under the Minister's salary. In all my life I've taken an interest in the progress of the labour movement, not only politically but also in their strife and in the fight for better conditions, for themselves and their families. I still remember vividly the time of the sweatshops in the big centres in the union movement, particularly the time that the unions sought to organize, in order to do away with the sweatshops, where there was no control of hours; no control of labour conditions; no control of hygiene. It was strictly part of a slavery. That was the time that thousands of immigrants came in from different parts of Europe. They were starving. They did not have the facilities that we have today, like welfare, hospitalization, medical, and so on, and it was quite a struggle on the part of unions, particularly in America, to try to improve conditions which at that time was quite difficult. The immigrants were afraid that if they refused to work for the very low wage, they may become a public charge and they were subject to deportation, so they accepted whatever was offered to them. It was a hard and bitter struggle on the part of the unions to try and improve conditions, which I'm glad to state that that situation does not exist now, but the improvements came from a struggle of organization of the unions and a struggle of the leaders of the unions. They looked upon a union leader at that time as one that came to America to disturb the conditions in the United States. They called him anything under the sun. They felt because they're immigrants and because they came back from countries suffering privation and misery and problems and persecution and what have you, they were accusing them of being so-called revolutionaries. Well, the leaders of the unions didn't get scared and they tried and . . . a certain amount of progress. They had bitter strikes and there were bitter fights, not only with the manufacturers or the industrialists, also with the government of that day. They were accused of everything -- Bolsheviks, . . . -- people that came to our democratic America and tried to disturb the general situation; and it's taken over 50 years for some of them to realize that Labour is a factor and a legitimate partner in the economic life of this country, either Canada or the United States.

In my life I have at all times tried to tell my children of that struggle, and it was a bitter struggle, which I would not take the time now to emphasize it; and in order to . . . this for my grandchildren in case they'll ask me "what have you done in connection with the improvement of labour? Why didn't you speak on this resolution?" I am taking the liberty of a few minutes to put myself on record at what I think about the general situation, and I have no intention to speak in detail.

My first statement is that the time has come with the help of the industrialists and with the help of the progressive legislation in this House which we fought for for many years -- I still remember when we have suggested something it was turned down because it came from this part of the Opposition, and I still remember vividly that a certain important bill we introduced for years, it was always defeated. Suddenly one of the ex-Minister's of Labour came up and introduced an identical Bill and when we asked him "where were you last year?" -- and the record is in the journals -- he said, "I have a right to change my mind." I agree with him. Everybody has a right to change their mind, and the government -- the best government and the present government have changed their minds to the good, and more and more they realize that labour is an essential partner in the economy of our province and they're taking them in. They're consulting them for awhile, and we came to realize in 1963, although we have not realized in 1940 or 1930, realized that this is the only thing to do, in order to keep peace in the family of the industrialists and of the labour people, because strikes are really costly, and everything could be done on negotiations; everything could be done on consultation; and I am proud to say now that the government of the present and the government of the last ten years have made progress and I hope that this progress will continue. Once and for all we must realize that in order to have peace in the family each one who contributes to the economy of the province must have a voice in it, and Labour -- I'm not asking for labour the main voice, but they are there. They are a very important part of the partnership between labour and industry and the government.

The development of Canadian economy, of Manitoba economy, will benefit not only Management and Labour, but they'll benefit the whole community. There'll be no suffering of people being out of work, and there's no suffering for anyone if the workers get a fair portion

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . of the profits of the industry. There's no necessity -- a small profit doesn't hurt anybody and the industry today are just as anxious to have peace and goodwill between labour and industry, although they may have opposed it years ago. They recognize the unions now. They recognize the good work and the progress that the unions have made, and have taken them in as an equal partnership, and I'd like to see the Minister of Labour, who is the head of that Department, to see that this is continued and progress to be made, so we will not see some workers starving because they are laid off on account of not sufficient work, and we will not see, like two patients going to a doctor with a belly-ache, one is from over-eating and perhaps one is from under-eating.

I feel that the government, the Department of Labour in particular, should set up a joint committee -- labour, management, government and consumers -- because the consumer suffers if the people have no work and they're unemployed and the purchasing power drops, and even industry suffers and particularly the government suffers by having to subsidize them under the Social Allowance or any other agency which the province or the people -- the taxpayers of the province -- have to see that there is no starvation and there's no suffering, because through no fault of their own they are out of work. No one individual -- it will have to be proven to me if there is one -- wants to be idle and wants to go to the Unemployment Insurance in refusing a job, because Unemployment Insurance is only starvation. If there is one, then make an example of him, but you cannot make an example of one among 900,000 people in this province.

This committee should keep in touch with changes being made, with changes that are taking place, and keep groups informed as to developments so that action may be taken at all levels to meet the changes. If co-operation can take the place of conflict, many sections of the Labour Relations Act might be changed, including those relating to strike votes and the making of unions into legal entities. My personal appeal is that it is in the interest of the government and the interest of their appointment as the one to handle it, the late Minister of Labour, in the interest of consumers, in the interest of the welfare of the province, is get together and let's see that everyone gets his rights, his portion of the welfare of the province. There should not be one who suffers and one who piles up profits. Each and every one is entitled to his share.

I am sorry, Sir, to have taken up your time, but I felt to place myself on record and my grandchildren will not ask me, "where were you when this important item was discussed?"

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 passed

HON. J. B. CARROLL (The Pas): If no one else wishes to speak at this time, perhaps I should comment on some of the remarks which have been made to date. The Member for Seven Oaks was concerned about a particular case that went before the Workmen's Compensation Board, and while I can't tell him any of the details of that particular case, if he would speak to me privately after, I would be very pleased to get further particulars on it for him. I will say this, though, that every effort is made by the Board to handle their cases expeditiously, and obviously there has been some doubt about this particular case and this is the one that always causes concern for members of the Workmen's Compensation Board, because there are always borderline cases where there is some doubt as to whether the case is a compensable case, whether the injury was actually -- the action actually occurred during the course of employment, and things of that kind -- medical evidence as to whether this may have been an old injury which was recurring and things of that kind; so that I would like to get further particulars on it for him and I'm quite sure that in any cases of this kind the Board does try conscientiously to arrive at the right decision, and in every case where there is doubt and there's reasonable doubt, the weight is always in favour of the injured workman. We now have a full-time Workmen's Compensation Board and I know that the members are putting a great deal of time and effort into cases these days, and I'm sure that the cases are being very adequately considered and every protection is being given that's reasonably possible to workmen who have been injured and make claim through The Workmen's Compensation Board.

The Member for Rhineland was concerned -- and I'm sorry that he's not in the House at the moment -- about the needle trades in his area and the large rate of turnover. I really can't account for the large rate of turnover except in the area in which he's concerned there are a lot of new workers involved, and I rather suspect that many of these people do not have the

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . aptitude for that kind of work. This may be found out early in the course of their employment and they are let go at that stage. I also believe that in many cases they employ a lot of younger girls who, for one reason or other, decide to leave employment with the purpose of marriage in mind. We do make some arrangements with these employers in new areas where there isn't a pool of skilled labour, whereby they can start at somewhat below the going rate of wage for a certain specified period of time to enable them to build a competent labour force and to assist them in getting under way in their new industry.

The Member for Rhineland also wondered about winter work, particularly as it applied to farm labour. And I would like to say that every effort is made by the department to try to stimulate winter work among industry in general, and in particular the municipalities of the province. And the members are all aware of the "Do it Now" program; the billboards which are purchased; the advertisements that appear in our newspapers from time to time trying to stimulate and encourage industry to provide work during the course of winter months. I'm sure the House will be interested to know, too, that our winter works program is quite successful this year. We have a very substantial increase over last year with a 41 percent increase in the numbers of individuals who are engaged in winter work, and many of these will employ farm labour through the various municipal offices.

The Member for Portage la Prairie was concerned about the examination for television people. I'm sure that he will be aware that the House last year, I believe, unanimously passed this legislation which had the effect of including television people among those who will be licensed, in future, under The Electricians Licence Act in the Metropolitan area and in the other cities of the province. With respect to the municipalities in the province who are not incorporated as cities, the application of this Act may come into force with a resolution of council. I hope that the effect of this will be to encourage qualified people to engage in this business and it will discourage those who may not be qualified. And I think there is some evidence, through stories that have been published by the Better Business Bureau, through tests that have been conducted by some of our local newspapers, that there are people engaged in this business who are either completely unethical or who do not have the proper knowledge with respect to the job in which they are engaged. We hope that the Member for Portage would want to have qualified people working in his area. We would hope that he would want to see this kind of protection given to the citizens in his community. And certainly every effort will be made to include any experienced people who have basic qualifications, and to begin with we aren't going to be maybe quite as tough in examination as we might be as time goes on. Those who are already engaged in this business will be given every opportunity to write and to pass, and I'm quite sure that those who have experience will not have any great difficulty. We're providing for not only written examinations but oral examinations for those who may have difficulty with the theory part of it but who may know quite well, and have adequate training in the experienced ends, in the practical end of repairing television sets.

Now the Member for Inkster -- and I'm sorry that he's out of the House because I think he made a very constructive speech this afternoon. He remembers the days of the sweatshops; the early days when immigrants were badly treated by employers in this country; and the fight that they had to gain recognition, first of all from their employers, and secondly from various governments, and I hope that he paid a tribute to us when he said that he hoped that we would continue to progress as we have been in recent times. We agree with the philosophy that workers should get a fair return, and we also think it's proper that the employers should get a fair profit, which I believe is what he suggested in his remarks.

He also went on to say that he hoped that a joint committee could be established of labour, management, government and consumers, and I would like to make the same kind of remark that I made the other day that something after this style is being considered by legislation this year in a bill which will be presented by the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and we think that this is a very realistic approach, and in fact is the very approach that has been so successful in some European countries.

The Member for St. John's also made, I think, a very constructive speech. I don't agree with everything that he said in it, mind you. We talked about the conditions for labour here in Manitoba and the fact that probably things were slanted here in favour of industry. And I believe, if I remember correctly, he made some reference to the COMEF Report, so I have

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . taken the liberty of taking a small quote from that report which I hope will cast some light on this subject -- (Interjection) -- It's in context. I'll read the paragraph: "As a result of this assessment" -- and I presume they're talking about the whole assessment of Labour and Management -- "As a result of this assessment the Committee has concluded that, although such legislation has a direct and significant effect on the cost of doing business, it does not have the effect at the present time of placing either Manitoba industry or labour at any measurable advantage or disadvantage compared with industry and labour in the adjoining provinces." In other words, labour is not at any disadvantage with respect to our legislation and in relation to the Province of Saskatchewan, or the Province of Alberta, or the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec -- and I believe these were the provinces that were being compared by the COMEF Report.

He also referred to the philosophy of the government, and I believe he said the Liberals and Conservatives -- I'm not sure of that -- as being one of trying to keep Labour happy; just trying to keep them from rising up, I suppose, in revolt, or something. He also went on to say that he believed in a co-operative approach, and I quite agree with this, that we should have a co-operative approach, but I'd like to go a little further and say that really the prevailing standards of wages and working conditions, fringe benefits and all of these things, are not established by the government, and I don't believe that he would want the government to impose these standards, or unduly influence these standards. These prevailing rates, etcetera, are arrived at by negotiation and we think this is a very proper way of doing it, and the way in which it's being done in European countries. I'd like to just quote, if I could, here the -- if I can find it -- the attitude that is being taken now in the United States. The Secretary of Labour, Arthur Goldberg -- the former Secretary of Labour; he's now gone to the Supreme Court -- he stated his United States policy some time ago, and I'm quoting: "Hitherto government mediated only. Now government is concerned with the character of the settlement. Government is intent on seeing that the agreements follow the government guide lines."

In other words, the Government of the United States is taking an active part in these negotiations and trying to establish that wage rates don't get out of line with what the government feel is the desirable level for wages and things of that kind, and I would like to just read again if I could, into the record at this time what William Mahoney said. I read it the other day and I'm going to read it again -- The National Director of the United Steel Workers of America who said this: "Like us" -- and he was talking about the European situation -- "Like us on both union and management sides, they were united in their desire for a minimum of state interference, but unlike us up until now, they realized that the price they had to pay for their independence from the state was to jointly agree to place the public interest first and to co-operate in the public interest. You could not have both independence and irresponsibility." In other words, William Mahoney doesn't think the government should establish the rates of pay in anything but the very minimum, and that's what we're doing. We're establishing the bare minimum. We think that any other approach should come from the free negotiation between labour and management with one exception -- bearing in mind the public interest. I think this is the whole key to the success in Europe, that we have this responsible attitude, bearing in mind the public interest. Well, I think that's really all I wanted to say at this time on that particular point.

Now the next item that he raised was the question of Vacations with Pay Act, and I believe I did say in the House that we had introduced The Vacations with Pay Act and I must give him credit because he did score a debating point there. Being of a legal mind he's looking for technicalities, I suppose. What I should have said was: "We introduced a bill on Vacations with Pay which had the effect of giving two weeks after one year, and giving protection to those people who were not getting that kind of vacation at the present time."

The original principle of the Vacation with Pay Act -- I suppose it's maybe wise to mention it at the moment -- was that an employee was entitled after a year's employment to a holiday, and I think there are many people today who want to interpret this to mean that really it shouldn't be a holiday, it should be an increase in wages. If you only work five months you should get holiday pay in relation to the five-month period in which you worked -- and I think probably in some agreements this may be so. But the original intent of the Vacation Pay Bill was that a person was entitled to a rest; to get away from work and come back refreshed; to

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . spend the time with his family. But I think this idea has become distorted in recent years. And I think that the construction industry did a very good thing when they implemented, or came to the government and said, "We know that we can't pay vacation pay to most of our employees because most of them don't work with us for 12 months, because they move from job to job. Our job may only last three months here when we need carpenters and then we need the other trades following up." So they came to the government -- possibly as a result of negotiation with their union -- and said, "We believe we should make our contribution on a monthly basis and that it should go to the government to be held to be paid out to our employees at the end of a year's work." I give the employers full credit for having come to us and asked for this kind of an arrangement to be made. It hasn't been requested by employers in other parts of Manitoba, and that's really why it is applying only to the Metropolitan area at the present time. It has on occasions been extended beyond the Winnipeg area, at the request of employers. It was in effect at Thompson, I believe, and I'm not sure whether it has applied to other places as well.

The next point was the harmful legislation that we brought in last year -- harmful with respect to labour -- and referred, I think, specifically to one bill. I'm just wondering whether the Member for St. John's has taken the time to read some of the other protections and some of the other advantages that labour was getting in that particular controversial bill, because there were several other features to it besides the ones that he probably considers to be harmful to the labour movement in general. I would commend him to study the Act and see if there isn't a great deal of merit in that legislation besides those features that he's specifically referring to.

The Conciliation Service -- saying that we're understaffed, I believe -- but to my knowledge there have been no delays at the Conciliation Officer stage. I believe that we're giving an excellent service. I do agree that these people work a lot of extra hours partly because other negotiating members cannot meet during normal business hours, -- some of them have to meet after hours -- but I will say that they're a dedicated group and they're doing an excellent conciliation service, but I don't believe that there has been any -- there have been cases brought, to my mind, where any negotiation has been held up or impeded in any way as the result of our officers not being able to service the negotiations in a proper way. Now, I think he probably mentioned the Labour Board and I will say that at this stage there can be many delays, many of them of a legal and technical nature, and I must say that they're procedural delays caused by, generally, members of his profession who find all kinds of roadblocks to put in the way of the hearings of the board. I don't mean to reflect unkindly towards his profession, but unfortunately, to lay people we find these delays sometimes quite needless when men of common sense should be able to sit down and get these things processed much more quickly. However, these happen. We apologize for them. We can do nothing about them, because there are at the same time protections built in there which benefit both sides.

The Conciliation Board. I believe that there have been delays as the result of the appointment of conciliation boards, and it's understandable that when three busy men are appointed to a board, it's difficult to get all of those three men together at a certain time and on a certain day that is satisfactory to them all, and you have to -- besides those conciliation board members -- you also have to get the negotiators from the Management and Labour side at the same time, and so forth. So our difficulties -- because sometimes, the union representative may be in Calgary doing business, or out in Vancouver or some other place, and the employer may at the same time be away doing business in the east or something else. So there are delays of this kind and we are trying to, I must confess, get away from the use of conciliation boards as much as possible. We think the best conciliation is the kind of -- or at least the best solutions are those that are found by the employer and his employees by themselves, without any help from the government, but failing that, we think they can be solved in most cases at the Conciliation Officer stage, if there is bargaining in good faith on both sides. We have as a matter of policy been trying to discourage conciliation boards, and we think that in future the people applying may have to make a pretty good case for a board before it's established, and I think we have provided in our estimates some decrease in amount for conciliation boards, because as a matter of policy we don't think there are as many necessary today as have been used in the past, and I think other jurisdictions feel the same way.

With respect to the appointment of arbitration boards. There have been delays at times

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . and I think that I can say at the moment that we have solved any administrative defects that may have been present in our department, and we hope that there will be no delays of the kind that were referred to by the Member for St. John's when he said that we did not always appoint them immediately following the seven-day period in which the other parties have to appoint their members of the board.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, I thought I could bring it up under some item, but it's dealing with compensation, I don't see any item, so I guess I have to bring it up here. Mr. Chairman, I was looking over the annual report of the Compensation Board today, and I notice that their beginning balance -- at the beginning of 1962 -- was \$29,639,000 some odd hundred dollars. At the end of the year, it's \$30,684,000.00. It's increased, and I was always under the impression that why we weren't increasing our benefits under the Workmen's Compensation and trying to rectify some of the benefits that people should have, such as the widows that were left and people on a low income and were getting a low rate for the compensation, that these are one of the benefits that they could have looked into, so I thought I better go back and take a look a little further back, and I find out that from year to year, the amount in the Compensation Board is always increasing. At the beginning of 1960, it was \$25 million and it's gone up every year since. I think, Mr. Chairman, that in view of this money building up and at a rapid rate, that although the Minister has brought in some amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act -- he's brought in a bill and they're going to do something -- I don't think that they're going quite far enough, that they could take a closer look and see what they could do for these past injuries of people that were on low incomes and had to live on a very small pension, and in view of the huge amount that we have in the fund at this time, I think that the Minister should take a real close look at it, and I thought while I was on my feet -- I notice that the Member from St. Boniface is not here -- oh, there he is -- I would like to refer to him for just a minute. He said that we felt that we were the only ones that were concerned about labour and labour problems. He's always far off. He couldn't have been further from the truth. We know we aren't the only ones that are concerned. He's the one who tries to give the impression that we are the only ones that are concerned. We aren't the only ones that are concerned; and he talked about the minimum wage when he was speaking the other day. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, where the honourable member was on January 14, 1963, when at the annual convention -- and this is a story that appeared in the Free Press -- "The Manitoba Liberal Party Saturday took a stand against an increase in Manitoba's 66 cents an hour minimum wage. Delegates to the Party's annual meeting rejected a resolution which urged a substantial increase in the minimum wage. The resolution had claimed there are members of the community suffering from conditions of hardship and degradation, because the present minimum wage is insufficient." Only one speaker on that resolution, then he can get up in the House and say that we are the only ones that are interested. Well, on the basis of what he did at his annual convention, I don't think he was very interested in labour, so perhaps he had a point when he said we are the only ones that are interested.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . the Honourable Member for Elmwood, I don't think the Honourable Member for St. Boniface needs any help, but I'd like to say that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was with me and we both voted for that increase, so he can't blame him for it.

Now the other thing that the Honourable Member for Elmwood

MR. PETERS: . . . vociferously at the convention as he does here.

MR. HILLHOUSE: The other matter that the Honourable Member brought up was the matter of the increase in the funds in the Workmen's Compensation Board. I wonder if the honourable member understands how these funds are built up? I wonder if he understands that all these claims are funded and that that fund will increase from year to year depending upon the number of claims that are to be paid out of it?

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I thank my honourable friend for his remarks. I am glad that he mentioned this thing about the minimum wages, because apparently I was misunderstood by the press anyway, when I spoke about this, and I had intended to correct it. I was expecting that his Leader had warned me that he was going to give me a few words. I was waiting for this. I might say this, that I fully recognize the importance of the Minimum Wage, and I feel that it's a real problem though, and I'm not ashamed of what

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . the Liberals did. Politically it was a mistake, there's no doubt. The thing is that they all agree, the same as I do, the same as apparently the members of the government, that it is an important thing. What I tried to say, the other day -- apparently I didn't do too well -- what I tried to say the other day on Tuesday night -- not -- the paper is quoted as saying that I had helped the case of the low minimum wages, and this is not true; or if it is, it's certainly not what I had in mind. The only thing that I was trying to bring out is the problem. It's not just a cut and dried thing and \$1.00, \$1.50, that is not the solution. This is not the way to do this. What I was trying to say, we have to remember first of all, the value of the man. That's an important thing. I don't think that you people want to feel that we're against labour if we feel that they shouldn't be paid for something they don't do. This is a difficult thing. This is welfare. But we're talking about labour and just pay now. This is the first thing I was trying to say, that this is an important thing, and then there are other factors also.

What I did say to start with, that it is the duty and it should be the dictate of the conscience of everybody to see the people working for them receive livable wages. That's the important thing. Livable wages might be a certain amount in a certain spot and somewhere else it might be something else and I think that should be considered, and when I give this little story of -- maybe a fellow that's practically a moron, but still he has to live, and he's no good at all to an employer. I know that some people in the back who might say, "Oh, yes, they've used these people as cheap labour", and I admit that, but it is not the case that I'm trying to build. This is not a case; I'm just giving an example that you, yourself, or anybody might feel sorry for the man, and he doesn't know what to do with himself. Instead of having him spend his time in the beer parlor, they'll say, "Okay, push this broom," and they don't need this at all, and you know that's being done. You know there's some people that are doing that. Either a man had an injury at work and he has nothing; they say "Okay, we'll give him some kind of a job", and he's not needed at that job and he's not doing a thing. Well, you will stop some of this if you have the minimum wages too high, and the same thing with the children, as they come in after school and keep the store for awhile. There again. So you see, as I said again, and I'll repeat, I'm not ashamed of what the Liberals did that day. I'd be more ashamed if they, just to be on the safe side, said "This is going to look bad and I'm sure that the NDPs will jump on us the next session. Let's do something fast and have one of those meaningless resolutions." I don't go for that kind of stuff. I think that they were very sincere, and it's a tough problem. Maybe we weren't smart enough to come in with a solution. We're still working on a solution, and I think that the members across from us are doing the same thing. It's not that the people are afraid or that. There's nobody that wants to see the people in labour receive bad wages except some unscrupulous employers.

MR. PETERS: And there are some!

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, definitely, and I've always said that. But there are also some on the other side. We're all human. There's not the group that's lily white and the other that's black -- all black. This is impossible, and this is why I said this party is wrong with their attitude that there's only labour and everybody else is crooked or trying to do . . .

MR. PETERS: You're the one that always said it.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right I'm the one that always said -- all right. Well we'll go back to that famous night of April 23rd and on Page 1578 this is what was said, and at the top of the page it doesn't say Mr. Desjardins -- it says Mr. Harris, and that's not my name.

MR. PETERS: You look like him.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I've got a few pounds on him, I think. "The New Democratic Party and its predecessor the CCF, came into being and exists today to fight for the common man." I said that he was sincere in saying that. I'm still saying this. "It is composed mainly of such men who have found through bitter experience that they must have their . . ." -- which is wrong. If you allow somebody to work on a party of people that are bitter -- that's wrong. That's why they have blinkers on each side. They can only see one thing -- if they're bitter -- because you shouldn't be bitter. I'd better watch out. I know what you'll come back and say -- I'm bitter on a certain subject and you're right. "It is composed mainly of such men who have found through bitter experience that they must have their own party to look after their own particular interests, which proves" -- I'm just reading -- "which proves -- I don't care what you say -- we know we are fighting for the common man and we are the only people that I think have

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . the interests of the common man, because we are people of that kind." Now I didn't say this. This is what I said: "I think that unfortunately when we start on labour it seems that a group here in this House feel, and today a member was doing very well who" -- I didn't think this was that bad and that awful to read -- "and today a member was doing very well and I think that he was very sincere but then he said that they were the only people interested in the common man." That's all I said. I'm not doubting the sincerity of this group, but I wish that they didn't doubt our sincerity, and I think that we are -- I think that every member -- I don't think that there's a monopoly -- there's a law against a certain group and before you join you have your initiation and you say you must kick your fellow man in the face. I don't think that that's right. I think that in all parties you have people that are definitely interested in their fellow man. Now I think that this group is interested, maybe a little strongly -- they accuse us of maybe going for management -- maybe these people are interested maybe too strongly for the head of those unions who are more capitalist than we are. Those people make an awful lot more money than I do, or more money than probably anybody here. -- (Interjection) -- A lot of them. All right. This will be in . . . ; we'll check this tomorrow. You might be sorry when you have to pay my bills. But in the meantime . . .

MR. E. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): I worked for an undertaker. I know.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well I'm not in that field. I'm a mortician, I'm sorry. But in the meantime, in the meantime I wish to say that I'm very sincere and I don't doubt the sincerity of my friends. I don't want to get them mad. But a few years ago, as I stated on that day, a few years ago I said, "Well let's keep the undesirable people" -- and they had some in labour -- people like Hoffa -- and I think -- sure I was told that they could never prove anything on him; he's too smart. I admit that; and when he's so smart he's dangerous; and he's not a common man when he can spend \$27,000 on his daughter's wedding. -- (Interjection) -- "You see this is not right. Don't fight for a man like that", and I was told "it's none of your darn business," and "he can come here", and all of a sudden Mr. Jodoin said, "I'm sorry that I spoke for Banks to bring him in here." This is the point that I was trying to make.

MR. PETERS: Well Banks wasn't marrying his daughter. It was Banks' son marrying somebody's daughter.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think he was -- I don't know if he's mixed up with the question that I asked the honourable member on the sex questionnaire that I was talking about the other day, but I'm not talking about this now, Mr. Chairman. I was just trying to make this point that there's sincerity in this party, I don't doubt. I'm not denying it, but I don't think there's too much sincerity when you say "we're the only ones that are interested." One point that this group brought last year was this -- these votes and strikes -- these secret ballots. Well how can anybody for labour be against it? I don't know. I mean against that point. Because secret ballots are wrong and who said that?

MR. PETERS: I never said they were wrong. I said we do have secret ballots.

MR. SCHREYER: Will the member permit a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Sure.

MR. SCHREYER: I want to ask the member -- (Interjection) -- No, but I want to ask the Member two questions. He mentions Hoffa and how Banks, I take it, and somehow he tries to work it in to some kind of reference to the New Democratic Party, and I want to ask him this. No. 1. Is he aware that Hoffa, among all the fairly high-ranking labour leaders, does he know that Hoffa is definitely opposed to the C. L. C. and Canadian Labour for its political action? Hoffa tends to support the old party system in a broad sense -- and No. 2 is: You mention Hal Banks -- are you aware that he was brought into the country after the former Federal Liberal Government took extraordinary procedures regarding the Department of Citizenship and Immigration?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't aware of that because I don't spend my time reading about those characters. I can only say this -- (Interjection) -- I can only say this that as far as Hoffa -- I did not try and award this in a deal against the NDP -- but in 1961 I stood here and I asked for better co-operation between management, labour and government, and I still feel -- I don't agree with the Minister when he stands up and this is all we've done, and I don't agree with the previous administration. I think that you should bring in legislation

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . in this field only when you have to. I think that it has to be built like everything else between two human beings -- between two groups -- on honesty and sincerity, and then when the groups can't get together because of the fault of one or the other, then the government should step in and they should -- those two groups should suffer the consequences. That's what I said, and while I was saying this I said well we have enough trouble, and I mentioned the fact that we were very fortunate in this labour business here in Manitoba that we haven't had too many strikes and that the leaders all seem to be very sincere people -- the labour leaders -- but I said that I hope -- at the time they were talking about Hoffa coming here for a big reunion of some kind, and I said "We don't need him here." This is what I said, and I can find this if I'm not believed. I can find this and where the then member of St. John's and the NDP jumped on me for this, and I was wrong and I should mind my own business, and the only point that I made last Tuesday night, was that -- the only point that I made -- that Claude Jodoin changed his mind, and he was sorry -- he was probably responsible for that measure that you said the former government had done because in this article he was saying himself that he had worked so hard for Banks and he was sorry he had made a mistake -- and this is the only thing that I was mentioning, and I don't want to start a big battle on this. I was glad to have the opportunity to be able to correct this feeling that I probably left -- this feeling that I was against -- I was in favour of a low minimum wage, because I'm not, but I recognize that it's a problem and I haven't got the full solution and I'm sure and I hope that we'll get it soon, and I hope that either the NDP -- I'll be glad to go along if they bring something -- not just \$2.00 or \$1.50 period, and to heck with the worries -- the government will worry about that. I don't care who brings it in. But in the meantime I recognize it's a problem and I'm not ashamed of what the Liberals did. I admire them. I admire them to say if we're not ready, we'll look into this later on, and I can say that I haven't heard of any one who was against a minimum wage but they want something realistic. This is not a thing that we should play politics on, and this is --(Interjection)-- one more minute. This is the only point that I was trying to make. I don't doubt the sincerity of this group except when they say "we are the only ones who we think are in favour of labour." That is wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the interest of the common man, we're about ready to pass the first item of the Minister's salary. Most of these items that we are discussing now will come further along.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I am qualifying it. In the first place I deny definitely that we ever claimed that we are the only ones who are interested in the suffering of the people. We have made suggestions, and when the Liberal -- the Opposition -- did something good, we supported them, and when the front benchers did something good, we have supported them. We have never mentioned that we are the only ones. All we want is for you to support our contention if possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 passed. Item 2; Item 3

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I was out of the Chamber briefly this afternoon when the Honourable Minister spoke, but I wonder whether he answered my query re unemployment insurance for farm workers.

A MEMBER: You'll read it in Hansard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3 passed.

MR. MOLGAT: A question came up last year regarding the Stationary Engineers, and I asked the Minister then whether he would give consideration to licensing those who are presently in their jobs as a result of an oral exam rather than a written exam, because I think he's familiar with the problem, that there are across the province in many of the smaller power plants, people who do not have the required standards at the moment. Most of them are men who are getting on in years, have been out of school for a long time and are not in a position to take a written exam such as required under the Act, and get their proper papers. I wonder if he has given consideration in the past year -- he said he would -- to putting these people through an oral test, making sure that they know that they can handle the plant that they're presently in, and giving them the required papers, so as to get these people settled once and for all and get away from the problems that come up regularly with his inspectors.

MR. L. HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak a few words on this Employment Standards Act. I'd like to draw the attention of the people here to say that we have no

(Mr. Harris, cont'd.) . . . protection for people working in low temperatures in these various plants. There are people working in these various plants from 35 to 40 degrees all day long and standing at the table packing meats, and the meats are coming in half frozen. Now this is not very good for their health. I would say that a person working in a place like that, day after day, and year after year, is bound to contract some lung disease. I don't know, it might be TB, but I say that under our present Act -- I've gone to the Acting Minister of Labour to try and find if there was anything in our Act here that could protect these people, because when you go to the people in these various plants that control them -- and even if you have an agreement -- in there they say you have nothing under the Act that could possibly tell us what to do.

Now I would say that we should have to bring a section in here and I would urge the government to do so, to put teeth in this Act; to protect the so-called people in the plants. As I said we have those working in these different plants and they are packing various foods away. The stuff comes in there, it is ice-cold. There are fans blowing over their heads and with this low temperature it doesn't make very good. Then again, we have men going from low temperature up on to a hog kill, from 80 to 90 degrees temperature. They go from a place that is about 40 to 50 degrees; they go up into this hog kill, into this hot temperature. I don't want to appear this way, that I'm trying to bring every little thing in, but these chaps -- just to show how some people are -- it comes noon and these chaps have to go up on the kill. What happens? The employer says, "You change your clothes to go on this kill in your own time." A man has an hour for lunch, but no, it's not his hour. He's got to change his clothes in that time and go back on that kill, and furthermore when he comes off, he goes and changes his clothes and goes right back into the cooler again. There's no man going to go home -- every man has to live and every penny that comes in, he needs. So I say let's put some teeth in this Act and let's see that these people are protected. Because if we don't protect them we're going to pay for them anyway and it's going to come out of our taxes. So, therefore, Sir, I would say that we should possibly do something all the way along for these people.

Now I will just give you a little skit here that I more or less wrote up. There are those working in cooler packing meats where the temperatures range from 40 to 45 degrees. The meat coming in on the trolleys is half frozen and there is a big fan over the top of the meat products beside the girls, which causes them great discomfort regardless of how many clothes they wear. Because of this type of refrigeration they are continually getting sick and losing time from work, and this could cause TB. And furthermore, in another plant there are men working under refrigeration of 45 to 50 degrees who have to go from there on a hog kill where the temperatures range from 80 to 95 degrees. Now here is the sad feature. When these men are finished the hog killing they have to go back to work in the refrigerated conditions for the remainder of the day. Does that make for a healthy employee? No. Another circumstance that comes out when we talk of management being kind: These chaps are sent to a hog kill. If the kill starts after lunch, they are told to change their clothes on their own time, which in this case is their lunch time. This just proves that in our estimation an injustice is done to these men all the way through.

The Acting Minister of Labour on page 1582 of Hansard, dated April 23rd, 1963, says, and I quote: "Now in those areas of work where there is a real health hazard, then I think the Department of Labour likes to lean on the service of the Department of Health." We know that in the Department of Labour there are inspectors whose duty it is to continually tour all plants and places of work to ensure that the working conditions there are safe and healthy. Under this Act now I've yet to see a health inspector that we could turn to to stop this discrimination against these people who are working underneath these conditions. I know in Ontario they have an Act that covers the situation. In Ontario they have an Act that covers more or less the situation. I have looked it up, Chapter 130, Section 43 1(a) Ontario Factory and Shops and Office Building Act. I quote: "They shall heat the premises throughout and regulate the temperature so as to be suitable for the work to be performed therein and not to be injurious to the health and comfort of the employees, but in no case shall the temperature be less than 68, unless authorized by the inspector in writing."

Now, Sir, I went to our Acting Minister and I asked him whether there was anything there, and he was very good, very obliging, I'll say that for him, and he did all he could possibly for me -- I'm not doing this with any rancour. A lot of people think that I feel bitter, as

(Mr. Harris, cont'd.) . . . I to be. I don't feel bitter; I feel I have something to do for my fellow man. If I feel that way, that's my concern. I don't feel that anybody else has to feel any different. I am here to do a job and I'm trying to do that job. Mr. Hamilton -- Mr. Carroll sent me this note and it was sent to him, Mr. Carroll -- here's Mr. Hamilton sending this thing: "Here in Manitoba there is no specific section of the Act that deals with heating. It is at the Minister's discretion. The standard for heating is not less than 68 degrees. If it is below that temperature special clothing should be granted. Summer work is a matter of comfort and type of industry." Well, you see, if there was an Act here to provide the protection that should go with this thing here -- this is just word of mouth -- there's no teeth to it whatsoever. As I say, we have a lot of Acts here that need to be amended badly. We are getting now we're not taking no baby steps anymore; we walk like a man and I'm pleased to see that. So we should think like a man, and we should go out and see to these various Acts and see that they should possibly be amended so that everybody should get the possible protection that comes. The way it is right now, in these plants they're organized. They can't do a thing because it says there's nothing in the Act that can possibly protect you. You either do that and if labour gets up there, the people get up there and do anything, they're "out looking for trouble." If they walk off a job, "see what Labour does -- they're just a bunch of communists, that's what they are. They're only out there to protect their own right." So, as you see, we have a lot of work to do here and I'm just bringing this up to show some of the things that we should possibly do. Thank you!

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, under the Employment Standards Act, I'd like to say a few words about a group

MR. CHAIRMAN: on Item 3. We're on Item 3 now

MR. WRIGHT: I wish to speak about a group that I feel is not protected or covered by The Employment Standards Act, and as I said before I think we're very fortunate in having the Employment Standards Act. I refer now to newspaper carrier boys, and I want to speak as a former paper boy because this will give me authority, and it will prove that through hard work and initiative that "local boy makes good." You know -- this sort of thing. In fact every businessman who doesn't have a diploma on the wall these days to show that he was once a newspaper boy just hasn't arrived yet. They have these clubs now, you know, where you can apply, if you ever delivered papers, and you'll get a diploma. This is the corporate image of the successful man. Well, familiarity breeds contempt, and the sight of small boys dragging heavy loads has become commonplace, and I suggest we take this matter from the realm of Horatio Alger and examine it. Now, Mr. Chairman, I delivered newspapers at a very early age. I delivered the Winnipeg Telegram when they used to be at the corner of Albert and McDermot Street -- and that's not yesterday. I also delivered the Winnipeg Tribune, because you see I was very discerning, even at an early age. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I delivered papers when the old woman on Carlton Street was still a young girl, and at that time their editorials didn't reflect the frustration of old age, or whatever it is that is causing it to produce the editorials so vindictive today, and I think that sometimes these editorials might haunt the spirit of the great John Daffoe.

Now the age of a newsboy is governed by how much his remuneration will buy, in my opinion. A boy of say 14, 15 and 16, many of whom have acquired modern social habits and who have even taken up smoking -- you just can't get along on the amount of money that you get from delivering newspapers. So we now see children of much younger years delivering them, and I notice that there are at the present time two groups of boys on tour -- and this is a wonderful thing -- but in reading about these tours that the newspapers give the boys, I notice that the average age is 13, so that makes many of them 11 years of age. I notice, too, Mr. Chairman, that under Section 905 of The Municipal Act there's very little in there -- in fact nothing in there -- that gives the municipality the right to protect these lads. My interest in this matter arose in 1957 while I was Mayor of the Municipality of West Kildonan, when I had occasion one Saturday afternoon to stop my car and assist a young boy of 11 years of age to cross the street -- he had collapsed, by the way with his load of papers -- and I assisted him to the curb. In fact, we had to take him to the doctor. When I asked him how old he was, he told me that he was 11 years of age. Now I notice, too, and I'm bringing up this business of familiarity breeding contempt because I think we're all guilty of it. Newspapers are getting heavier. I

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) noticed that, I believe, yesterday, there were 52 pages in the paper, and I think it is not uncommon on some Saturdays now to have as high as 70 pages in it. Well, Mr. Chairman, when I brought this matter up in 1957 at a Council Meeting I did it because I felt that someone had to say something about these young lads carrying these loads. The immediate reaction was a scathing editorial in one of the papers -- and I'm at a loss to understand which one it was -- chiding me for my mollycoddling of youth, and all this sort of thing. In fact, it was such an important issue that I made the national news on this occasion.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in work and I believe in discipline, and I believe that a lot of our young people would be much better off today if they did have family chores to do, so I'm not looking at it from the point of view that I want to in any way mollycoddle our children, but I do believe we are living in an age of wonderful progress. In fact you go out to the golf courses -- and I haven't had time to take up golf -- but I'm told that they even have mechanized caddie carts for the male now who wants to get exercise. I happen to be a supervisor in industry and I know that you can't get a man to lift a weight any more; he waits for the crane. And I see all these blessings of the mechanical age, but I'm aghast at some of the loads that these children are carrying. Now you'll notice, if you're observing, that there's a new trend in the carrying of newspapers, and they now carry the band of the bag across their forehead, much in the manner of a mature man who at the Trappers Festival is trying to walk off with 600 pounds of flour, and this places a terrific strain on the small bones of the neck of a boy of 11 years of age. I notice, too, that the newspaper companies are not too concerned; that they come along in the evening in wintertime, throw off the bundles in the street -- some of them -- in my area I think the Tribune has a depot where the boys can receive their papers in some sort of comfort where there's heat, and they're to be commended on this. But on the other hand, I see the other paper company throwing them off at the curb; the papers blow all over the street; the boys are asked to sort their papers under these kind of conditions.

I think the one remaining reminder on our city streets, Mr. Chairman, of the days of the packhorse is our young children who are delivering papers. We saw the end of the horse cars, street cars, but this to me is still a reminder that we have much to do. Now what I'm asking for here is that the Department of Labour should look into this, inasmuch as our young boys who are delivering papers do not come under compensation -- they are classed as self-employed businessmen -- and this is all to the good. It certainly teaches them some of the laws of business -- but I think that we should do something to see that they are given some minimum of protection. I often wonder how much of the work of the chiropractor, the osteopath and the physiotherapist in later years is not attributable to our neglect in looking at this problem when these young people are doing this job.

MR. S. CHERNIACK (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, there was something I wanted to mention and possibly the Honourable Minister would prefer that I did so before he responded. Under the Employment Standards I'm wondering if he's going to be in a position to give us information as to how many inspectors there are; how many infractions have been noted and how many prosecutions as a result of it. And I'd like him to deal, if he will, with the question of government prosecuting in the cases where infractions have taken place. I think that one of the faults that we have had is that it has been left to the employee agreed to launch the prosecution, and certainly that employee would not be in a position to continue in his job very comfortably if at the same time he has launched a prosecution. I'd like to read into the record a recommendation or two of Mr. Justice Tritschler on his report on the Brandon Packers Commission, which I think is relevant at this stage. In part 25, he states the following: "Item (2) The law enacted by the Legislature for the public good should be enforced against employers, unions and others by public prosecutors. (3) The law will be regarded with greater respect if it is enforced by the state, rather than by the private person who considers himself aggrieved. An offence will be regarded as an offence against the state, rather than a private squabble. (4) The person aggrieved ought not to be put to the trouble and expense of conducting a prosecution for the breach of a public statute."

It seems to me that there is validity in this point and I do know that the government has recently appointed a prosecutor in a particular matter, but I would hope that the Minister will announce policy that the government will henceforth take on these prosecutions as a matter of course.

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

Now, there has been difficulty in connection with the problem of payment of overtime in the construction industry. I would like to know, what do the government inspectors do in looking at the problem of overtime? Do they wait for complaints? Do they make key inspections during the peak seasons? Because that is the time when -- we are now in a situation of high unemployment, and now is the time when overtime provisions, if enforced, might well result in the work being spread around, rather than the employer paying overtime, and on this point I would like to know just what the government inspectors are informing employers and employees in relation to overtime payments? I was recently astounded to be told by a worker -- I don't know for whom he works, but I know it's in the leather industry -- and he informed me that the inspector told him and the employer that the overtime provisions of time and a half apply only in those cases where the wages are less than 99 cents. In other words, that the overtime provision is for 66 cents, plus half more, which is another 33 cents, total 99 cents, but if a man is earning \$2.00 then the overtime provision does not apply in that he is earning more than the minimum wage provides. Now, I would like to know if it is possible that an inspector could have made the statement, because I can't vouch for it, and if the department has authorized a statement of that type to be made, just what is the government's interpretation on this point?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to go back and just say a word on Item 2, because the Leader of the Opposition raised a question about oral examinations for operating engineers and before I had an opportunity to answer that we got into Employment Standards. As far as I know, the Act just says that they must pass examinations, and I think there have been cases -- and I'm not positive about this -- but I'm quite sure there have been cases where the board has considered oral examinations for employees. I think of one last year of a man who was a fairly recent immigrant who couldn't read English, but who was a qualified tradesman in his own right, and the board did hear him through an interpreter, and he passed and qualified his examination in that way. I'm quite sure that the board do everything possible to try and accommodate people who have the necessary experience within the field and qualify in other respects; but it isn't only an examination. They do have to have a certain number of years of experience in the trades, before they can qualify to write the examinations and this is, in many cases, where people are ruled out, because of a lack of experience in the field, but I do think that every effort is made by the department to accommodate people of this kind.

Now, if I could move on to -- off Item 2 unless the Leader -- The Member for Logan -- and I must thank him for having raised this matter with me privately earlier -- the question of temperature and what standards are applied under the Employment Standards Act. The policy is -- and it's not spelt out by legislation -- is that in normal places of employment, a 68 degree temperature is considered to be adequate -- 68 or higher. However, we do recognize that there are hazards, possibly to health from fumes and dust and noise and possibly even low temperature, and I'm not sure of that, and where we have any doubt about the health hazard we consult with the Department of Health, and together we have a joint responsibility to make sure the employment conditions are reasonably healthy. Now, I really don't know what one does with people who are working in freezing plants, who are handling and packing frozen foods in coolers. I think it would be quite impractical to try raising the temperature in these places to the 68 degree temperature which appears to be in effect across the board in Ontario, and we aren't sure how they work these things out in other jurisdictions, so we have asked that the department investigate this and I know that the Deputy Minister of Labour has written to the other deputies in Canada, including every other province -- as I understand it -- to find out how they operate in the field of temperature, particularly in these cooling and deep freeze plants, and things of that kind.

The question of newspaper boys. I really don't know what the answer is to this problem. I think possibly parents have some responsibility and possibly the newspapers themselves have a responsibility here. I know that there has been some thought given to this matter by the department and frankly at the moment, we haven't come up with an answer, but we will be pleased to keep it under consideration and see if there isn't some way in which we can work out a solution.

The Member for St. John's is asking about the number of employees or number of

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . inspectors. The number of employees is 32. The number of inspectors -- I'll have to add up here -- as I read the estimate here, there are 21 positions filled at the moment with provision made for two additional positions. Oh, incidentally, getting back to the question about temperatures, we do inspect temperatures on complaint, or any hazard of that kind. If someone lodges a complaint with the department, the department will go out and inspect to see whether the working conditions are reasonable. We will call in the Department of Health if we feel that that is justified. I understand that there have been no complaints laid under the section of the Act that deals with this, except for a complaint that was raised by the member himself when he spoke to me the other day, and if he'd like to consult with me more specifically on that, we might arrange to go into it more thoroughly.

Prosecutions. The Member for St. John's is concerned as to who has the responsibility for prosecutions, and I'd like to say that the government does have responsibility for prosecutions under the Employment Standards Act for lack of vacation pay; failure to give notice. With respect to overtime provisions, I must confess that the only standard which is required under our Act is the minimum, and therefore we can only enforce the minimum and time and a half based on minimum wage. Any other arrangements that are made are voluntary arrangements which are made between the employee and his employer, or between the union and the employer, and of course, that's a matter for the parties to settle themselves, but we do handle the prosecutions and I would like to refer the member -- I think it's page 70 of the report, the annual report of the department -- and you will see several pages of prosecutions and how they were dealt with by the courts -- I believe it runs right through to 78.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed with the discussion of these estimates, I wonder if I could have the permission of the Committee to raise quite a different matter which I think the committee should be informed of and about which it is necessary for me to make a statement at the present time and if I have permission I would like to do so. The point at issue is that on April 19th the government received a communication from the San Antonio Gold Mines Limited, in which they informed us that unless some action was taken with respect to their situation, that they would have to close that mine immediately, and in subsequent discussions that were held with the company it is apparent that "immediately" means what it says, and that subject to my making a statement today, it is likely that dismissal notices will go out to those concerned. The administration, naturally, took a very serious view of this impending situation, because members will realize that San Antonio Mine is situated at Bissett, Manitoba, that it is a one-industry town, and that if the mine were to close it would mean the end of the sole support of some three hundred or so people who are employed there, to say nothing of the thousand or eleven hundred people who depend upon that mine, and it appears from the information that I have obtained that to close the mine might very well mean the death of the mine and the death of the community. Therefore, it is obvious that this is a very important matter, and as a result, on receipt of this letter, a task force of those who are charged with the responsibility in the government, met with the representatives of the company in order to determine whether some steps might be taken to prolong the life of this community, in view of the situation that is facing us. And I'd like to report to the House that it seems as if we have been able to find a basis of agreement by which arrangements may be made for the government to give assistance to this community in order to prolong its life, and I want to make that statement now because the people who live in Bissett will be hearing of this matter, and it is important, I think, that they should know that steps are in hand and being taken to avoid the shutdown of the mine and to prolong the life of this community.

Now, I need hardly say, Mr. Chairman, that this is a very serious step, fraught with the most difficult problems and I propose on Monday, if all goes well -- and I think indications are that it will -- I propose on Monday to come to the House prepared to make a full statement of all the factors involved in this situation, and to place before the House legislation which will embody the recommendations the government has for dealing with this very depressing and difficult situation. We find, as far as can be ascertained, that there are reserves of ore in this mine that are well worth the recovering, and that under certain circumstances it is possible that the life of this community may be prolonged into the future. In any case, we have developed a plan for dealing with this and it will be presented to the Legislature on Monday. I know that members will be full of questions on this point. I would hope that I would be allowed

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . to answer them on Monday, rather than at the present time. I think I should say that we have arranged for the suspension of trading in the stock of this company on the two exchanges where it is registered, namely, the Winnipeg Stock Exchange and the Toronto Stock Exchange, so that there will be no trading in the stock of this company while these negotiations are going on and while the Legislature is considering this particular matter.

I bring this matter to your attention, Mr. Chairman, and to the attention of the members of this House, because of its extreme importance and because of its important implication in respect of policy, and say that I will be prepared, Monday, to discuss the matter fully and to place before the House for its consideration our recommendations in this respect.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I will reserve our position on the matter and save our questions until Monday. I trust that the Minister then will have very ample information, because there will be many questions that we will want to ask.

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

MR. GRAY: One second only. We are very happy with the statement presented and in the meantime that the mine is going on, and until we hear the statement on Monday, that there will be no suffering of the families, I believe, in that particular section.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that on Monday it would be our expectation to move first reading of a bill to deal with this matter and to actually present the bill itself, if we can get leave to suspend the rules to do so, and then to adjourn to committee at some convenient time in the day, where we may have a full discussion of all the details, and where representatives of the company and mining engineers and others who have information of value to the members of the committee will be able to give their story and be available for examination by members of the House.

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