

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions  
Reading and Receiving Petitions  
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees  
Notices of Motion  
Introduction of Bills

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 110, An Act to amend Certain Provisions of the Statute Law and to correct certain Typographical Errors in the Statutes.

HON. R. G. SMELLIE, Q.C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Birtle-Russell) introduced Bill No. 111, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (2).

MR. SMELLIE introduced Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Municipal Act (2).

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are seated some 73 Grade 11 and 12 students from the Souris Collegiate under the direction of their teacher Mr. Gisiger. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

There are 25 Grade 8 students from Winnipeg Beach School under the direction of their teacher Mrs. Sawyer. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Education.

There are 34 Grade 5 students from the Robert H. Smith School under the direction of their teachers Miss Corbett and Miss Scott. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities.

There are some 25 Grade 11 students from Ste. Agathe School under the direction of their teacher Sister Denis. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye.

Nous vous souhaitons la bienvenue ici cette après-midi. Nous espérons que tout ce que vous avez vu et entendu à l'assemblée législative vous sera utile dans vos études. Puisse cette visite vous inspirer et stimuler votre intérêt au sujet des affaires provinciales. Revenez encore nous visiter.

We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to consult the House in connection with the adjournment over the Easter season. My suggestion would be that we adjourn at the close of business on Thursday. I don't know how many hours will be found in Thursday when we arrive there, as to whether there's 24 or more, but whenever we close on Thursday we should adjourn at that time and stand adjourned until Monday the 6th of April. Members will know that the Dominion-Provincial Conference is being held in Quebec City during the week of the 31st of March, and some members of the Cabinet, as well as myself, will be in attendance at that meeting, and that under the circumstances it might be advisable to adjourn for that week and return on the 6th of April to continue our business. So I offer that suggestion now because when the Thursday evening rolls around we will have to be able to know what motion to make in connection with the adjournment. But I put that before the House and would be glad to hear any comments members would like to make, Madam Speaker, that you deem advisable.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I had not heard of this suggestion before. Normally we adjourn, I believe, for Good Friday and then reconvene on the Monday following Easter. However, I shall be glad to take it up with my group and see what the wishes of my members are.

MR. RUSS PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): I think, Madam Speaker, that I would do the same. It sounds to me as an individual, subject, of course, to ratification by the members of my group -- and I don't need to tell you, Madam Speaker, or

(Mr. Paulley, Cont'd.) . . . anyone else in this House, being Leader of a group sometimes puts you into difficulties and you don't get your way with them all the time -- however, Madam Speaker, my personal opinion is that -- and I'll try and impress this upon my caucus -- that I think that it is most important that the negotiations at the federal-provincial level be conducted without the fear of the upset of the government in Manitoba during the absence of the First Minister and some of his colleagues in cabinet, and so I too, Madam Speaker, will undertake to have a discussion with my caucus and will let the First Minister know, if at all possible, by 5:30 this evening when we rise, in order that he will have the information one way or the other in advance of tomorrow.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I should also like to take the opportunity to lay on the Table, Return in answer to an address to His Honour on the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

HON. M. B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Minister of Public Utilities)(River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to lay on the Table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 33 on the motion of the Honourable Member from St. George.

HON. C. H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I'd like to lay on the Table of the House the report of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to remind the members of this House, as well as the members of the press, that tonight we'll have this long-awaited Pea Soup Night in St. Boniface College at 8:00 o'clock.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to present the Second Report of the Flood Forecasting Committee held on March 24th.

The Committee met to review the situation concerning flood prospects on the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. The committee's conclusions, taking into consideration the recent heavy snowfalls to the date of the meeting, are that there will be no flooding along the Red and the Assiniboine Rivers this spring. River stages in Winnipeg will be below the 18-foot level ordinarily considered to be the first flood stage. On the Assiniboine River spring peak flows will be confined to the channel along most of its course and below the tops of the dikes at Brandon and east of Portage la Prairie. The situation on both rivers will be under constant surveillance by the committee up to and through the breakup period. Should unusual conditions develop causing a marked change in the above forecast further reports will be issued.

The following information to the date of the meeting was available to the committee for its appraisal of the situation. 1. Results of the snow survey made by the Water Control and Conservation Branch during the period March 16th to 18th in the basins of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. 2. A soil moisture survey made by the same branch at freeze-up last fall. 3. Records of all-weather flows in both streams as recorded by the Federal Water Resources Branch. 4. Meteorological information on fall and winter precipitation obtained by the Meteorological Service of Canada at stations in the watersheds of these rivers in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. 5. Meteorological information on fall and winter precipitation provided by the United States Weather Bureau covering the United States portion of the Red River Basin.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): Before the Orders of the Day, Madam Speaker, I'd like to announce a Dominion championship for Manitoba, originating this time in the constituency of Pembina in the Town of Morden. Less than a year ago an Elks Club was organized in Morden. It was a rink from that group that won the championship for the province and then proceeded to Vancouver where they have won the Dominion championship. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to make an announcement to the House. Some concern has been expressed about the worried look on the face of my desk mate and colleague, the Member for Ethelbert-Plains the last few days, and I'm pleased to announce to the House that he became a grandfather last night. I might add, Madam Speaker, that I understand that on these occasions a grandchild does not really rate cigars but that for the inveterate cigar smokers applications will be received.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I will accept that invitation and ask the honourable member to convey on behalf of the House I'm sure, to his new grandchild and to the parents, our good wishes.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, unfortunately people get credit which they don't deserve.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert-Plains): Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the honourable members for their very kind words and then remind them that the only credit I can get is when I don't deserve it. Thank you!

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the bills set forth on the Order Paper.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 30, Section 1 to Section 37, was read and passed.

MR. S. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I was unable to be present yesterday at the meeting of the committee which dealt with these amendments. I had expected from the discussion that we had had on a previous occasion when this bill was discussed in committee that there might have been an amendment which would have provided that in the case of holograph wills the law as set out in these sections would apply to wills drawn before or after the enactment of the Act in cases where death occurred after the enactment. As I understood it, Mr. Ed. Pitblado who was recognized by the committee as being an authority, had indicated at the prior meeting that there was value to this suggestion since holograph wills are usually prepared by people who do not know the law and have not consulted lawyers, and I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney-General could reveal to this committee the report or discussions which took place, which satisfied the committee not to proceed with the type of amendment that had been discussed.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, the matter was considered by the committee as requested -- that is by the Bar Association Committee interested in this Bill -- and they recommended that no change be made. I can't tell -- I was not personally present so I can't report the discussion they had, and as a matter of fact there was very little discussion subsequent to the one occasion in the Law Amendments Committee concerning this section.

The remainder of Bill No. 30 was read section by section and passed.

Bills No. 50, 91 and 92 were read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 99, Section 1 to Section 13, was read and passed.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, on Section 11, may I say a word please? Section 11 reads: "Section 172 makes it an offense to give liquor to a person under the influence of liquor." This makes it an offense to sell or otherwise supply liquor to a person under the influence of liquor. Now supposing I entertain members of the Legislature and they come in. I have no way of knowing how many drinks they had. I'd probably hire somebody to serve liquor at my home to the satisfaction of the most of the members I invite. For instance, right after the opening of the House, the Honourable First Minister and the Leader of the House was kind enough to invite us to his home for a reception. He did not say that the reception will consist of coffee, or other soft drinks, but however, he was kind enough as far as I am concerned -- the other fellows objected naturally -- but a drink was quite welcome. Then the lady at the house -- please let me explain my friends, in my own way. I know you are all academic graduates but I'm not. Then I had a drink, and the lady that served the drink came up to me again and said "Would you like a drink?" I said, "Yes." And it was after the second drink everybody could notice that I had a drink. But I said, "Yes, I'll have a drink." Now under this section, she's liable to a fine, and perhaps the host, the Premier of this province is liable to a fine, giving me a third drink after I had a second drink and I already had a drink. How can anyone judge whether I had enough or I didn't have enough? So this here section says unless you had a drink almost literally you're not supposed to, otherwise your host, the waiter or anyone else can be fined and called to court. That was my reading, my layman's reading of this section.

So I think this is absolutely unnecessary. In my opinion it is -- I wouldn't say idiotic -- but it is not according to common sense, put it this way; because it isn't a question of prohibition. It isn't a question of the liquor store giving a drunk a bottle, and he feels that he is drunk, and it is also questionable whether it was right or wrong. For this definitely applies

(Mr. Gray, Cont'd.) . . . to my home. When I invite a person to my home, offer him a drink, and he has a drink, we have a conversation, we have something to eat, and then I say Mr. so and so, or my friend, can I offer you another drink? And he says yes, and I do offer him that drink, then I am under this section liable, liable to an offence of offering him a drink knowing, realizing that he already had one or two drinks. And let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, about drinks. Some people can take five drinks and not get drunk, and one can take one drink and talk about politics foolishly. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I move that Section 11 of this bill be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . might say, if you talk, don't drink.

MR. ROBLIN: I would just like to speak to the amendment my honourable friend gave because he referred to his visit to my house. I want to say that my honourable friend comforted himself like a perfect gentleman all the time he was with me. However, I take this as notice that I'm to keep my eye on him the next time. However that may be, I think that it is the duty of the host to provide various types of refreshment including orange juice, and there was plenty of that at this particular reception my friend refers to. I must say that it was reported to me afterwards that the consumption of hard liquor was very light, which I think reflects well upon the moderation of the members of the House, but I do think that if it happens at any other occasion, private or otherwise, where somebody has taken too much to drink, it is the duty of someone to see that he doesn't overstep the bounds of propriety. I don't see anything wrong -- I'm not going to vote for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think my honourable friend has moved the deletion of that portion so you had better put the motion.

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

MR. GRAY: A voice in the wilderness again.

MR. ROBLIN: You were in good company at my place.

The remainder of Bill 99 was read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 101 was read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered certain bills and directed me to report as follows: Bills no. 30, 50, 91, 92, 99 and 101, all without amendments, and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

Bill No. 30 was read a third time and passed.

Bill No. 50 was read a third time.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): On Bill No. 50, there were a number of amendments laid on the table just a few minutes ago and these were apparently embodied and passed in the bill. I wonder if the Minister could briefly outline just what changes have been brought in because of these amendments. I am not too familiar with them because I could not attend the Law Amendments Committee meeting the other day.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend raises a point of order. I think he understands the Minister can no longer speak. He's introduced the bill and he has no right to reply on the third reading of a bill. The questions that my honourable friend has in mind are those that should properly have been put in Committee of the Whole which we've just passed, and I don't think there's any way in which we can satisfy him now.

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

Bills No. 91, 92, 99 and 101 were each read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 76. The Honourable the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. A. VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, in my humble opinion we are discussing at this time a very important bill. The fact that it is before us at the same time as the report on the Livestock Inquiry Commission -- and here I would just like to say for one minute that I was sorry this morning to hear that the Honourable Member from Morris who expected to be in the House today had to go back to hospital so while I'm mentioning this Livestock Commission I would like to convey to him my wishes for a prompt recovery. As I just said,

(Mr. Vielfaure, Cont'd.) . . . this gives this bill that much more importance, the fact that both of us are before this House at this moment, and one only has to look at the weekly newspapers to see the great interest amongst the farmers, the discussions, the meetings that take place regarding the marketing boards at this time. This Act, to me, is taking away a lot of powers, away from the producers and investing them in the two Ministers of Agriculture and Conservation and Mines and Natural Resources.

I would think that this bill should be given a lot more study. The fact that the powers are being taken away from the producers and given to the Ministers concerns the farmers. Furthermore, not too long ago an important bill was passed before this House by the Minister of Utilities and here is what he had to say at this time, Madam Speaker, and I'm quoting from Hansard on page 1129: "Madam Speaker, I'd like to recommend to this House and I'm referring now to Bill 40, An Act requiring the Registration of Real Estate Brokers and Real Estate Salesmen, and quoting from Hansard he says, "I'd like to recommend to the House that after this bill has received its second reading that it be referred to the Committee on Statutory Regulations for further study. This bill is a complete revision of the present Real Estate Agents Act and has many routine changes as well as some completely new provisions. In this manner I think it will receive the complete study and proper airing that a bill of this size and importance deserves." On this very same bill the Premier had this to say: "It is our feeling that in the usual procedure before the Law Amendments Committee we might not have sufficient time and leisure to deal with the very complicated points that are involved in the way that we should like. We also want to provide an enlarged opportunity for members of the commercial fraternity to study these bills and to appear, so our hope would be that it would meet with the wish of the Assembly to place those before the Committee on Statutory Regulations and -- whatever that is . . ."

Now the Minister of Agriculture has this to say in regard to the bill that is before us today. "This revised Act introduces an entirely new concept to the operations and marketing plan, that of vesting with producer boards only such authority as is required to successfully operate the business of marketing their product. The main powers of regulation and all of the powers of enforcing and policing regulations is vested with the Manitoba Marketing Board which is a public utility type of board and responsible through the government to all the people of Manitoba."

I do not disagree with these statements, Madam Speaker, but I say that if this other bill was so important to the commercial fraternity, this bill is definitely as important to the farming fraternity. Therefore I would strongly recommend that it pass second reading and be referred to the Committee on Statutory Regulations. The fact that we just received the Schuman Report, the Livestock Enquiry Commission I should say, after three years of study -- and in its recommendations there are four recommendations that recommend further study -- shows that there is a great deal involved in both these bills. Although I recognize that these are two separate bills, on the other hand they are definitely closely related in the way they affect the farmers. I think this legislation will affect the farmers, the producers of this province, for many years to come and I would strongly recommend that it be referred to the Committee on Statutory Regulations, even if this means -- and I know it does -- that it will only come back before us at the next session. This would, I think, give all parties interested a chance to express themselves and we would be in a much better position to vote on this bill when we have received the representations of the different people concerned.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I would like to make a few comments in connection with Bill No. 76 at this time. The bill in my opinion is destructive in its compulsory aspects, the powers that are given to these boards under this bill, and any commodity coming under it I feel is lost to free enterprise. Growers will be subjected to tight regulations as to the amounts of any given produce that will be produced. They will be regulated and will have to accept the price offered, to say nothing of the cost, because they will also have to bear the cost of the operations of these boards and commissions, so that here are a number of things which are actually out of their control. However, if this is going to be made law I feel that I would like to make some recommendations.

One has to do with section 4 dealing with the Manitoba Board, and I feel that this committee comprising that board should have a judge on its committee, because this committee will

(Mr. Froese, Cont'd.) . . . be hearing appeals under Section 10 and therefore I feel it is essential to have impartial people on this particular board, people who will have the knowledge who will be able to judge the appeals that will be made.

I feel that Part 2 and Part 3 appear very much the same. They are almost identical except that one applies to producer boards and the other to commissions. Apparently the difference here is that the commissions are set up by the government whereas the producer boards will be brought into being on behalf of the producers. My main opposition to the bill naturally is the compulsion and the compulsory features of this bill, and I feel that these should be eliminated.

Under Sections 16 to 25 co-operation is requested with extra provincial boards. This has to do with co-operatives who are brought into being under legislation from other provinces or from the federal government, and here, too, we are tying ourselves to legislation of provinces which we have no control over.

Under Sections 17 and 18, also 26, and 27, fixing prices and restricting of deliveries can adversely affect the producers concerned and these are powers given to these boards and commissions. They will have a definite effect on the producer and could also bankrupt him.

Sections 21 and 22, and 30 and 31 -- one dealing with the boards and the other one with commissions -- state the cost of processing shall be paid by the producer, and here again he will have no control as to how much processing will be done, who will do it and what the ultimate cost will be.

Part 4 refers to the small producers, and the small producers will have no vote in establishing a producer board, and therefore naturally will also not be entitled to have a voice in this, and this I feel is discriminating when we only give a right to vote to those people who have retained remuneration from a crop of \$500.00 or more. What happens to a large producer if he has a crop failure? He then becomes a person with no vote and I feel this is wrong. I feel that these people should have a vote. I think also under Part 4(g) we are discouraging the small producer, and I'm sure that once the producer boards will set up their own by-laws, we will see further discrimination and that this will just be extended in their by-laws and regulations. It will mean that it will be difficult, if not impossible, for new boards to enter and belong to such an association, because the purpose of this very legislation of setting up such producer boards is to decrease production so that there will be a better demand, a better price for the product that they have to sell, and that they will not have an over-supply of produce.

I feel that this whole matter is defeating the very purpose of our trying to get irrigation underway and trying to work out conservation programs whereby we will have water storage in the area back home and which eventually we want to put to use in irrigation. If we are going to start restricting at this point already, why go to all that trouble? I think this is the wrong thing to do.

Under Section 34 of the Act, we find the appointment of inspectors mentioned and their powers. I find these are far too excessive. In fact, they can come into any farmer's yard and snoop around without having to prove evidence of appointment. There is nothing mentioned in the section to that effect that he has to produce evidence of his appointment as an inspector. I feel that this legislation is robbing the producer of his freedom -- freedom to produce and his freedom to sell to whoever he likes, and at the price satisfactory to him. This is all going to be determined by a board for him, over which he will have no say and no control.

Then in Section 37, there is a new principle here in applying justice on presumption that -- it says here in Section 37: "In any prosecution under this Act, or the regulations, or any order or directive made under this Act, it shall be presumed that the natural product in respect of which the prosecution is instituted was grown, raised, harvested, or caught in an area of the province to which the regulation or order or directive respecting this product relates." So we are going on assumption and presumption. I feel that this is not a right way to go about it, especially so when you are charging people first of all for growing the product.

Madam Speaker, I definitely cannot go along with the bill as it is, and then also to find in Section 39, apparently we are passing on legislation which they claim already is ultra vires, and why should we -- Under Section 39, subsection 3 it says, "All provisions of this Act that are within the powers of the Legislature shall remain in full force and effect, notwithstanding that some provisions are held to be ultra vires," so I, for one, am not in accord with the

(Mr. Froese, Cont'd.) . . . legislation and will oppose it.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 98. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I only have one brief comment to make in connection with Bill 98. This is the proposing of legislation to amend The Credit Union Act and I may say that in the course of the past few years I have always listened with interest to the Member for Rhineland when he has spoken on this matter of credit unions, and I have come to agree quite strongly with at least one or two of the major proposals that he has put forward, and one of them in particular is that credit unions be given the power to organize along community lines rather than the way they are restricted at the present time to occupational or ethnic -- perhaps that's not quite right -- but to occupational, ethnic or other close interest group type of basis. They are restricted to that at the present time, and I would think that the Minister, the department, the government should think seriously about the possibility and the desirability of extending the power of the credit union to organize along community lines. This is the only comment that I wish to make on second reading.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I also wish to comment briefly on Bill. 98. I have read it and compared it, twice I think, and I'm in accord with most of the sections I should say, probably with all the sections that are contained in the bill. I feel that some of the sections are giving clarification to the legislation that we presently have on our statutes and therefore will compliment the legislation. In particular I'd like to congratulate the Minister that he's finally brought in something in regard to the investment of reserve funds which formerly stated had to be held liquid, yet there was no definition as to what liquidity consisted of. So this has been clarified and I feel that it's well.

Madam Speaker, I feel that I should rather speak on the lack of certain provisions that I would like to see in the bill that aren't contained in the bill. For one thing, lack of certain provisions to enable the credit unions to set up a stabilization fund to help and assist those credit unions in difficulty or whose share capital is impaired, should have been put into the legislation so that we could set up these stabilization funds and assist those credit unions. This would be done at no cost to the government and was something asked for in past years as well as this present year by credit unions. They've asked for this for a number of years and I feel sorry that the government did not see fit to bring in legislation concerning this matter. This matter of providing for a stabilization fund, the monies which would come from the reserve funds of credit unions would not cost the government anything and yet it would help the credit union people of this province to assist those credit unions that are in need, those that have had difficulties; probably a credit union that was displaced because of an unemployment situation; probably of a factory or an industry being moved to another province, and here the credit union's left and they cannot pay out the people that have the assets in the credit union. If we had legislation of that type they would take care of this. They'd pay out the people who have funds in it and look after those that have borrowing. So that the credit unions could be cleaned up in no time. Whereas if it is left as at present it would take from 20 to 25 years, probably more than that, to clean up the aftermath of just one organization like that. And it leaves a bad taste in the mouths of the people that are directly concerned, that live in the particular area where the situation takes place, and it is next to impossible afterwards too, to get another one going. And that's one reason I would like to see legislation passed that we could have such a reserve fund which could be looked after by the credit union people and would not be of any cost, or any obligation to the government itself.

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 Minister of Labour, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, before you put the question, we had quite a debate here yesterday and I don't want to open it up today.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I'm just wondering if my honourable friend can speak again at all, because on the point of order here once we are in the Supply motion and once a person has spoken for any reason, he's not allowed to speak again, although some other person can, but I think my honourable friend has exhausted his right to speak at any Supply motion that might be brought . . . .

MR. PETERS: I will go along with the First Minister's opinion.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, may I rise to this? As the honourable member was saying, we had considerable debate here yesterday and it isn't my inclination to open it up either, but what the honourable member had in mind was that the government should now set up a board of enquiry to look into the whole matter of meat processing in Manitoba. I think that . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I rise again to say that once a particular subject, namely, meat processing, has been raised on grievance it can't be debated a second time on Supply. Probably if you want to, a substantive motion could be brought in covering this, but my recollection of the rules indicates that this thing is barred from now on and we'll just -- perhaps, Madam Speaker, we can find the relevant . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Madam Speaker, on the point raised by the Honourable First Minister, I don't think he is correct. He was correct when he stood to say that a member who had taken part in the debate previously could not again take part in the debate. I would suggest that my honourable friend is not correct on two grounds: First of all, the honourable member who was speaking when the First Minister raised the point of order had not taken part in the debate and could continue it. But even apart from that, Madam Speaker, my colleague from Seven Oaks was introducing a separate subject in effect, in that he was asking for an investigation to be made by the Department of Health into the inspection and processing of meat products. Now I'm not going to make a speech on it -- my honourable colleague from Seven Oaks -- but I respectfully suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks is in order in taking part in the debate, introducing a new matter in effect, because the motion that was under -- the question under debate yesterday was statements made by the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The question under debate as proposed today is the question of inspections being made by the Department of Health, which I suggest is a different matter entirely.

MR. ROBLIN: I think, Madam Speaker, your task will be to decide whether or not in your opinion this is a new subject that has been brought up. If it is a new subject, well then I have no objections to it whatever, but I think that that point should be decided.

In paragraph 2, citation 234 of page 199, there are some general comments on procedure, grievance procedures on going into Supply, and in sub-paragraph 2 on page 199 it deals with the first point I raised: "No member is allowed to speak more than once on the motion. He cannot discuss all the matters which may then come up and when he has spoken on one of them he has exhausted his right to speak on the motion before the House, namely, that the Speaker do now leave the Chair."

We had no amendment to the Committee of Supply yesterday but just a general discussion on the motion itself. The previous sentence in that same rule deals with repetition, I think, and it reads as follows: "Once debate is concluded on one matter and another intervenes, members cannot again discuss the former." Now whether that bears on this motion I leave for Your Honour to decide, but I think the question is, is my honourable friend bringing up a new item of business? If it's a new item of business and you rule so, Madam, I have no objection to it. If you rule it's part of the old discussion of yesterday, then I think the answer to that is obvious, but I leave it with you.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, if I may bring up one further point. As the First Minister read there, "once debate is concluded on one matter and another matter intervenes, members cannot again discuss the former." I think it might be proper to say the discussion is not necessarily concluded. Yesterday on the matter brought up there were speeches made but no specific action was taken, and I think it could be considered that the honourable member today is continuing the debate on the same matter. Nothing has intervened in between and he has the right to continue because no new material has been brought in since that debate, and no conclusion really to that debate was reached. It was debated but no conclusion was reached.

MR. ROBLIN: On the point of order, I'm on the side of the Honourable Leader of the

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . NDP here because the matter was most emphatically concluded. The motion was put and that particular debate is concluded by the motion being put and I don't think there's any argument about that.

MR. PAULLEY: In all deference, Madam Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition, I'd rather you rule on the fact that the subject matter is different than that which was debated yesterday.

MR. ROBLIN: Perhaps it would help if we allowed the honourable member to state his subject matter very clearly. That might help us a little.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I would suggest that this is a question where you would be well advised to take it under consideration because I would certainly not want the interpretation of the rule as the Honourable the First Minister and the Honourable the Leader of the NDP have given it. I would think that you would find when you consult our own rules, and we have two dealing with the matter, and Beauchesne, I would think you would find that the only way that a subject matter is concluded is if there is a vote on that issue. Now the vote was not taken on that issue. The vote was taken on the question of going into the Committee of Supply and this was just an incidental discussion to -- which is a member's right on the motion to go into Supply -- that is the motion on which the debate takes place. But the conclusion of the matter is when there is a resolution, in my opinion, when there's a resolution or a bill before the House and then action is taken and a vote is taken and that debate is concluded, and we're not allowed to revive a debate that has already been concluded according to our own rules. But I certainly would not want to see the rule widened to suggest that just because we discussed a certain matter in the House or in committee without it being contained in either a bill or a motion -- which after being passed becomes a resolution -- without either of those having been before us. I think that's much too wide an interpretation. In my opinion, Madam Speaker, a matter is not concluded until a vote has been taken upon that issue and it must be introduced, in my opinion, by either a motion leading toward a resolution or a bill.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may on this point, as far as we're concerned -- and this group introduced the subject matter for today, or attempted to -- I've consulted with my colleague from Seven Oaks, and if Your Honour would like to take this under advisement and give a thorough study to the various points that have been raised, certainly we would have no objection. I would like to state, Madam Speaker, the subject matter that was to be introduced by my colleague from Seven Oaks was, namely, a request to the Department of Health to commence a thorough investigation and study into inspections of meat processing plants in the Province of Manitoba. Now that's putting it just briefly but there was the objective, which we suggest is a separate subject. However, if Your Honour desires to take time out to consider the points that may be valid that have been raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, we have no objections to the vote proceeding to go into Supply at this time, and await your ruling.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, again to the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that's a very interesting matter. If you see fit, I'd be most interested to hear what your view of that is, Madam, because it's an interesting situation. I think we have to restrict the discussion to a grievance procedure rather than generalize it, but I wonder whether on grievance procedure if we proceed to discuss a grievance before Supply without an amendment, and the discussion is concluded in a sense by passing the Supply motion, whether or not that does not conclude discussion of that particular topic, because my honourable friend thinks not. He may be right but if that is the case, that means that on successive Supply motions, day after day, we could have a discussion of the very same topic time after time, even though different members of this House would be taking part in the debate on the various occasions. Now that to me is a novel idea. I must confess I never visualized grievance being proceeded with in that way before Supply. So I put that question -- I raise that matter, Madam, so that perhaps you might consider that too, if you see fit. Otherwise I agree with what has been said that perhaps it's better to reserve decision.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, again speaking to the point of order. This is an interesting point, but on the other hand I would want the Honourable the First Minister to consider this situation as well that if we took the position that debate was concluded by the fact

(Mr. Campbell, Cont'd.) . . . that it had been discussed on the motion to go into Committee of Supply or on a motion for adjournment of the House to discuss an urgent matter of public importance, or on an individual bill, just because a discussion took place that that would prevent it coming up at another time, then I think we would definitely restrict the right of the member to discuss matters of importance that could arise at different times. There's a case in point -- let me take the example now: We have the motion for second reading of the bill proposed by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and Conservation, the one on which the Honourable Member for La Verendrye spoke a short time ago. Now, if I speak on that bill, and I might, I would probably want to discuss the question of meat packing and meat processing, and I wouldn't want to feel that I had been prevented from discussing those questions on that bill because of this discussion that took place the other day, and I think you will find that both our own rules, which are clear -- I don't remember the numbers of them now, but I did look them up and I think they're clear, the one about reviving a debate -- probably it's Rule 31, is it -- and another one, 55, which I think is perhaps equally clear -- the purpose is to keep a debate that is concluded from being revived time and time again, and this is in my opinion a bill or a motion leading to a resolution.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, may I be allowed to make an observation on the debate respecting the point of order. I have here an older edition of Beauchesne so there isn't much point in giving you the citation number, but it makes more or less the same point as the Honourable Member for Lakeside has just made except that instead of making reference to the word "concluded" it uses the word "decided", but it seems to be quite clear and I'll just -- if I may, I'd like to read this: "When a motion to go into Supply is proposed, it shall be permissible to discuss any public matter within the power or parliament or to ask for the redress of any grievance, and it is not necessary to move an amendment for that purpose, provided that the discussion and the amendment, if one is moved, shall not relate to any decision -- any decision -- of the House during the current session." And I humbly submit that no decision was reached on the debate that occurred yesterday on the motion to go into Supply. I use the word "decision" or rather Beauchesne does. The Member for Lakeside uses the word "concluded", but I think that the point is really the same.

MADAM SPEAKER: We've had considerable debate on this motion, and several ideas have been expressed. I will take it under consideration and give my ruling at a later date.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department XIII - 1. Administration.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Mr. Chairman, in rising for the first time to take part in this debate, I would like to pay tribute to a team. This team is 110 people in the Department of Labour. I would like to express to them publicly my thanks and appreciation for their efforts on our behalf as the government and on behalf of the people of Manitoba. These people are working in an area that has been described as an area somewhat similar to marriage -- it is one of antagonistic co-operation -- and I think that with the efforts that -- I might say that I have mentioned it before and I bravely mention it today because my dear lady is listening to us and she said that I wouldn't say it. I did, and I'm sure that we're still friends.

Mr. Chairman, the Labour Department's estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1965 show a moderate increase in the amount of approximately \$79,000.00. Now this is exclusive of the Winter Works program which has been transferred to the Department of Municipal Affairs. The increase in the estimates is made up of the following: No. 1 - Normal salary increments of \$15,690; No. 2 - General salary increase \$23,820.00; No. 3 - Changes in personnel which include additions to the staff, \$22,915; No. 4 - Increase in Board fees -- and this is due largely to raising remuneration of board members from \$5.00 to \$10.00 a meeting -- this is \$3,500.00; No. 5 - An amount allocated for seminars and labour research. I might say that this is exclusive of the salary of the Labour Research Director -- \$8,000.00. And there's miscellaneous expenses for fees and equipment, printing and advertising, \$5,200; to give a total of \$79,125 over last year's estimates.

One of the major undertakings, Mr. Chairman, by my department over the past year,

(Mr. Baizley, cont'd)... was to establish permanent and effective liaison with representative groups affected by our legislation. Towards that end we established permanent groups fully representative of employer's and employee's interests. We made known to them many changes in legislation and administrative procedures that we were contemplating. We invited them to sit down with us to review and analyze our mutual problems in an objective and factual way. In fact we went further. We invited them to work out their own solutions, using their expert knowledge and experience in striving to compromise these differences for the common good. We believed joint consultation could work. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we believed it so strongly that it practically became an article of faith with us. We put it to the test and we found our faith was justified. The first real test we made of joint consultation was in connection with the Construction Industry Wages Act. When I introduced Bill No. 29 in the House, I described in detail the long and careful study conducted by the employers and the unions themselves. I described the sincerity with which they went about their tasks, the patience with which they tried to reconcile conflicting interests, and the unflinching courtesy and co-operation they showed to one another in evolving a common denominator of legislation to meet an extremely difficult problem.

The success of joint consultation with the Construction Industry Wages Act has convinced us more than ever that this approach is the right one. Therefore, we intend, Mr. Chairman, to extend it to other major areas of our legislation. We are planning in the immediate future to undertake a joint study of The Labour Relations Act. We also intend to examine in the same way our mechanical and engineering services, our safety program, our labour standards and manpower training.

There has been some suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that we intend to re-examine all of our legislation in a very brief period. This is not so. And may I repeat, this is not so. It would be foolish to attempt such a venture with any hope of success. We have no thought of overhauling all of our legislation in one big bite. There is far too much of it and it is far too complex. We intend to go about this in a sensible fashion, Mr. Chairman. We shall try to set up priorities according to the particular needs of each situation. We do not intend to tie ourselves down in advance to any hard and fast deadline. We shall explore every problem as carefully as we can, with the best technical help we can get, and over as long a time as is necessary. Our aim is to be exhaustive in our reviews and as comprehensive as possible in our conclusions. We are not rushing into hasty, skimpy surveys and makeshift remedies.

I realize that honourable members are apt to question and criticize some of the areas I have mentioned. I shall try to answer any questions they may ask and any criticisms they may raise. But I hope they will bear in mind that as I have said, Mr. Chairman, these areas will be subjected to serious self-criticism and analysis. This kind of joint consultative action was of course recommended by the COMEF Report. The report also suggested other avenues my department might explore. These were in the field of manpower and in developing educational programs, to bring about a better understanding of mutual problems between labour and management.

The Department of Labour has implemented these suggestions and I would like to outline to you what it has done. In June of last year my department sponsored a major experiment in the furthering of better understanding between labour and management. This took the form of a seminar on labour management problems, the first of its kind ever held here. We had the co-operation of the University of Manitoba in sponsoring this seminar and we had the support of the National Productivity Council in helping to finance it and I would like to acknowledge publicly their interest and assistance. Above all, we had the enthusiastic endorsement of both labour and management -- it was really their show. They took over; they planned the seminar; they decided on the topics that they wanted to study and the experts in the various fields whom they wanted to guide them in their study.

For a solid week some forty representatives of management and union followed a rigorous schedule of examining basic problems of economics and labour relations under the guidance of Dr. Neil Chamberlain of Yale University, Professor Woods of McGill University and Dr. Clarence Barber of the University of Manitoba. When the seminar was over my department felt that it had been a most successful venture but we also felt that our own opinion should not be conclusive. It was the reaction of those who participated that really mattered to us, and it

(Mr. Baizley, cont'd)... was therefore gratifying to us to find that labour and management felt the same way. They told us they believed the seminar was an unqualified success and they urge us to sponsor a second one.

Now we are going to do this and it will be held early this summer. We have followed the same approach Mr. Chairman and we have left the planning of this second seminar up to a joint committee of labour and management in co-operation with the university. They are working out their own program and we want it to be their seminar. We believe that this is how it can be most valuable. It can be most valuable to them and in the long run to all of us too.

Now I'd like to say something about the Department of Labour and what it has been doing in the field of manpower training. Last fall the department sponsored a conference on manpower training to investigate its problems, to examine our existing programs and to make recommendations for improvements in them and to consider new programs. Nearly seventy representatives of Management, Organized Labour, University, Agriculture, Education and other especially interested groups, took part in the Manitoba Manpower Training Conference. This was the first joint conference on manpower training ever held in the province. One of the recommendations of this conference was that before we can have a satisfactory and comprehensive manpower training program, that there must be thorough research into the present and future supply and demand for manpower. It had been decided that this kind of research should be directed and co-ordinated by the Department of Labour. It is recognized that basic labour research for manpower training must not be fragmented among different departments and agencies, but must be carried out entirely as an integrated unit. Now the effectiveness of research on one problem depends on knowledge and understanding gained from others. One problem reveals information relative to others. There should and will of course, be close co-operation and consultation with other government departments and particularly with the Economic Consultative Board.

Mr. Chairman, to head up this research, the Department of Labour has acquired the services of J. M. Mulvaney, Assistant Professor of Economics at United College. Professor Mulvaney will take over the full time duties of Director of Labour Research on June 1st. Under Professor Mulvaney's direction a research program will be undertaken, the problems considered and reviewed will be the provincial labour force, there will be an analysis to determine the age, sex, educational, occupational, industrial and geographic distribution of Manitoba's labour force. The analysis will be based on an historical or evolutionary approach showing how the labour force has developed over recent decades and this research will be integrated and related to studies of the national labour force.

The future pattern of labour demands will be projected at specified dates. This will be done on the basis of an analysis of the social and economic forces underlying present trends. There will also be careful investigation of the character and strength of those forces which may be expected to be significant in the foreseeable future. This projection will be maintained on a continuing basis and integrated with national projections. The Manitoba Department of Labour will of course, take the fullest possible advantage of the manpower research which is being done by the Canadian Government and the governments of other countries. We certainly can benefit by the experience of others in approaching this problem and by the great volume of research already done in this field.

We are well aware of the fact that unemployment in Canada and in Manitoba is higher than it should be, particularly in certain areas. This despite the fact that our experience in Manitoba is about the best in Canada. We are also aware of the fact that opportunities for employment for those who lack marketable skills and are not properly educated are steadily declining. On the other hand, there is a demand for highly skilled workers, technicians and those with professional training. We do not wish to hold out that raising the level of education of our population will in itself end unemployment. We are certain however, that our manpower training program must be intensified and expanded. We must raise the level of the general education of workers. We must provide more opportunities for occupational trade, technical and professional training. This will result in a work force more adaptable to the changing needs of industry and commerce and therefore be more employable. On the basis of the research already done, we know that there should be a maximum opportunity for everyone to raise the level of their knowledge in the three basic subjects: language, arithmetic and science.

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

On the strength of this, the Department of Education have embarked upon a program known as basic skill development. Those interested may now attend classes with a view to raising the level of their knowledge of arithmetic, language and science to roughly Grade X. In order that this program might reach those that need it but could not otherwise participate a scale of allowances are payable during this training period and already over 900 are participating in this program in our province.

As our research program develops we will be able to assist other government departments particularly the Department of Education, in determining the kinds of occupational, trade and technical training opportunities which should be provided in the light of present and future manpower requirements. It should be emphasized that our manpower training program is a joint federal provincial program.

We recognize Mr. Chairman that we have a long way to go before we have a manpower training program based upon adequate and accurate research and geared to the needs of industry and commerce and also geared to the aspirations and capabilities of our population. Dramatic, quick progress should not be expected. Improvement will be gradual and sound. We hope we can eventually provide the highest possible degree of opportunity for everyone, so that they may participate in the growth and development of our province and of our country.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to Labour Relations and say something about some of the major innovations that the Manitoba Department of Labour has been carrying out in this field. The first of these had to do with the settlement of labour management disputes. Our department has been taking the view that the best solutions of such disputes are those reached by the parties themselves. They are the most meaningful both in immediate terms and from the long range point of view. It is our belief, Mr. Chairman, that labour and management can mature only through their own efforts and that they can arrive at mutual respect for each other and mutual understanding of each other, only by negotiating their own settlements, so we have been placing a new and strong emphasis, Mr. Chairman, on the settlement of disputes by the parties themselves. We have been encouraging the parties to these disputes to make more vigorous efforts to resolve them through collective bargaining.

We have been offering all the help we can through making our conciliation services more available to the parties on a continuing basis at any stage of a dispute, so long as there has been a willingness on the part of the parties to negotiate, because we have indicated very firmly that it is not good enough for the party simply to go through the motions of bargaining and then expect a conciliation board to take over their problems and settle them for them. We have made it plain that we will not establish conciliation boards as a matter of routine practice. Mr. Chairman, the result has been that over the past year not a single conciliation board has been established. This new policy has proved itself in practice. True, there was some opposition at first, but that was even slighter than what might have been expected. By the end of the year, the new approach had been generally recognized by both labour and management as being a realistic and beneficial approach to their own relationships and, Mr. Chairman, we propose to continue with it.

..... Continued on next page.

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

My Department has been very much concerned also with a different problem in labour relations and Mr. Chairman I am referring to unfair labour practices. This is a very real problem and my department is keenly aware of it. The early stage in the forming of a union is a most crucial stage. It is a period of great tension for all involved, for the employees who are trying to organize into a union and for the employer too. The organizing of a union is a very big step for the employee. It is also a big step for the employer. It is a time when employees are excited and nervous and very often the employer is just as disturbed as the employee. Many things Mr. Chairman, are said and done by both sides at this time, and it would be better if they had not been said or had not been done because of the many things that are indiscreet; they're injudicious. Some of them are just downright foolish at times, but these things do happen at this very stage. It is true that in the organizing stage employees are most vulnerable to pressures by their employers. It is true that our labour relations law gives employees the right to organize and makes it unlawful for an employer to fire a worker simply because he wants to join a union. But it is equally true, Mr. Chairman, that an employer has the right to object to the union being formed in his plant. He can object all he likes so long as he does it lawfully. Sometimes employers do fire workers just when an organizing drive has started. When this happens it is almost inevitable that the union and those employees who want a union interpret the firing as being due only to union activity. Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact that they believe this does not automatically make it so. It is one thing to suspect; it is another thing to prove it. An employer who fires an employee while his plant is being organized may be firing that employee for union activity. On the other hand, the employer may have a dozen good reasons for firing that employee which have nothing whatever to do with union activity. The employer's timing of the firing may be unwise because it leaves him open to suspicion, but that is still a long way from being unlawful conduct. It is for the courts and not for my department to determine whether or not a firing constitutes an unfair practice. It is essential that such cases should be brought before the court without delay and where there seemed to be sufficient grounds to warrant a prosecution.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Labour is doing just this. Every complaint of an unfair practice is investigated immediately and competently. We are following a procedure which we worked out in consultation with representatives of labour and management groups, and which has their approval and support. My department has had about a dozen charges of unfair practices brought to our attention over the past year. Every charge has been investigated promptly and thoroughly. Our investigations have found that some of the charges were obviously frivolous and some were even vexatious. In some cases we found charges were laid because of a misunderstanding. We were able to clear this type of problem up and the charges were withdrawn. In a few cases where we thought we might be able to find some foundation to the charges we referred them to the Attorney-General's department to determine if there was sufficient evidence for prosecution; and in two of those cases we were advised there was not. I can assure the members that we will continue to deal with charges of unfair practices with despatch and we will not hesitate to launch a prosecution whenever there is evidence that the law has been violated.

Our department appreciates that it is necessary to carry on continuous process of re-appraising its legislation in all the various fields and we have been doing that to the best of our ability. Over the past year we have reviewed in particular some of our legislation dealing with the safe operation of machinery and the licensing of operators and installers to see if we've been keeping in step with the technological changes. We have found that improvements in manufacturing and the introduction of new and more efficient safety devices have resulted in some of our licensing becoming too rigid in some respects and even unnecessary in others, so we adapted as much of our legislation as we could over the past year to meet these changing technological requirements. We have aimed to make our licensing more realistic while still keeping it consistent with the demands of maximum safety.

Mr. Chairman, in keeping with this policy we amended The Operating Engineers and Firemen's Act to provide for new certificates for operators of compressors and refrigeration plants. These certificates permit persons who are fully trained in air compressors and refrigeration operations to take charge of such units. Previously it was necessary for an operating engineer

(Mr. Baizley, cont'd)... to be placed in charge of air compressors and refrigeration equipment. We also amended this Act to permit air compressing machines and refrigeration machines to be operated without the need for a licensed person being in constant attendance. We felt that we could remove that restriction as being no longer necessary because safety devices have been developed which automatically shut down the equipment when there is an abnormal operating condition. However, the Act still calls for periodic checks of safety devices and alarm systems connected to them. We amended the Act also to eliminate the need for a person holding a certificate to supervise the operation of portable pressure plants such as the air compressing machine used to operate jackhammers and other similar equipment in the repair of streets and highways. These amendments have not yet been proclaimed as the new regulations have not yet been completed. A preliminary draft of the new regulations is ready; employers and unions will be asked to review the changes. The new regulations will be ready as soon as possible for presentation to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

The drastic technological changes which are occurring in this field make it imperative that new regulations be examined carefully so as to be flexible, reasonable and adequate to today's and tomorrow's need. We found that specialization in the electrician's trade have resulted in the performance of various kinds of work which did not really call for the vigorous requirements of a journeyman's license, so we amended The Electricians Act to establish a number of new licenses which would allow the holders to do such work. This brought the licensing requirements in the trade in line with present day reality.

Mr. Chairman, in the same way we broadened the range of licenses applying to gas installations. We revised our regulations under The Oil and Gas Burner Act to meet changed conditions in that field. In some cases new types of licenses made it possible for less qualified persons to work in limited areas. In other cases because of the particular hazards involved and the equipment having a high gas . . . . higher qualifications were set as being essential for adequate safety. Installations of this type may be made only by persons holding a commercial and industrial gas fitters license. To date, Mr. Chairman, 35 persons have taken this examination and another 12 in the Brandon area will write their examinations soon. The new licenses also paid attention to the increased use of liquified petroleum gas in the province. They modified qualifications of installers of such equipment thereby accommodating in particular special situations in remote areas of Manitoba; and at the same time they provide for a greater measure of safety control by placing on suppliers the responsibility for inspection of new installations.

A new Elevator Act was proclaimed on January 1st of this year. New regulations have also been made effective which eliminate the requirements for licensing of elevator operators. This was on the recommendation of the Elevator Board which felt that the licensing could be safely eliminated. Although the licensing of elevator operators is no longer required the department will examine an elevator operator at the request of an owner and issue a letter of competency. The new regulations require that all existing freight elevators must be provided with hoist-way protection. This will involve changes to about 140 freight elevators. The facilities of the elevator repair company is unlimited, so it will take two or three years to complete this program. Since the beginning of this year the department has issued orders on 20 freight elevators to bring them up to the minimum requirements of the regulations.

I feel I should say something about safety in the construction industry, Mr. Chairman. A field with which my department is very much concerned. Last year a Construction Safety Board was established under The Construction Safety Act. One of the main functions of this board was to review the existing regulations and as a result of the board's efforts, new regulations have been developed and are nearing the stage where they will soon be ready for consideration by the government. These regulations have been designed so they will be as flexible as possible. They have been divided into separate parts, each dealing specifically with various stages of the construction industry. As new construction techniques are developed which require regulations to govern their safe methods of operation additional parts can be added easily to the main body of the regulations. Specifically the various parts and phases of construction which it is proposed these regulations will govern are as follows: Part one would be applicable to all phases of construction and would deal generally with such items as safety clothing to be worn by workmen; the erection of barriers and covered passageways at construction sites; and notification to the department in the event of serious or fatal accidents. Part two would govern the

(Mr. Baizley, cont'd)... safe design and use of scaffolding, staging and hoisting, etcetera. This part would provide in considerable detail the materials to be used for scaffolding and staging. It would also specify minimum requirements for hoisting equipment, cranes and similar machinery. In addition it would deal with the minimum requirement of ladders which are used on the construction site. Part three would deal essentially with safety operations in excavation work. Due to the accident frequency of this phase of construction very extensive study was given to the subject before proposals were developed. As many details as possible will be written into this part to help insure there will be no misunderstanding on the part of the foreman regarding the precautions which must be taken during an excavation. Part four would govern the safety requirements of the erection of skeleton frame buildings in the construction of bridges or similar structures. The requirements contained in this part have been patterned after what has been found to be effective in other areas.

Another part which is completely new deals with the use, the storage and the transportation of explosives used in construction work. These regulations were developed after a series of 13 meetings of the Construction Safety Board, and as the regulations were being developed representatives from the following industries were asked to attend the meeting and were invited to voice their criticisms of the proposed rules. 1. All major sewer and water contractors in the Greater Winnipeg area. 2. Steel erectors and union representatives of persons engaged in steel erections. 3. Manufacturers of power actuated tools. 4. Manitoba Hydro and the City of Winnipeg Hydro Electric System. And I would like to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that until the new regulations are made effective that the department will of course, continue its inspections to promote and enforce adequate safety measures in the construction industry.

The employment standards division of the Department of Labour has steadily increased its inspections in connection with wages, hours and safety. Inspectors made 915 safety inspections in the construction industry in the ten month period ending March 31, 1963. In the same period in the industrial field inspectors made 4,256 safety inspections. With these inspections are included the distribution of safety material, posters and stickers. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that safety promotion has been made the key aspect of any inspection in encouraging individual worker safety and in trying to develop employer-employee committees. The results have been very encouraging and it is our intention Mr. Chairman to pursue a more progressive and vigorous approach in the field of accident prevention and in worker education in the future.

To this end a detailed study is presently underway into the accident prevention activities of the Department of Labour and this is in co-operation with union, employers and the Workmen's Compensation Board. There is no room for complacency in the matter of industrial accidents. Nevertheless credit is due the many employers who have developed techniques which result in an excellent safety experience. Unions also deserve real credit for their interest and assistance in this field and the Department is doing its best to cope with the problem. Mind you, we hope to do better and we expect that by a more effective pooling of our resources that the program would be improved.

Settlement of wage complaints took up much of the time and effort of this division of my Department. Wage adjustments to employees made under the Vacations With Pay Act, the Employment Standards Act and the Fair Wage Act, amounted to a total of \$37,013.00 for a ten month period ending October 31, 1963. This compared with \$41,216.00 for the full year of 1962. The largest adjustment was made under the Fair Wage Act for a total of \$14,282.00. Under the minimum wage regulation of the Employment Standards Act \$7,552.00 was collected for employees. Naturally it is not the department's desire or intention to prosecute for every violation. The department's efforts are conscientiously directed towards either an amicable settlement in the case of wages or immediate corrective action in the case of unsafe working conditions. However, where there is a lack of co-operation or flagrant infraction it is necessary to prosecute and last year 46 employers were prosecuted on 93 different accounts.

I think I should mention too that the Employment Standards Division conducts annually what is probably the most comprehensive wage survey made anywhere in Canada. Last year 2,217 different establishments were canvassed. This covered a total of 160,000 employees in 269 classified occupations. I think I should make some comment too, Mr. Chairman, about the work of the Fire Commissioner's office. Its primary function is in co-operation with the municipality to enforce part 2 of the Fire Prevention Act. This includes activities relating to

(Mr. Baizley, cont'd)... the inspection of public buildings throughout the province in the interest of providing fire safe structures. In this connection the matters of primary concern are the provision of adequate exits, fire alarm systems and good housekeeping. Other matters which come under the jurisdiction of the Fire Commissioner's office are the storage, sale, and use of combustibles and explosives; the installation and maintenance of automatic and other fire alarm systems; the construction, maintenance and regulation of fire escapes; the means and adequacy of exits in cases of fire from factories, asylums, hospitals, churches, schools, halls, theatres and all other places in which numbers of persons work, live or congregate from time to time for any purpose.

Another important function of this office, Mr. Chairman, is the investigation into causes of fire and particularly where there is reason to suspect arson. The office also compiles and files statistical information relating to fires which it receives from the various other sources. In its educational activities the Fire Commissioner's office provides fire prevention literature and film to all interested parties, conducts training programs for fire protection and prevention for various institutions and interested groups. The office also helps in correlating techniques of fire fighting with the various fire departments throughout the province. I would like particularly to mention that last year the Fire Commissioner's office expanded its activities by opening a district office at Brandon in order to give more efficient and speedier service to the southwestern part of the province. This office serves an area approximately 95 miles by 75 miles including 108 towns and villages in addition to the City of Brandon.

I would like to close Mr. Chairman, with a few words about the work of the Apprenticeship Division. As part of its program for keeping pace with development in designated trade, this division has revised the trade rules for the automobile repair trade to provide for more specialized training. The division has prepared and issued literature and posters promoting apprenticeships to all junior and senior high schools in the province for the use of guidance teachers. Besides this, over the past year members of the staff have addressed interested groups about our apprenticeship program. Discussions have been going on with management and unions at Lynn Lake, Pine Falls, Flin Flon and Bissett to promote training in areas and in trades not previously dealt with under the Apprenticeship Act.

Last year a total of 98 apprentices graduated in Winnipeg and 25 graduated in Brandon. During the past year examining boards were established under the Tradesmen's Qualification Act in the automobile repair and carpentry trades. A Board of Examiners for the plumbing trade has now been established also. Due to the efforts of this division and the support of the Department of Education, trade improvement courses have been set up on an evening basis in Winnipeg and in Brandon. I might say that a similar course has also been set up recently in Morden. There are approximately 200 men attending these courses, who will be eligible for journeymen examinations and as other trades indicate the need, other examining boards and courses will be established Mr. Chairman.

Now Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, these have been some of the highlights of the activities of my department in its varied and different fields.

MR. STEVE PATRICK(Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to take this opportunity to congratulate the Honourable Minister of Labour for his lengthy report. As a matter of fact, it was so lengthy that we might have some difficulties in asking him too many questions in respect to labour matters. But it seems that he has used a somewhat different procedure than some of the other ministers have used in the House, somewhat different procedure than last year, because some of the Honourable Ministers have made short statements and the others have proceeded with the procedure that was used last year and have given us rather lengthy reports and at this time I would like to thank the Honourable Minister of Labour for giving us a long report because I think for us, on this side of the House it will make it somewhat easier to debate and ask questions in respect to labour. At the same time I would also like to extend my compliments to his staff. He mentioned a team of 110 in the Department of Labour, well that gets to be a pretty large team when you get 110 people but at the same time I would also like to thank him for the work that they're doing. I realize that there's a problem and their job is not the easiest because we are somewhat in a transition period, going from agriculture to more industrialization in our province. I would like to thank the Minister for his endeavours in such things as joint consultations as to labour and management. I think that we can do with

(Mr. Patrick, cont'd)... many more such things; also the fact that he mentioned manpower training and such things I think are very important when we are dealing with the Department of Labour.

He mentioned something too, priorities and study of labour legislation, I understand in the Throne Speech we were given to understand that there will be a three year study in connection with labour legislation. I would have been somewhat happier if he would have indicated what the priorities will be because he definitely stated that there is not going to be a complete study on labour legislation immediately or in the near future, which is somewhat different to what the Throne Speech had to say.

I would also like to point out that I also agree with him on such things as a seminar on labour management. Perhaps I believe we could go a little further in seminars, maybe we could establish a course within the Manitoba Technical Institute on such things as labour and management or labour relations. I think this would probably be very beneficial to labour-management relations.

There was also mentioned labour projections. I wish the Minister would have told us a little more on labour projections, because we are going into automation nowadays and I think this is a very important subject and very important for us to know what is going to happen to labour and to the unemployment because automation -- he just briefly mentioned it -- I think it would be beneficial for us in the opposition to know what actually is happening in respect to projections as far as labour is concerned.

I also heard him mention that today in Manitoba the labour situation is the best in Canada. He might be correct on this, but I don't think we should be too satisfied with this, because we all realize that this year it was even somewhat difficult to get labour for construction industry because of our winter works projects this winter, since we were quite busy and built many houses which somewhat differs from many other winters. So I would say probably this was an exception this winter which might not be in the future or has not been previously. I was quite interested to listen to him on conciliation seminars and conciliation officers or services that are available. I think perhaps the Department of Labour can take some initiative in instances where there is labour problems and we might be able to solve some of these problems better in such manner.

I was very happy to hear the Honourable Minister mention something about the Construction Safety Board which again as I say, we don't know too much about it because he just mentioned it that there is a study at the present time. I believe this is most needed. I think it is a long time overdue. I would like to say there must have been a time -- this department must have been treated quite lightly since we didn't see too much action in this respect and I believe it's high time that we did something about it as far as safety is concerned.

My remarks are going to be short and I will refer my comments mostly to industrial safety which I believe there is no one area of government regulation and assistance which is so important and beneficial to those concerned as a well conceived safety program. I made comments on it last year and I think it's a place that we could improve greatly. It has been determined as we advance technically the effects of stresses and environments in employment are such that human body may not be naturally fitted to withstand without damage. I'm certain people in industry are subjected to conditions which decrease their effectiveness with increasing frequency as we advance technically. For instance what are the long term effects of loud noises, abnormal light, loud motors, or strong electro-magnetic . . . . I would like to see the Minister endeavour to assess the effects of various industrial environments on workers. A community benefits through greater industrial efficiency of our labour force in the form of savings. One cannot measure the benefits in saving of human life and health. The industries would find profit accrues from energetic safety programs once inertia has been overcome. Employer relations benefit when workers are made aware that there is a personal and urgent interest in their welfare. The cost of workmen's compensation which is ultimately borne by the consumer and taxpayer, a completely unproductive expense is saved. I suggest the department responsible for the safety regulation in industry in this province can do more if given the resources and facilities. I'm convinced the effort would be profitable within a short time for all groups concerned. My impression is that the injury, accident and fatality rate in industry, excavation and construction is too high. All you have to do is look at some of the . . . .

(Mr. Patrick, cont'd)... things, I believe there is quite a number here, I'm not going to quote, but there's many particularly in excavation which I think we can do -- but we have to do quite a job.

Safety of the employee is largely governed by part 4 of the Employment Standards Act. These rules are set out defining in different ways safe conditions of work in different factories and similar places, such things as protection for machinery, fire extinguishing equipment, fire escapes, lighting and ventilation are covered. There are many items which are inadequately covered, or not covered at all; working on tall buildings is one of these. However I do not plan to deal with changes which might be considered, I'm more interested with the enforcement. Perhaps a meeting of industrial associations, labour unions and provincial labour personnel is the way to approach a specific program. The money to finance this activity should be made available in this budget.

The Honourable Minister of Labour may wish to consider uniting the safety functions of the provincial government under The Workmen's Compensation or a special board. The rate payable in workmen's compensation should be made to reward productive effort and penalize poor performance in safety practices. It is my impression that safety inspection has insufficient legal powers for enforcement. Although I have limited resources to assess the situation, but it has been brought to my attention quite a few times that notice is given to construction companies in Greater Winnipeg forewarning when the inspection will take place. I think this is a waste of money and does not serve any purpose if this is correct that the places are forewarned before inspection of safety officers. I would say this is contrary to the whole purpose of such an inspection and wages for inspectors are wasted under such circumstances.

In the matter of excavations and in the matter of cave-ins, I think this government should increase its activity in this department to reduce the frequency of fatal accidents. The unnecessary injuries and fatal accidents which have occurred from this cause make action by this government of immediate concern to all members of all Parties in this House. We all know there was quite a few excavation accidents in the past year and I'm not going -- I'd like to ask some questions or just precisely what happens after occurrence of an excavation accident. For instance, many a time or there were times that I've seen in the paper where reference to coroner's report that the accident was due to failure to observe safety regulations. I wonder had the employee been instructed in safety regulations? Was the worker under supervision by a supervisor or paired with an experienced worker? Was there adequate provision in the estimates which accompany the tenders of the companies for proper safety measures? I think these are most important. Had this project been inspected by provincial or other safety inspector, or any projects that had accidents in the last while? Has the engineer or safety officer responsible for reviewing these accidents any recommendations to make to reduce the number of cave-in injuries and fatalities in excavation work. How many contractors have been prosecuted, the ones that have broken the law? These are just some of the points that I wanted to make. For instance I mentioned there is no regulation as far as the high buildings are concerned and lack of enforcement. It is my information that the accident which occurred on a tall apartment block, the contractor had been warned by a union inspector quite a few times to provide safety measures or safety belts and it was completely ignored, I understand the Department of Labour has been warned of this and asked to do something. Apparently nothing had happened, and invariably we had an accident which was a serious one. So I would say up to this time it doesn't appear that the Labour Department or the Minister have been or has been too active as far as the safety regulations are concerned.

I also want to bring something to the Minister, it's probably not a provincial matter -- I believe it does fall within the Department of Labour and I think he would be quite well interested in this. It's in connection with the parcel-post department employees at the post office which I think falls under the federal department. It is my information that the parcel-post employees are paid somewhere around 5 1/2 cents per parcel plus \$20 per month, and parcels today apparently are too few to what they've been two or three years ago and the salary has been reduced almost by 50 percent in many instances. I believe that these people are being inconvenienced and it's a severe blow as far as income is concerned. I understand for instance they used to deliver telephone books and Eaton catalogues and so on and they have not these parcels any more. I understand it is their ambition or their hope to come under the civil servants or

(Mr. Patrick, cont'd)... the same as all the mail carriers, but I think it is a grievance because at the present time they have no sick benefits, no statutory holiday pay. They work a six-day week, they don't get any pay for sorting, which takes place from 4:30 in the morning to 8:30. They don't get paid for work on Sundays or Mondays when they have to do their sorting on a long weekend holiday. They are paid strictly on delivering or per parcel. I think this is something that the Minister should look into because as I said their salaries have been cut down by almost 50 percent in the last two years.

That's just a few of the comments I have to make and I'll ask some more questions later on.

MR; LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak a moment here on this government supervised vote on unionism. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that this thing here, or it seems to me that this thing here -- I've made this into a pudding -- the currants are inside but you can't see them. This thing puts something into this strike vote that these people didn't want at all and more complicated it is getting every day. Now here is something from the Free Press: When the union first heard there would be compulsory government supervised strike vote, there wasn't much serious discontent over the prospect. Most unionists believed that such legislation would mean what it said and nothing more, a union strike vote would be supervised by a government official. Little did these optimists realize that after the back-room boys had been to work on legislation, it would be transformed by regulation into a government organized vote and it would no longer be a union strike vote. Now we would say, well we can't see nothing wrong there, but we have to go further into the picture to see, and like a lot of things around here, it starts off in a nice way but then they start to put in the different things that come along to kill a number of things. There were a handful of unionists who shouted out against the idea on principle because they didn't like to have any more laws than there already existed, but the optimists said among themselves, "We have nothing to hide. If a government man runs the vote for us then public opinion so often turned against us by untold tales cannot be made to think that the union fixed the vote."

Contrary to some people's theories the great majority of union locals are not run crookedly, and could not possibly lose by having a government official acting as polling officer. The strike vote supervision however was not passed to be just supervision. It became a procedure saddled with rules that have made it complicated and more difficult for the union to obtain a majority that looks like the local wants to strike. Before the new law all the union local did was to hold a vote in the Labour Temple or in similar quarters and then announce the result. Now the same local has to have a vote taken not only among persons in the local but among all the workers in the plant or establishment who may or may not be in the Union, but who are in the bargaining unit for good or for bad. It is no longer a union strike vote. This is some influential unionists' belief is what can be termed as a part of gradual chipping away of union rights.

I sometimes wonder, when I reflect on conversations before the new rule came in, with Jack Carroll, then the Minister of Labour, if he originally intended to have hamstringing rules attached later. I believe he honestly felt at the time it would be good legislation, that it would be appreciated by the unions. When he first talked about the idea of supervised strike votes he was very enthusiastic that firms and unions would like it, at least that is the impression I got. I remember agreeing with him that I felt that unions have no strong objections to a government guarantee that a vote was bona fide, that no longer could an unfriendly person say the thing had been rigged and thus crumbled away -- and without . . . . the morality of men on the picket line.

The union official is not concerned with the vote of a worker not in his union, a worker who perhaps may scab when the strike begins, or even if he doesn't scab, then he isn't likely to show any interest in union's aims and objects. If you like the union it is felt you would have joined. The only interest the non-unionist has ever shown in a local is enjoyment of higher wages and benefits the union has brought him. Now we inject it into the strike vote scene by government.

Another thing the union just didn't relish is the rules of the Strike Board making it possible for his boss to attend the vote. This is infringing on union tradition he feels. In fact the boss and non-unionists are not welcome at the voting meeting. The list of persons entitled to vote is decided by a government official known as the Returning Officer. He also settles

(Mr. Harris, cont'd)...the place, date and time of vote. He can exclude names from the vote list if he feels justified. A union cannot any longer be the deciding factor on who casts a ballot, a right and a privilege it has had ever since strike votes began. The Returning Officer can decide on what kind of a notice goes out before the vote. It used to be none of the government's business. I can remember a short time ago when the Labour Department ordered that one vote be held in the Norquay Building in relays after work. The union involved didn't like this a bit. It had been used to having, I think since the turn of the century, a union chart on the wall of its meeting room and then held its vote.

The rules say the officer can fix the number and location of the polling places. To some unionists who cherish their hard-won rights and fairly ancient practices, this power as given to the plutocrat, however nice, is the absolute end. That he can direct and conduct a vote is not in the general sense objected to. His okay to a vote is like endorsing the Local's integrity, but this is all that the union's vote would occur. I know that it can be said that the unions don't, under the law, have to decide against a strike even if their supervised vote shows that they have only 50 percent in favour of the strike. The unions can then hold a private vote and strike on that result. But it isn't the same anymore. The supervised vote results are announced and the public opinion that a union needs so much in a strike would be influenced by the supervised vote.

So it seems now that what we used to do in a simplified manner before -- I know myself that people don't like to strike. I have seen this thing for many years. I know I was a young lad of 13 and I went down into the coal mines and I worked for 35 cents a day, eight hours a day -- three-quarters of a mile down in the ground and three miles in. The place where I worked was of high combustion and anything could happen. Two or three hundred men were killed off at a time. There was no regard for a human being -- no regard at all -- and the only way that we could do things for ourselves was to unionize. We had to do it. Now I was along there. In 1921 I seen a general strike. Come along again in 1926 -- I think I'll go out into the world. I'll go to Canada; this is a brand new country. I might have said this before but this was in my thoughts. They're a young country; all good vigorous new laws. I come here and what have we got? We're going back to the tail end of the old laws. We're not progressing any; we're going back. I say let's go ahead. Don't go back. Now, Sir, I say that we have quite a lot to do on this government supervision there. I think sometimes in my estimation that we're stepping into things that maybe we shouldn't.

Now Sir, I will get away from that a little and get on to accident reports. We used to have on these accident reports the near fatalities. They used to list every case. I remember when Jack Carroll was here that it was listed down. Now I don't see it in this book anymore listed. I wonder why, because it would seem to me that if you're going to check these things that you should possibly check into each and every individual case.

I have something here -- I don't want to go to these things all the while, but they're put down very good. "Trench unsafe; company fined. A Transcona construction firm which was checked by St. James police because of a dangerous trench on a job near St. James Bridge underpass last fall was fined a total of \$100.00 on conviction under The Construction Safety Act Thursday." Here is this construction company, pleaded guilty in Provincial Police Court to charges of not taking safety precautions and failing to adopt safety working practices. "Court was told St. James police officers ordered work stopped October 4th on sewer trench ten feet deep and ten feet wide near the St. James pass approaches at Saskatchewan Avenue and Madison Street.

"Police attention was drawn to the job by the fact it was going on within four feet of a busy street with no barriers or signs. They told the foreman to call two men out of the trench only a few minutes before the cave-in occurred where the men had been working. Police requested a Provincial Department of Labour inspector to come to the site. He immediately confirmed the order to cease work until the trench had been properly shored up. A Labour Department counsel, Kenneth Cameron, told Magistrate Cousley Thursday that safety precaution charges arose from the fact there was no shoring material at the site. "The safety practice charge," Mr. Cameron said, "followed the foreman sending men into the dangerous trench".

"Mr. Cameron reminded the court that the trenches with sides steeper than 45 degrees must be shored up while the work is done in them. He described this construction operation

(Mr. Harris, cont'd)... as sloppy workmanship. The lawyer acting for the construction company acknowledged its responsibilities in this matter. " A hundred dollars -- and here are these men now. What are we coming to? They ignore everything that should be done on these things and then we wonder why -- then they come back at us -- they come and say: What is labour doing? Why are they kicking? Why are they doing this? Surely I have a wife and children at home and they expect me to come home if I'd been working in that trench. The money is all right, but after all life is a little dearer than that. And I would say, Mr. Chairman, looking over all these things, that there's still a lot to be done and we kind of slough off our responsibilities. With that I thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word or two to the Minister and the department. May I first of all thank the Honourable the Minister of Labour for his comprehensive statement insofar as his department is concerned. I join with him in a tribute to his staff, that they are doing a pretty good job. Insofar as the Department of Labour is concerned, I think Mr. Chairman, quite frankly, that under proper direction they would do a far better job. When I say under proper direction, I want to assure the Honourable the Minister of Labour that I'm not speaking of him personally, but when I'm using the term "direction" in this case I'm using it in its true sense insofar as principles and philosophies are concerned, that under proper direction for the well-being of the labour community, indeed the province as a whole, I'm sure that the department would be most efficient, if not even more efficient than they are at the present time, for I sometimes feel that the department are in a position of having to do things that they don't really believe should be done.

I think an illustration of this was the fact that despite the Minister's statements the other week on a construction industry bill, his department, his deputies and others within the department convinced him that a few of us on this side of the House were correct. Now I won't pursue this further and I don't say that all that we say on this side of the House will be accepted by either the Minister or those that work with him in the department, and I only refer to this in passing.

I listened to the Minister as he was discussing the question of labour-management relations and I think that this is a very vital field for the progress of Manitoba. A number of us had the opportunity this morning of going out to my home city of Transcona and going through the shops there, and I think, Mr. Chairman, I can say without a question of doubt that at least so far as Manitoba is concerned that here we really do see excellent labour-management relations. We have our co-operative committees that meet periodically where the men have the opportunity of drawing to the attention of management things that they think should be done and, vice versa, management say to the representatives of labour what they think should be done.

As a matter of fact, I thought of this the other day, Mr. Chairman, when my colleague from Seven Oaks was referred to as sort of the liaison between the Department of Public Works and the members. He was acting in the spirit of co-operation representing management and labour, or the coming together of management and labour insofar as this building is concerned.

I agree with the Minister that this is a field that still needs a lot of exploring and a lot of understanding. While I am appreciative of the fact that we on this side of the House, and in particular in the New Democratic group here, are often considered as primarily the representatives of labour, I also want to say that we're fully appreciative of the problems of management and it is in the field of management and labour relations that we can find the necessary impetus for the future enhancement of the Province of Manitoba.

I want to say to the Minister that as far as this group is concerned we are prepared at all times to further enhance the co-operation between labour and management, because there are many good features in both and, similarly, I frankly confess on the other hand that in some areas the relationships aren't as good as they should be. So I say to my friend the Minister, keep on attempting to bring about more harmonious relations between management and labour.

And I think, Mr. Chairman, that one of the areas in which this can be done -- the Minister referred to it -- is in the area of The Labour Relations Act of the Province of Manitoba.

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

In the Throne Speech, the government announced a three-year program of review of labour legislation. I would suggest to my friend that one of the first areas to be tackled is this of labour relations, and in particular, and I note that my honourable friend recognized the problem and dealt with it to some degree in his speech here this afternoon, in particular that area where the workers are attempting to become organized. Now my honourable friend, while he was speaking insofar as this area was concerned, dwelt upon the question of firing. He mentioned the fact that sometimes the timing of the firing of an individual within a company whose employees are attempting to become organized is pretty bad. The timing is pretty bad. My friend mentioned the fact that on investigation sometimes it's revealed that it was only because of poor timing that there seemed to be any misunderstanding, or that there were misunderstandings and disputes. I want to say to my honourable friend, however, that I have found quite the reverse in a considerable number of instances. That while the exterior appearances indicate that it was bad timing, that it was deliberately bad timing, because I've had drawn to my attention on a number of occasions that individuals have been dismissed in employment based on even rumour of an attempt of organizations to bring into a union employees for their betterment in their respective categories. So I can't, Mr. Chairman, accept the remarks and statements of my honourable friend, and I note just now that he's had a little further advice from the former Minister of Labour in connection with this. I might say insofar as the previous Minister of Labour, we had a considerable amount of difficulty while he was the Minister of Labour in this field and I certainly hope, in all due respect to the Minister of Welfare, that in most instances at least the present Minister of Labour gives him a deaf ear. So I say to my friend, the present Minister, that this is one of the areas, that is in the time that a labour organization is attempting to set up a union in a plant, that is one of the most touchy, most touchy periods in labour-management relations. If my honourable friend and his staff can solve this problem I certainly will take my hat off to him.

My friend also mentioned the question of safety and accident prevention. He dwelt at quite a considerable length with what the department is doing. We have suggested before, Mr. Chairman, and I suggest it once again to the government, that in the area of safety and accident prevention that this is a field which properly belongs under the Compensation Board of Manitoba. Here we have, Mr. Chairman, the Compensation Board who is responsible for paying out of claims to injured workers. It is the Board that is charged with the responsibility of levying on industry, and only on management of course, on management, fees or charges in respect of accidents. And I'm happy to note, and I'm sure that everyone in this House is happy to note that our accident ratio is down this year, or the past year, over what it has been in the past, but nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, I think that if this trend is to continue or this trend could be enhanced, if the same department or section of government was charged with the responsibility of conducting investigations, of issuing of pamphlets and leaflets, and generally supervising accident prevention in the whole province.

Now I might say, Mr. Chairman, in this regard, the Canadian National Railways -- and you'll please excuse me for using them as an example, but it is an area that I'm reasonably well familiar with -- the CNR is one of those companies whose assessment is based on their incidence of accidents, and because of the fact that their assessment is based on the incidence of accidents they are constantly and persistently using their department of safety prevention, in the first instance of course to do whatever it can to prevent injury to the individual; but secondly, to keep down the assessment as it is being levied against them in respect of accidents. Now I think if this was done -- I think if this was done, and there's that old saying, Mr. Chairman, "He who pays the piper plays the tune" -- if that's the right way around of saying that, I'm not positive -- but this could be applicable insofar as accident prevention is concerned and payment as the result of accidents. So I suggest to my friend the Minister who is just starting out in his venture that during the period that he is the Minister, that this matter may be given a lot more consideration than it has been given in the past, and I think that it is worthy of that consideration.

While talking of the question of workmen's compensation, I want to say to my friend that I've had a number of complaints directed to me in that employees in some industries -- and I would suggest that this may be in some of the smaller industries -- are not receiving the

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)...general instructions as to what to do insofar as processing claims for compensation. I think the Minister is aware that we do have a general directive, signs are placed here and there, there are booklets, but I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that these are going into everyone's hands and I would suggest to the Minister that this be done.

Now, Mr. Chairman, dealing with the question of labour and labour relations, I want to say a few words on another aspect of the Honourable Minister's remarks this afternoon dealing with labour. He raised the question of training and re-training of individuals in this vast and rapidly changing of labour personnel and methods today. Also, I think he touched on the question, in dealing with this aspect, on the question of unemployment. I want to read to him a sentence or two from a document which I happen to have in front of me which goes back: "Realizing that unemployment and the problems arising therefrom constitutes the major issue facing the people today, places in the forefront of any program the demand that full maintenance of unemployed and their dependents be borne by the Dominion Government. Further, that a shorter working week be brought about with no reduction in wages. Further, of the taking of immediate steps to provide special classes for all children of school-leaving age and upward who are unable to obtain employment and also the establishment of kindergarten classes where necessary."

Well, kindergarten classes has nothing to do with my honourable friend the Minister of Labour, but the other point that I mentioned has, the question of training and re-training of the unemployed or the unemployable. The Minister speaks, as indeed his government speaks today, and many others, as though this is something new. We've just discovered -- we've just discovered the necessity of training and re-training individuals to meet this automated age. The document that I read from, Mr. Chairman, was datelined the City of Winnipeg, Friday, November 18, 1932 -- thirty-two years ago and it was then the election platform of the Independent Labour Party of Manitoba. So we in 1932 were still saying what is necessary today, and after thirty-two years we haven't achieved it.

And what do we find today, Mr. Chairman, in respect of the Department of Labour report? Do we find any reduction in the work week as the result of automation in the Province of Manitoba? Do we find any reduction in the work week because of the ever-recurring number of unemployed that we have in Manitoba? I say to my honourable friend that we still have a very grave unemployment problem here in the Province of Manitoba. But if we turn, Mr. Chairman, to the report of my honourable friend the Minister of Labour, on page 23, that despite the necessity of training and re-training of the labour force to provide employment in Manitoba; despite the fact of increasing automation in the Province of Manitoba; despite the fact of increasing automation in the Province of Manitoba, we find that in the year 1963, that in the Wage Survey Coverage Report of the Employment Standards Division, that in the year 1963 the standard work week in the Province of Manitoba was the highest in total hours since the year 1951.

In other words, in 1952 the standard work week was 51.5 hours; in 1963, 41.7 hours work week. When labour has been suggesting that we should establish for all employees a standard 40-hour work week, when we have been told that we should re-train our people who may be displaced by automation in order to take jobs, the average worker in Manitoba is working longer, or worked longer in the year 1963 than he had since 1951 according to the report of the Honourable the Minister of Labour. I don't think we can hold the Minister entirely responsible for this. I only raise this point, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that governments, not only this one but governments generally, are giving lip-service to meeting the problems of automation, the problems of the unemployed.

We often talk in this House, as I am sure they do in the other provincial jurisdictions across Canada, of the great value that we are receiving as a result of the winter works program, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that because of the incentives that have been given insofar as winter works is concerned that there is more work going on in the winter time than ever before, but I am now receiving reports, from some within the construction industry at least, that there has been a levelling off in the total number of employed who are employed constantly. In other words, while the amount of work in the winter time has risen, there being X number of jobs to be done over a twelve-month period, there has been a general levelling off of the employees kept in full employment; and, transversely, an increase in the number of permanently

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd)...unemployed within the construction industry. Now I don't know if my honourable friend the Minister of Labour would agree with that, but this is information that I am getting from some of those within the construction industry.

Now I'm happy, Mr. Chairman, as I read some news reports to note that there are some concerned with the question of employment in Canada who are rather more optimistic than the Leader of the New Democratic Party. I refer to an article that was in the Winnipeg Free Press of Saturday, March 21st, where Bill Maurice, one of the reporters, interviewed William Thompson of Ottawa, the Director of Canada's National Employment Service. Mr. Thompson is quoted as saying that unemployment was down 76,000 from last year. I don't know if he said, "Hurrah" when he said this, but I suggest that while unemployment was down 76,000 from last year this really is only a hole in the bucket insofar as the general overall picture is concerned, because Mr. Thompson then goes on to say: "but he stressed that within two or three years there was going to be an influx of young people in the labour force which will impose a challenge for the economy to have become buoyant enough to absorb it." So this is the picture that we have to face up to.

Further on in this article, Mr. Chairman, reference is made to the ever-increasing difficulty of our students at our universities to be able to find employment during the summer months in order to pay for their tuition, and I think in this, Mr. Thompson is right. I had last summer -- and I'm sure that many other members of this House had the same directed to them last summer -- a number of young boys and girls coming to them and asking them if we knew where we might find them a job in order that they might receive sufficient dollars to continue their education. I think this is a problem that is going to become more and more evident in the province, and for this reason I respectfully suggest that the government should give more consideration than apparently it has been doing to lower the costs to the individuals of education at the university level, because so many of the individuals rely on summer employment to get enough money to help "ma" and "pa" out insofar as their tuition fees are concerned. If they can't find employment, I greatly fear that some of them will not be able to go back to university to continue their studies, and if Mr. Thompson is correct, it is an indicator that my fears are not unfounded.

So with these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I wish to the Minister ever-increasing success in his endeavours as Minister of Labour. Any time he wants some expert advice I'm sure that members of my group, possibly not their Leader but members of my group are prepared to give it to him. We are happy that at least in some instances he does listen to us. We want him to call together the Minimum Wage Board to re-survey the absolutely inhuman minimum wage that we have got here in the Province of Manitoba. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Welfare now is doing better insofar as providing the wherewithal to keep limbs together than the Minister of Labour is with his minimum wage. So I ask my honourable friend call Cam McLean and the boys together; talk to them nicely; talk to them firmly; and adopt what is desired across Canada, a minimum wage of at least \$1.25 per hour and be, for once, in the Province of Manitoba a pioneer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 -- passed, Item 2 --

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to take this last minute or two and I would like to answer questions of the honourable -- (Interjection) -- beg your pardon? -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Item 2.

MR. PETERS: I was waiting for the Minister to answer, and seeing that the hour that it is, I don't think there is much time to ask any more questions or get any answers, and I would move, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee rise.

MR. EVANS: The motion of course is not debatable and I think it meets with the wishes of this side of the House as well, and so if it were possible to do so, I would second the honourable member's motion. Would the Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply is considering a certain resolution, directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: It now being 5:30, the House will now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 Thursday afternoon.