



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 13    2:30 p.m. Wednesday, February 28, 1962. 5th Session, 26th Legislature

Printed by R. S. Evans, Queen's Printer for the Province of Manitoba, Winnipeg



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, February 28th, 1962

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon), introduced Bill No. 8, An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Brandon Golf and Country Club.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe we were just on the wrong motion there. Reading and Receiving Petitions. Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. Notice of Motion. Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q. C. (River Heights), introduced Bill No. 37, An Act to amend The Flin Flon Charter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN: I would like to ask the pardon of yours and the members of the House for getting out of order. I was looking at the Votes and Proceedings instead of the Orders of the Day. I would now like to make the motion that I previously made.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface), introduced Bill No. 31, An Act to incorporate The St. Boniface Club.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day may I have the consent of the House to present a petition? If so, we beg to present the petition of Capital Funds IAC Limited praying for the passing of an Act to authorize the said company to carry on business in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Minister of Welfare)(Portage la Prairie): Before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Department of Welfare for the calendar year 1961.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the NDP)(Radisson): Will copies be available for all members?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: There will be copies available, yes.

MR. PAULLEY: When?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: As soon as we can get them put together.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has replied to my second question--excuse me for not standing up--to the effect "as soon as we can get them ready". May I respectfully ask him to have them available as quickly as possible because, as the House well knows, we're going into estimates at this time, and it would be of prime interest to all of the members of the House in considering the estimates for the department--and I might say, Mr. Speaker this is also the same in respect of other departmental reports--that the Members of the House should have these reports in order that they may be able to scrutinize the estimates of the department in view of their past performances. This is the only way in which we can do it, so I respectfully ask all of the Ministers opposite in departments, with their departmental reports, not to answer us "as soon as available" because when we get down to this session of the House I think it's of prime importance that we have them.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I assure the Honourable Leader of the NDP that these reports will be available in a very few days.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . point. It is conceivable that we'll be into the estimates of the Honourable Minister's department within a few days, and I think it is most unfair to we in opposition that these reports are not available to us for a considerable period of time before we go into estimates. It's most unfortunate and most unfair, as I say.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker I would agree with my honourable friend if there was the slightest possibility that he would not have several weeks to look at this report before the estimates of the department are on. I appreciate his point of view and

(Mr. Roblin, oont'd.) . . . . we'll do our best to give him that report as soon as we can, and I assure him it will be in good time so that he will not be unduly rushed before looking at the estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the new Minister of Public Welfare. I understand that old age pensioners staying in some institutions in the Province of Manitoba were being permitted to keep only \$5.00 of their pension money for their personal needs. I want to know if it's true that with the increase of \$10.00 in the old age pensions that they're still being permitted to keep only \$5.00 for their personal needs. Because in fact the amount of money which they have is no greater now than it was before the increase, still \$5.00 a month.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's quite correct because under the Social Allowances Act, anyone who is in receipt of Social Allowances is entitled to receive \$10.00 per month for personal uses. Now if he has knowledge of any institution that is not making this sum available and has it within their power to do so, and does not make the sum available to the residents of that institution, I would be very pleased if he would report it to my department, because those are not the regulations. Now, as I mentioned previously also the Social Allowances Act will continue to meet need wherever it is found, and these regulations have not been amended since the change in the pension categories that he mentions.

MR. ORLIKOW: I have this information; I'll turn it over to the department. I wonder if my information is correct, if they have been wronged up to now, if these people can get the back amount which they are entitled to? In other words they've only been getting \$5.00, they should have been getting \$10.00. Can they get the difference for the past year?

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Utilities and in view of the fact that I haven't had an opportunity of advising him in advance of the nature of the question, he may take this as notice. My first question is: were tenders called for the sale of top soil at the steam plant at Selkirk, and if your answer is yes, what tenders were received for the purchase of that top soil? The other question is: was that top soil moved from the steam plant at East Selkirk to the Grand Rapids site of the new Hydro Electric Plant, and if your answer is yes, how many yards were moved; what did it cost to transport that soil by truck from the steam plant at East Selkirk to the docks at Selkirk; and what did it cost to transport that soil from the docks at Selkirk by barge to the site of the Grand Rapids plant? And another question: was there any sod purchased for the Grand Rapids site, and if so, how much was purchased and where was it purchased from?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): In the initial response to that thoughtful question from my honourable friend I can only say that it would appear that portions of it at least would be more appropriately asked under the machinery of an Order for Return. He might wish to peruse his questions--I don't retain all of them in my memory--but I believe that he would possibly agree with me if he looked at his questions again, and certainly we'll attempt to get the information for him, no matter in which form the question appears.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I don't mind putting it in the form of an Order for Return as long as I get an answer to my questions.

HON. G. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker before you proceed, may I lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Department of Industry and Commerce and the Manitoba Development Authority for the period ending March 31st, 1961, and a return showing the staff provided in the 1962-63 estimates.

A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour--I'm sorry.

MR. EVANS: I was asked a question by the Leader of your party. Copies of the annual report of the department will be distributed in the House immediately. There are copies for each caucus room laid on the table of the House. If further copies are desired I can provide them.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Labour. In the February 24th issue of the Manitoba Gazette notice is given under the Companies Act that letters patent has been issued incorporating four individuals of the towns of

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) . . . . Lynn Lake, Flin Flon, Thompson and Bissett, all safety engineers, to carry on without pecuniary gain objects of a patriotic, philanthropic, charitable, scientific and professional character by the name of Mines Accident Prevention Association of Manitoba, corporation without capital stock. My question, Mr. Speaker is, what jurisdiction will the Department of Labour have over the activities of this association, and will it relieve the government of any of its responsibilities in regard to mine safety?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the member for Seven Oaks for giving advance notice of this question. I'd like to say that the Department of Labour will actually have no jurisdiction over this company which has been set up with the purpose in mind of trying to reduce industrial accidents in their mining operations. Associations such as this do function in other provinces and in other industries as well, whereby a group of industries get together to try to reduce accidents in their industry; to try to eliminate hazards; to try to make them a safer place in which to operate. Now the functions of the departments that have an interest in this remain the same and the Department of Labour will continue to function in those areas in which they have jurisdiction, which in mining operations is restricted to burrowers, --electrical and construction safety. The Department of Mines & Natural Resources have the responsibility for all underground operations and in the processing in the plants the Department of Health, of course, have some responsibility with respect to the fumes and other health hazards that exist in the operations as well. These companies, I think, represent all of the mining companies in the province. They spoke to me about this last year; indicated that they were thinking of an association of this kind; did express the hope that it might eventually reflect in lower assessment under Workmens Compensation, among other things. We certainly welcome associations of this kind because we think it will be most helpful in reducing accidents in the mining operation.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Second Reading of Bill No. 3, the Honourable--

MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House, the annual report of the Workmen's Compensation Board for the year 1961.

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading of Bill No. 3, the Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 3, An Act respecting the Department of Public Utilities, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is anything I can usefully add to what I said on the occasion of the Committee of the Whole stage of this Bill. It takes the usual form as members will see for the establishment of various departments.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): I think those of our group would have no major objection to the Act that is being proposed here, in general, but we do have some questions that we will want to ask about the intentions of the Government with regard to the application of this Act. I note, for example, that it makes provision for the appointment of a Deputy Minister and such other officers and employees as may be required; so our first question would be: is it the intention to appoint a Deputy Minister? The next one following on this would be the one: is it the intention of the Government to appoint a Minister as such to take care of this Department by itself? When we look at the component part of this particular department, we find that now for example, the Manitoba Hydro group coming under this, the Public Utilities Board, the Securities Act, the Taxicab Act, the Manitoba Telephone Act and the Highway Traffic and the Amusement Act--now it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that all the way through in each one of these particular fields, the Government has now some very efficient management. Take for example the Hydro, which is now combined with the old Power Commission system, I think we can say that we have had excellent management for a number of years in both those departments. We've had very qualified staff; we've had commissioners appointed from the public at large and these have operated most efficiently. The same could be said, in my opinion, about the other component parts of this particular department. They have been operating under commissions, the Public Utilities Board, for example, as far as I understand, going either through it or the Municipal, cover the Securities Act and the Taxicab Act, and while I can see some value in having these all together in one department, I do wonder whether it's necessary, in view of the organization that exists down below in all of these fields, to set up an entirely new staff and organize a completely new department. It seems to

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . me that it could be done through one of the departments or through some of the personnel now existing, in view of the fact that these, as I say, have been both efficiently managed in the past and I think are very capably staffed at this time. So these are the questions that we will want to go into once we get into the committee stage of this Bill, but I want to make these observations prior to our accepting second reading of this particular Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether or not my colleague from Inkster may have a remark or two to make in connection with this. We are interested in the jurisdictions which will come under the Department of Public Utilities. Most of them are listed as, what we normally consider as Public Utilities. I am wondering whether or not that it might be possible for this Committee or this Department to broaden its scope to take under consideration such things as the responsibility of the jurisdiction in assessing of rates in regard to our Medical Health Care and also the setting of rates in respect of our hospitalization scheme. It seems to me that in these fields, and particularly in MMS, that because of the ever-increasing coverage and the ever-increasing responsibility of a private organization in the field of health and assessing of rates, that the time has come when Government of necessity in order for full protection or full analysis of the rates that are being charged to the citizens of our province in respect of these services must come under the preview and under the review of a department such as the Public Utilities Department as being set-up at the present time, and I would like to hear from the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, the Premier, as to whether or not the Government has given any consideration to referring these matters or amending the statutes necessary in order that the participants in such schemes as these are fully protected and the matters are fully investigated before authorizations of rates are made.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, all I want to add is that this is an extremely important department. It's transferring business which is in public interest to a department able to give more serious consideration. At the present time all the utilities are very, very important. Electricity is very important; telephone is very important; even a taxicab board is very important--it all comes under utilities--and many others which I cannot at the present enumerate, that should be handled completely in a special department, although it may varyiate from the principals of the Government as to public ownership, but I think we are in public ownership now, so might as well strengthen what we have, find everything possible that could be included in public ownership, so far it does not do any harm to the consumers, to the people of the province, either in electrifying the province, or give them low price telephone calls, or protect their investments, or what have you, I am whole-heartedly in favour of this, providing they don't stop here, but take in everything that's possible into this department that could be diverted and directed to the interest of the people instead of the interest of the individuals.

MR. ROBLIN: If that exhausts the list of members who wish to speak on this Bill, perhaps I could make a comment or two on what has been said.

I think that the contributions to this little debate have been valuable. I agree very largely with what the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition had to say about the general status of this department and the calibre of the people whom we have associated with it at the present time, and I do not anticipate any very substantial increase in staff or civil service on account of this particular measure. I think, however, we do have to look a little bit ahead, and it seems to me that in particular, problems are arising in connection with public transport on the highways, the trucking industry in Manitoba and matters in connection with the Royal Commission on Transportation which may call for a study of our policy on transportation in the province, and matters of that sort are raising quite a lot of new problems in this connection. The matters of highway safety and of that kind of thing are connected with it as well. Now under the present circumstances, the department shares its Minister with the Department of the Attorney-General, and having no Deputy Minister under those circumstances does place a considerable load upon the shoulders of the Minister in this respect, and we are giving serious consideration to the appointment of a Deputy Minister in this department, although I must in frankness tell my honourable friend that no firm decision has been made and may not be made for a little while. It's not certain how that will turn out, but we do feel that in view of the fact that it is not the intention to appoint another Minister at the present time, perhaps we should look at this pretty carefully. We also think that in view of the negotiations which will commence

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . on March 19th with the federal government in connection with the development of the Nelson River and associated projects that the work of this Department is liable to increase quite substantially. So, while I must tell my honourable friend that we do not intend to make any immediate appointment, the matter is under consideration and as we see the situation developing we will be guided by those events.

I think the Leader of the New Democratic Party also made reference to a point which has been giving us a good deal of concern, and that is in his reference to the relationship between the Manitoba Medical Service and the government, particularly in respect of changes in premiums in the Manitoba Medical Service, and I think I may say without betraying any confidence that we have been having a number of conferences with the interested parties in connection with this matter, and I believe that I am not being optimistic when I say that probably quite soon we will be able to report to the House what arrangements we have worked out in order to put this matter on a more satisfactory footing than it is at the present time. I think we must bear in mind that the MMS is not a government body, that they are a privately-operated association, that the physicians who are members of it and who receive their remunerations from it, collect, I think, today about only 85% of the standard charge, so that--(interjection)--well I am willing to take the word of the gentleman in question that that is the case--I believe it is the case myself, and it's not just an open and shut relationship. That's the point I'm trying to get, that we have to respect the rights of all concerned. That includes, of course, the general public and the subscribers. Their rights have to be considered too, but I think that we are going to be able to come to an amicable arrangement that perhaps will meet the issue insofar as the public interest is concerned, and when we reach that stage I will be very happy to let members of the House know what has taken place so that they may pass their judgement upon it. So I think that I may answer his point in that particular way. I think, Sir, those are the major points in connection with this matter that I should comment on at the present time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 4, the Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 4, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, there are two points covered in this short amending bill. The first relates to the clarification of what might have been considered an ambiguity in the section heretofore dealing with breaches of regulations constituting an offence under The Summary Convictions Act of this province. The second one provides a system for substitutional service pursuant to the Act, and it arises out of a judgment of the Court of Appeal of Manitoba in which this suggestion was made by obiter dicta by one of the Justices sitting on the appeal in question.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to oppose the second reading of this Bill but I would like to state certain reservations that I have regarding the principles embodied in the Bill. I have no objection to substitutional service being ordered in cases where substitutional service is necessary, but I do not think that substitutional service should be ordered simply as a matter of convenience, as this Act states. Nor do I agree that substitutional service should be ordered simply because prompt personal service could not be effected. Now I can visualize cases where a summons is issued and perhaps the defendant to whom that summons is directed is out at Grand Rapids or some place. Now, we could argue that prompt personal service could not be effected on that person due to the distance away from the place of service, the origin of the summons. Now I don't think that should be any reason at all why substitutional service should be permitted in a case of that nature. Then again the use of the expression "conveniently be found". Well, convenience is a relative expression. What may be convenient to me may be a matter of inconvenience to somebody else. So for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, although I will vote for the second reading of the Bill, I reserve the right to make certain suggestions as to amending it when it comes into the Law Amendments Committee.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Attorney-General? I don't know about this Bill; I don't know the legality of it; I'm just accepting the word of the Attorney-General who is a responsible man. My question is: where and how have you found that this Bill is necessary? Who told you that the wording is not correct? Why bring it in? Are you going out at random and looking for faults in the old statute books and bringing in all the time,

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . . in my opinion, not necessary amendments? I'd like to know it.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . . is closing the debate.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to direct any questions with respect to this Bill, let me say first of all that I agree with the Honourable Member for Selkirk that one must be awfully careful in framing a section dealing with substitutional service that rights such as which he speaks of are not infringed, and certainly we will look forward to any suggestions or modifications which he might suggest, or other members of the House might suggest, if, in fact, when we get to Law Amendments we find that there would be infringement of the kind that he suggests. I should say that it was intended to deal primarily with matters of a civil nature arising under the Summary Convictions Act and we may well be able to improve that by making it applicable only to civil matters if that's found to be desirable.

With respect to the point raised by the Honourable Member for Inkster, I can only assure him that Bills are drafted by human beings and that all humans, including members of this House, and draftsmen, sometimes are prone to error, or sometimes as years go by they perhaps see that they didn't contemplate everything that should have been contemplated within a section. And basically the point that is raised with respect to the first portion of this Bill is this: that formerly the section read, the section contemplated regulations made by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or by Minister and subsequently approved by Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I think if he reads this he will see that this section should be made to contemplate all regulations because in this modern legislation has evolved, not all regulations are approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and it is one of those situations that just comes about through changes in statutes which reflect back on an Act such as the Summary Convictions Act and make it necessary to amend it from time to time to bring it up-to-date with what has actually happened.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 21--An Act to amend The Election Act. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 21, An Act to amend The Election Act (1), for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think this is reasonably self-explanatory. It merely brings the schedules of The Election Act into conformity with those amendments which were approved by this House in 1961. At that time the schedules were not looked at apparently as carefully as they should have been. This brings the schedules of the Act into conformity with the substance of the Act itself.

MR. MOLGAT: We have no objections naturally to this change. I think by and large we agreed to some of the changes that were made in The Elections Act last year. There were a number of matters, one of them in particular--that was the time between the issue of the writ and the election in which we had very serious disagreement, and we still have. However, this particular item we have no objection to, and are prepared to let it pass. I wonder if, at the same time this is being discussed whether the First Minister would also be prepared to advise the House in view of the comment of my colleague, the Member for Ethelbert Plains, of yesterday, would he be prepared to advise the House of the date of the next election.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour?

MR. GRAY: One question. This does not include the lowering of the age of the electors.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, it's right in there.

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

..... Continued on next page.



MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 22. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture, HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville) presented Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, the Bill in itself is self-explanatory. It merely permits a member or municipality which is a member of a veterinary services district to contribute further sums to the support of the district. At the present time they are limited to a share of the sum of \$1,000 and this will enable them to make further payments over and above their share of the cost.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT: (Seven Oaks) Sir, I wish to ask the Minister a question in regard to this Bill. As the wording is that a district may pay to the municipality and it is not mandatory, is the Minister suggesting that this is sort of an appeal to the municipalities who may have felt that they had received services above normal, or is this just an attempt to get the hard-pressed municipalities to donate to a cause which we all regard now as very important, the veterinary services of the province?

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . . before the Minister replies to that question I think, as I recall, that this was a matter requested by the municipalities themselves and I would want this assurance from the Minister before we proceed. As I understand it, some of the municipalities felt that they would want to make higher contributions in order to get more services and they were limited under the Act, in fact it caused some difficulties, as I recall it, in certain areas where some of the taxpayers felt the municipality had acted against the Act. So we want that assurance from the Minister, I'm sure, that this is a request from the municipalities, and also whether this will be voluntary on the part of all municipalities within the district, or if one municipality decides to do so whether there will be pressure on the other municipalities. We would want to be assured that each of them can make this decision individually and the veterinarian district does not put pressure on them, that is, if one decides and the others do not want to do so.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, because I'm in an awkward position here. I just wonder if the Minister would elaborate. For example, the veterinarian district organized and then there is the municipality and unorganized territory, and the district is combined from, say, two or more municipalities, and then it's combined with unorganized territories, whether this \$1,000 will come from the province or more, to the municipality once, and then to the unorganized territory, second. Or is it just going to receive one grant?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a comment on this, of a more or less general nature. While I appreciate the fact that this may have been a request from the municipalities for permissive legislation to increase the amount that they are paying in respect of veterinary services in the Province of Manitoba, I wonder whether or not we have not reached the stage, despite the fact of the apparent request of the municipalities in this regard -- that we have reached the stage where we're loading obligations and responsibilities to an ever-increasing amount upon our municipalities. It would appear to me that the veterinarian services in the Province of Manitoba should be a direct responsibility of the Province of Manitoba itself. I think we've reached the stage. Indeed, Sir, I think we have gone past the stage where the tax on land, which is the basic source of revenue for our municipalities, has reached its maximum. I think it would have been far better for this government upon receiving the request of the municipalities for this type of permissive legislation, to say to them: "We recognize your problem. We recognize the fact that your expenditures for such services as these are increased, but we, in the interests of the livestock industry and of the municipalities and the people of Manitoba will accept our responsibility and forthwith increase our contribution to veterinarian services so that it is not an additional charge or an increasing charge on the taxpayer of the respective municipalities." I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion, and it's not held by me alone, that the financial responsibilities for services of this nature and many others have gone far beyond what were originally the responsibilities of municipalities and that this government, even in permissive legislation like this, is encroaching upon the taxpayers in respect of municipalities and I would like to hear a comment from the Minister in respect of this.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HUTTON: These districts -- and we only have one in the province -- are established to enable the people who live in especially sparsely settled areas to avail themselves of the

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd) . . . . services of a veterinarian by offering that person in a sense some guarantee of income to defray the high costs of transportation which can occur in a rural area. The other thing that it does is level off or equate the costs of mileage or the cost of transportation between the farmers and livestock owners within this area in such a way that, for instance, where because of my location I might pay \$40.00 for a call, someone else under the same circumstances but a good deal closer to the centre, might only pay \$20.00 for a call, this payment weights the services of the veterinarian so that they are available to all the people within a given area, within a district, on fairly even terms. Distance and location have been taken into account and the government pays dollar for dollar up to \$1,000 and in the past the Act permitted the municipalities within a district to contribute a matching grant -- you might put it that way -- of \$1,000.00. We have been requested to permit the municipalities to make grants over and above this limitation, and it is not the business, I think, of the Provincial Government to tell the local people that they have not the right to co-operate and to throw their combined weight against the program which they feel is beneficial to them. So for those reasons we have presented this amendment to the Act to enable them to do the things that they want to do and I think that is a very good reason in a democratic country for making an amendment to legislation.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Welfare.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture the following resolution: Whereas the Government of Canada has advised the Government of Manitoba that it is prepared to recommend to the Parliament of Canada the enactment of legislation to improve the Canadian social security system by, inter alia, providing for (a) graduated old age pensions on a contributory basis for those who can afford additional provision for their old age and who have not undertaken it under private plans, contractual or otherwise; and (b) the payment of benefits under certain circumstances (i) to the widows and children of contributors who die; and (ii) to former contributors who become permanently disabled; and whereas it appears that Parliament cannot validly enact legislation for the purpose mentioned in clause (b) of the next preceding paragraph unless an appropriate amendment is made to the British North America Act, 1867; and whereas it is desirable that the Parliament of Canada should be enabled to enact legislation for the purposes aforesaid; Therefore be it resolved: That this House concurs in an Address being made by the Government of Canada to Her Majesty the Queen requesting the enactment by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of legislation to repeal the present section 94A of the British North America Act, 1867, and to substitute therefor the following section: 94A. It is hereby declared that the Parliament of Canada may from time to time make laws in relation to (a) old age pensioners; and (b) pensions and other benefits incidental to, or conducive to the better operation and administration of, a scheme of old age pensions; but no law made by the Parliament of Canada under the authority of this section affects the operation of any law enacted by the legislature of a province in relation to any of the matters specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section; And be it further resolved: That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that, failing the enactment of the amendment to the British North America Act, 1867, hereinbefore approved, the Parliament of Canada should enact legislation to establish a plan for the payment of contributory old age pensions as mentioned in clause (a) of the first paragraph of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Speaker, it is my conviction that the principle which is implicit in this resolution is one with which every member of this House will agree. The implementation of this principle will provide an opportunity for everyone to fulfill his responsibility to make adequate provisions for his declining years. When this subject was introduced in the House of Commons at Ottawa, Mr. Monteith, the national Minister of Health and Welfare said on page 531 of February 5th Hansard, and I'll quote: "The government's objective in this regard is clear cut. Our aim is to have an integrated program of old age income security which in addition to the universal flat rate benefit will provide a graduated benefit for all those who can reasonably afford further provision for their old age and who have not already undertaken it under private pension plans or under contractual agreements." On February 6th in further discussion of the measure, Mr. Monteith pointed out that the plan had evolved after a thorough study of the social security

(Mr. Christianson, con't) . . . . .system in the United States in a report that was prepared by a Professor Clark, I believe a Professor of Economics at the University of British Columbia, for the federal government. Mr. Monteith also stressed that the plan was not intended as a duplicate of private plans, nor was it intended to put any additional burden on industry. I would like to quote further from Tuesday, February 6th Hansard, wherein he states, and I'll quote again: "To the extent of that existing private pension plans are considered to be satisfactory as compared with the proposed government plan, persons covered under these plans will be exempt from the compulsory features of the new program."

Another important point: Benefits will be payable at age 65 or over in accordance with contributions made by the person during his working life and more particularly in cases of death or disability, benefit would accrue to the widow or to the children or to a disabled pensioner. This proposed program, we believe, will go a long way toward completing the systematic provision of retirement income for our elderly people and this program will be in addition to the present social security measures and it will replace neither the present government programs nor sound private plans. There is one other major provision, Mr. Speaker, in the new program; and that is the portability of the benefits. This feature will go a long way to increase the mobility of the labour force in Canada and I am sure all members recognize the importance of this feature in our rapidly expanding and changing economy and its great benefits to all our people. Another point, Mr. Speaker, that I should mention is the constitutional one. Some will question the need for an amendment to the British North America Act but in this regard the present government is only following the precedents that have been set out in the past, more particularly, in 1940 when the Unemployment Insurance Act was passed and again in 1951 when the present Old Age Security Act was implemented. Premier Lloyd of Saskatchewan questions that the terms of the amendment are sufficiently broad indeed to encompass all the objectives of the plan, but I would only say that I do not wish to get into this constitutional argument; I would prefer to leave that to the lawyers, but I feel that the Department of Justice is well able to rule on the point and I think that we should perhaps take their decision in this regard. I do believe, however, that it is beneficial that every province should have an opportunity to express its opinion on this far-reaching subject of such national concern. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution has a second operative paragraph and we believe that in the unlikely event some of the other provinces do not agree to the constitutional amendment that the federal government should nevertheless proceed with the plan of a graduated old age pension and on a contributory basis. This government has through its Social Allowances Act, taken the responsibility for meeting the needs of the aged who lack the basic necessities of life, but we believe that the government has a duty to provide a plan so that people during their productive years will have an opportunity to provide against the likelihood of need on their retirement.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, it appears that a constitutional amendment is required if we are to have the benefit of the far-reaching legislation envisaged. This legislation will ultimately provide everyone with the opportunity to prepare for his retirement and for the protection of his dependents by an orderly and systematic program. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend this resolution to the House.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Are you going to make a statement before going into . . . ?

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think that I -- in answer to the question, Sir, I don't think that I will make any detailed statement before we go into estimates. Perhaps when we get in, if there are questions about the estimates in general that the members would like to raise we could deal with them at the beginning and could have a free exchange of views on that point and I would be glad to answer any questions that I can then.

MR. MOLGAT: Again a question, not a speech. Could the Minister indicate the sequence

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) . . . in which we will be going through the estimates. If this could be done at this stage it would facilitate the work of the House very much.

MR. ROBLIN: I quite appreciate that point, Sir, and we will be proceeding with the first three or four departments in the estimates in that order, and then there will be some switches and I can give the House those switches later on, but I think we've got plenty to keep us busy today and probably tomorrow with the straight order of business as set out in the estimates.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before we go into the Committee, I want to express my appreciation — and I am certainly not buttering up the government on this occasion. I think they have done what we have requested in the past to give us these staff counts that we're dealing with in the estimates for '62-'63. May I suggest to them it would have been even more appreciated had there been a comparison with the staff of '61-'62. Now I can possibly visualize, Mr. Speaker, that that question will arise pretty well on every estimate as we are going through the estimates, and possibly the First Minister and the departments concerned -- we won't have it for today, but it might be advisable if before we sit again as a Committee, that they might be able to compile that. I am sure that it will facilitate the business of the Committee and give us the information that we will be seeking in any case.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne states, and very appropriately so, that this is the 150th anniversary of the great events in the history of Manitoba, the first attempts of permanent settlement in the organized fashion of our province, perhaps better known as the establishment of the Red River settlement. It is 150 years since Miles MacDonald and his party reached the Red River, August 18th, 1812, by which time his original party of 36 had been reduced to 18. The first 120 settlers reached the banks of the Red River on October 27th; other settlers came in succeeding years. A colony was nearly routed out on more than one occasion. The massacre of Seven Oaks occurred. Some settlers left for Ontario, but the colony succeeded in surviving. This is a bold venture and one that was destined to face many trials and difficulties and hardships. In the end, however, these pioneer settlers triumphed over their many hazards. In fact, it marked the real beginning of settlement in Manitoba and the first step in the change from a fur economy to the main economy of agriculture, to the agricultural economy in our province. The influence of the Selkirk settlers is seen in the subsequent life of the province, in religion, in education and in law. Their descendants today grace many of the professions. The beginning of this settlement was almost unnoticed because of the European War with Napoleon and the War of 1812 to 1814 between the United States and Canada. A Selkirk Centennial was planned in 1911 but its grandiose plans collapsed when the federal government of that day refused to participate financially and the money needed could not be raised locally. The 1912 Centennial turned out to be a pretty tame affair little remembered today. For the 150th anniversary, something tangible and lasting should be done. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to this government that some positive action be taken to commemorate the arrival of the Selkirk settlers. I believe a Memorial Park in honour of these pioneers would be an appropriate thing. The logical place for such a park would be somewhere, I believe, between Selkirk and Winnipeg on the banks of the Red River. Relics and museum pieces from these pioneer days could be gathered and housed in an appropriate building, perhaps one of a similar design to that which the pioneer people lived in those days. Such a park would have a twofold purpose; not only would it commemorate the arrival of the Selkirk settlers, but it would also serve as a wonderful tourist attraction. I trust that the First Minister and his government will give this matter their earnest consideration.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think the question raised by my honourable friend is an important one and this is a situation of which we should take advantage. He may be interested to know that we are already in negotiation with the federal government with respect to Lower Fort Garry and the establishment there of a museum containing such relics as he speaks of and other important items that can be gathered while they are still available. I might say also that arrangements are going forward for a celebration of these various events, the 50th Anniversary of Northern Manitoba and the 100th anniversary of the province at a later date. These matters of preserving our past and of having available in museum form what has been called the memory of the community as enshrined in documents and furniture, articles of clothing, articles of that kind, is an important matter and I think it is thoroughly advisable that this matter be taken in hand. When

(Mr. Evans cont'd) ... we are able to, we will discuss with the House or let the House know the details of the arrangements that are being made at Lower Fort Garry to preserve this historic material.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I didn't -- I assumed that we'd be in estimates and therefore I would ask that this matter be permitted to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate standing in the name -- proposed by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. McKELLAR: ..... stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable the Minister of Health.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister is unavoidably absent this afternoon, so I, in his name would ask that the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: ..... the same position as the Honourable Member for St. John's and I pray the indulgence of the House and ask that this matter be left to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fisher.

MR. WAGNER: May I have the indulgence of the House that this resolution stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fisher. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. R. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I am in the same uncomfortable position that I am not prepared. May this order stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Second reading of Bill No. 11. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE presented Bill No. 11, An Act respecting the Laurentide Financial Corporation Limited, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, this corporation is the corporation incorporated under the laws of British Columbia and by virtue of the provisions of Section 321(1) of our Companies Act, being a B.C. Incorporation and being a Loan Company, the only way that it can be registered to carry on business in the Province of Manitoba is by having a special act of this legislature passed. Once the Act is passed the Company can then register under the provisions of our Companies Act.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, having come somewhat abruptly to the end of our Order Paper, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock, Thursday afternoon.