

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Friday, April 26th, 1963

MADAM SPEAKER: When I left the Chair at 5:30 we were on the debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. Anyone wishing to speak on this debate may do so.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I would just like to say a word or two in connection with this. I must apologize to the Minister of Health as I wasn't in the House when he was speaking on this resolution, however, I was this afternoon when the Honourable Member for Swan River was speaking. I appreciate his observations insofar as the resolution is concerned, but I do want to say to the Honourable Member for Swan River, if I heard him correctly this afternoon, that I wonder whether or not he's putting just a little bit too much reliance on the Minister of Health insofar as obtaining for the Swan River area an ambulance service. The member indicated to me in his remarks that because of the fact that the Honourable the Minister of Health had mentioned that this was under survey and consideration that there was a possibility insofar as the Swan River area, and other areas in the province, that the matter would be resolved before too long.

Now I'm not going to speak as an old, old-timer in this Legislature, but I have been around for a few years now and I've heard Ministers speak before of the fact that we have this matter under consideration and our active consideration, and the usual phraseology of the Minister of the Crown, but I do want to say --(interjection) -- No, I'm not surprised at all my honourable friend, because I have heard these things. So I want to say to the Honourable Member for Swan River, don't be waylaid or misled by verbiage in this House from the Honourable Ministers of the Crown. It is their duty, I presume, or at least they presume it's their duty to say "well now this is a good idea, but don't worry about it. We've got it under active consideration and one of these days we'll get down and around to it." I think it is a truism and a matter of record that Ministers have been in the position where they said things like this over a period of years.

I join with the Honourable Member for Swan River as to their desirability of having readily available quick transport over the airways of injured patients from Swan River and other remote areas, although I don't mean to say by this that Swan River is in essence what you would call a remote area, but it is a considerable distance away from some of the more advanced treatment centres in the Province of Manitoba. But I have heard these sort of utterances from Ministers before, from Ministers of the Crown, so I suggest to the Honourable Member for Swan River that it might be advisable for him to take with a little grain of salt what the Ministers say in respect of this, and I would suggest to him that he keep right on the coattails of the Honourable Minister of Health if he does want to have, within a reasonable period of time, quick transportation from Swan River to the medical centres here in the City of Winnipeg.

I think, Madam Speaker, when we are talking of this very point we've got to recognize more and more in the Province of Manitoba, and in all due respect to our smaller centres in the Province of Manitoba, I think that we have to recognize more and more that there is being concentrated in the Greater Winnipeg area more and more of the advance facilities in the health treatment, that in the general area around the General Hospital in Winnipeg, through the expansion of the medical centre there, that rapidly this area is being so built up as a medical centre that it is becoming to be comparable with any other medical centre on the North American continent, and I think that we should pay a tribute to those who are responsible for the build-up this way in the Greater Winnipeg area. But we also, accompanying this, must recognize this very very factor, that there is being built up here in the Greater Winnipeg area more and more facilities for the complete treatment, diagnosis and treatment insofar as injuries and disease is concerned. So I would respectfully suggest to the Honourable Member for Swan River, and also to the Honourable Minister, that it is becoming more and more necessary for quick transport from the remote areas in the province into the Greater Winnipeg area where these facilities are available.

I appreciate very very much the services that have been rendered by the Department of Mines and Natural Resources in the supplying of transport in extreme emergencies, but at the

(Mr. Pauley cont'd) time I think we have to recognize that more and more facilities must be available. I would like to ask of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and also the Minister of Health when we talk about the availability of planes within the governmental service, have we available in these types of services personnel that are capable of making sure that the transport of patients, that they are under qualified and capable personnel between the scene of the accident say and the Greater Winnipeg area. Now I doubt this very very much, in all due respect to the personnel who fly the planes but I doubt very much, Madam Speaker, whether in the planes that we have available for this type of service, whether there is the accommodation in the planes themselves to make sure that the injured person or the affected person are transported in a reasonable, comfortable manner between these remote areas and the general medical centre here in the Province of Manitoba.

My understanding insofar as the Saskatchewan Air Service is concerned, that here, when there is a call for an emergency service, that not only is there available transportation as such but there is qualified personnel to accompany the patients; there is built into the planes themselves accoutrements that are necessary for the comfortable transport of the patients themselves. While it is true, Madam Speaker, that we can talk of the availability of a plane to rush an individual into these centres, I think it's more than just that.

So while I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable the Minister of Health that "we're still looking into this", these things have been looked into over a period of years now because this is not the first time that this resolution has been presented to this House. So I say to the Minister of Health, as indeed I say to the Honourable Member for Swan River, that this is not enough; that action is necessary; that the resolution of my honourable colleague from Seven Oaks is a worthwhile one. It need not be a costly venture insofar as the government is concerned, but if the service itself can render valuable assistance, as indeed I'm sure that it can to anyone who may be ill, anyone who may be injured, then it is really worthwhile. I suggest to the Minister of Health that I'll give him another year -- I must frankly confess he is somewhat in some respects a progressive young man -- I suggest, Madam Speaker, to him that he take another look at this. I feel sure that if he gives the matter a little more consideration, a little more serious consideration, that possibly next year when we meet again, the Minister himself will be proposing in his estimates that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks was correct, as he has been correct over the last two or three years, and that there has been an expansion in ambulance service in the Province of Manitoba and that he, in his estimates, in conjunction with those of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, will make available equipment that is properly equipped to take care of the cases and the circumstances as has been suggested by my colleague the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. ARTHUR WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, if no one else wants to speak, I will close the debate. Perhaps I have been a little too hopeful, Madam Speaker, in assuming that I would receive more support for this resolution, but hearing the Honourable Member for St. Boniface this afternoon I can see that I'm not going to get too far. I think that it boils down to the ideals of government, because while our Liberal friends during the election said "Let's put people first", we'll soon see in a few moments when we come to the vote, whether or not they are willing to do that.

I said before that in the Province of Saskatchewan, \$200,000 is the amount of money necessary to run this worthwhile service, because it does have some revenue. Much has been said about this matter, Madam Speaker, and I don't want to prolong the debate, but this afternoon in listening to the Honourable Member for Swan River I thought at first he was on my side, but then he qualified that quite a lot and he hoped the Minister would do certain things.

I can know of no better way, Madam Speaker, than to put on record something in the report of the Saskatchewan Public Health Report and it has to do with the air ambulance service in Saskatchewan, and this is for the information of the members. "The Saskatchewan Air Ambulance Service was organized just over 16 years ago. In this period of continuous service, 13,646 patients have been transported. Approximately one-half of the 27,000 landings were completed in unprepared rural areas and a record of no injuries to either crew or passengers as a result of accidents has been maintained." I think that's a fantastic record. "Last year," Madam Speaker, "1,055 people were transported to hospital. The University Hospital in Saskatoon seems to be the most popular place, because they have the bulk of the cases. A total of

(Mr. Wright cont'd) 218 emergency flights were completed by the aviation services in the far north not included in the total of 1,055. "I think that's important, because the Honourable Member for St. Boniface placed emphasis on the north. Well nowhere in my resolution do I exclusively talk about this service as being for the north, because I agree with the Honourable Minister that in times of trouble we always find friends and people will rally to a cause when we receive these accident cases. I just want to point out that this is a service outside of the emergency service from the north. This is a regular government service.

One of the reasons, Madam Speaker, that I mentioned this 218 emergency flights was because they were in addition to the regular service, but because of the heavy demand for air service, the crew based at Saskatoon has at times found it difficult to cope with the demand. The point I'm making is that there is a terrific demand for this service. I suggest that Saskatchewan has practically the same population as we have here and much the same area, and I think in Manitoba we have just as many remote places as they have in Saskatchewan. I think it boils down to the philosophy of government, whether or not it's a government of the people. I might say there were 101 flight requests not completed during the year due to unsuitable and hazardous landing conditions, but I want to point out that "several flights were initiated and completed after dark, some to lighted airports and others into fields in small centres", and I am told that many successful flights were accomplished on wheat fields by burning the straw. "Night flights into unprepared areas were attempted only if the area was previously known or the terrain in the vicinity was such a nature as not to result in excessive risk. This service continued to operate 24 hours a day, 365 days a year." Think what a solace it must be to people in remote areas to know that this service is available upon a phone call.

As I pointed out before Madam Speaker, it seems that we do very much to protect our property. We have fire departments on call 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, just to attend sometimes a chimney fire, and yet when it comes to humanity we seem to take the attitude that it is quite all right for us to depend on the private resources and sources of aircraft.

So I'm hoping that I will gain some support this time for my resolution. It will be introduced again and I think it's inevitable that it will be accepted, because as the population in Manitoba grows, and we hope it will, I think we are going to see that people are not left to chance or to the good nature of whatever aircraft happens to be stationed near at the time of accident or sudden illness. I might say too with our -- I'm not just speaking of the north -- on our highways today we have horrible accidents, and the only place in Manitoba where they do brain surgery is in Winnipeg. We have read -- many of us have read about terrifying ambulance rides to get people horribly injured into these larger centres.

So I think it's just common sense to think that the day will come when we have these wonderful planes, and I might add they have added one to the fleet in Saskatchewan now. It's a specialized piece of equipment. It lands at very low speed; it's very safe and it's different. I remember in Winnipeg in the early days when the police patrol, they commandeered the Dominion Express truck to take people to the police station. Well they don't do that anymore and I suggest that it's time we took a look at this business of getting people to a hospital, because after all we are centralizing our hospital facilities.

We talk about civil defence and trying to get things away from these congested areas but it seems when we talk about medical centres, they all have to be -- I suppose because of the high cost of equipment -- we are centralizing it more and I think it's necessary for us to take a good look at transportation to and from these centres because in serious hemorrhage, time is the essence, Madam Speaker. I don't want to say anymore than that, but I do honestly believe and perhaps who knows -- we heard today where my fight for coloured gasoline finally came into -- I was able to see that come about today because I believe it was a right principle, and I believe that this will too.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkir): Will the honourable member permit a question? Could the honourable member tell me whether he knows of any cases, and how many that have suffered by reason of the fact that there was not a government ambulance service in existence?

MR. WRIGHT: I wouldn't be able to say that. I believe that would be a medical man's -- I wouldn't be able to judge whether a man's injuries were aggravated or not, but I'm just pointing out that if our sister province can have a full-time air ambulance service, it seems logical that we need it in this province. There were 13,646 patients. I wonder what these 13,000 would

(Mr. Wright cont'd) think if they did not have this service available.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. George. The Honourable the Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain, I stood that debate.

MR. McDONALD: Madam Speaker, when I was elected as a member of this Legislative Assembly I thought that I was elected to the higher level of government for the Province of Manitoba, but when I see this resolution that we have before us I wonder just what it's all about. They seem to be taking a lot of time, this type of resolution, without too much thought put into them and I think we should all probably take a good look in the mirror when we start bringing a resolution of this type forward.

I spent 30 years in the cattle business. My father shipped cattle for 35 years and I take exception to say that the stockyards in Winnipeg are abusing the cattle or that they are not fed properly. I think when statements like this are made that it is unfair to cattle breeders. We are raising cattle and we are proud of it, and if there's any damage being done to these stock we are the ones that are looking after it all the time. We check on this and I think that if anybody has any complaints that they should go to the Department of Health right at the stockyards. There are inspectors right there at all times.

The Honourable Member from Lakeside is a farmer and I'm sure that he would agree with me too that any time that you make a charge of this type that you should be fairly qualified to speak on it. I think maybe when -- they suggest a scale when cattle are unloaded. I doubt if this would be practical. I know that it would double and maybe three times the cost of handling these cattle, and it certainly wouldn't be accurate because it would be like a 4-H rally, probably you'd have to have a staff there to mark them and check them all, and do the same when they were sold again to give you any particular check on the shrinkage. I think also that you'd have to have an ear-tag system or something like that because these cattle go through the ring several times.

Now we're only kidding ourselves if we think we're selling water and hay. If your cattle aren't fat when they get there and they're filled up with hay and water, the buyers don't want to buy them, so they're just put right back out through the ring again and they're not sold at all until the next day maybe. Now this is not starving. This is only giving the benefit of the doubt to the man that's selling the cattle, because nobody wants to buy cattle that are too full, they want to be able to see the flesh that is on them.

I don't think that we should talk too much about feeding cattle. I have checked on these stockyards, not only this year but over a period of years, and there's always hay and water in the different corrals and there's a staff on duty to put them in their place. Personally, I think it is very unwarranted this particular charge and I can't see any particular reason unless it's just to get their name in the paper, because after all it doesn't prove anything.

Now I think maybe I would just like to extend an invitation from the President of the Live-stock Exchange. He said that any time we wished to have every member or a single member of this Legislative Assembly -- the members -- they would be very very happy to have them over without any warning. I feel quite strongly that this is quite unfair. Thanks very much.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (LaVerendrye): Madam Speaker, I sure don't agree with what the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain just said and I don't see the resolution here as a charge against the yards. On the other hand, I see it as a resolution that would be very much appreciated by many a small cattle shipper. I myself have delivered thousands of head to the stockyards in the past years and I would not want to make a charge against the stockyards or the way the cattle are handled, but I think we should clear one point here as to how the cattle are usually marketed.

When a farmer ships an animal, either if he brings it with his own truck or the local transfer trucks the animal in, it is in most cases well fed before it leaves or it comes off the pasture, and when it gets to the yards it can be sold in two different ways. It can be sold to the packing-houses and, let's say for example that the man comes in with an animal and offers it for sale at the packinghouses and is offered, for the sake of argument let's say 20 cents a pound, so he figures he might get more by putting it through what we call the commissioners and he unloads

(Mr. Vielfaure cont'd) his animal at the stockyards.

He doesn't know what the animal weighed when he was offered 20 cents, so he drops it at the stockyards and a couple or three days after the animal is sold, and here I'm not picking on the commissioners, their job is to sell it at the most opportune moment, but then what happens between that time and the time it's sold is where the shrinkage mentioned in here happens. The animal was loaded on the farm where it was used to very quiet and normal surroundings and it gets a ride into a truck. It's nervous when it gets out; it's unloaded in the yards and definitely it won't have too much appetite. Even if it did there is lots of hay in the mangers, but I've hauled a lot of it too and we used to call it "fish hay" and they're not too enthused to eat that hay. But anyway the animal stays there two days and it's sold let's say for 21 cents, so the farmer will be under the impression, of course he will know this, but he will not be able to detect exactly the amount that was lost between the time he was offered 20 cents and the time he got 21 cents.

So even if he got 21 cents, and let's say for the sake of argument that the animal weighed at that time 900 pounds, he got a cent more but he still lost \$11.00. Maybe I shouldn't say he lost, but he would have got \$11.00 more by selling it at 20 cents, if the shrinkage was so. I know for example on an overnight trip from Moose Jaw, Regina or Saskatoon, the buyers usually figure five percent loss, so I imagine in a couple of days that it would be maybe ten percent. I am no authority on that. But if the scale was there it would be known to both the farmer and the buyer, and I think it would only be beneficial to the buyer because he would know exactly what has been lost by the animal in the last two or three days; and the farmer would know exactly as well what he's getting for the animal now compared to what he would have got if he sold it at the packers. So I can't see anything detrimental to anybody. I can only see benefit for everybody interested. I'm sure that such legislation would be greatly approved by all small farmers and I would strongly recommend it.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I just want to say a very few words on this resolution. When the Honourable Member for St. George introduced this resolution -- I work in a packinghouse and I know what they do with their cattle over a week-end, but I wasn't sure of what they do at the stockyards -- so I took a trip over to the stockyards, and as has been mentioned here by that member and the member for LaVerendrye, they do feed them but it's hay and water. That's all they feed them. They give them lots of hay and they give them lots of water, but then they have to take them off the feed because they get too full and nobody will buy them. I talked to different people from different packinghouses in the area of how much shrink there is on cattle. I was led to believe -- and these are the figures that were given to me and I can't vouch for them -- I was led to believe that even on the hay and water diet there is a shrinkage of from one to two percent. Some say one, some say one and half and some say two. That's three different figures that I got.

Now I know that the packinghouses themselves when they buy cattle, and they have to keep them over the week-end, they don't feed them on just hay and water. I don't know what the diet is but I do know that they do feed them lots of water, and the reason for feeding them the water is because they've bought the cattle and they don't care if they're full or not but it is for when they are slaughtered they will bleed that much better and dress up better. So they get lots of water. What the diet is I don't know, but I do know that they work on this project of feeding cattle over the week-end in the -- not in the stockyards, but the packinghouses that do buy the cattle have a special diet for them where I am led to believe there is no shrink, so I thought that I should say my few words here. I went out to see and I've got the figures, and whether they are correct or not, I leave this for the members to decide for themselves.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Speaker, I had no intentions of getting into this debate this evening and I'm sorry that the Honourable Member for St. George is not in his seat. I have handled, bought and sold some cattle, and possibly through the few years that I've been associated with the cattle business, the cattle that I have seen sold and have sold would run into a good many thousands.

Now the Honourable Member from St. George said, in the third line, "undergo a period of starvation." Now that's pretty harsh words, when anyone knows what good care the cattle are given when they arrive at the Union Stockyards or the packing plants in the City of St. Boniface. When it comes to cruelty, Madam Speaker, there is a man, as I understand, employed

(Mr. Shewman cont'd)by the Federal Government to watch how the animals are treated within the stockyards. In my experience around the stockyards, there have been very very few instances where the people that manage, conduct and handle these cattle in the stockyards have ever been charged with cruelty to the animals. There is more abuse I believe, Madam Speaker, through the trucking industry that handle the cattle from the time they pick them up until they deposit them at the yards. It has been mentioned that cattle will be starved for two or three days, as long as three days in the yards. My experience has been in selling cattle there that you cannot sell water by the gallon by pouring it into a beast. They will not buy it. They do have to be maybe put through the ring today, and on account of their fullness that they're not sold. The commission man in charge of handling that certain animal for the producer realizes that there is too much water and hay in the animal so he'll turn him back; he won't sell him. He will hold him over until the next day to allow for the shrinkage which is necessary for that producer to receive the most money that he can for that animal.

I had the opportunity last evening to attend the 50th Anniversary of the Winnipeg Livestock Exchange and the Public Markets, and they did recognize three men that had had 50 years or better of service in the livestock industry in the St. Boniface Stockyards and the Winnipeg Livestock Exchange. Now my experience has been with the men that handle the producer's cattle that they are out to get every nickel that they can, and as far as this resolution goes that there's starvation and cruelty, it's misrepresented.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the last speaker? Was he speaking as the Chairman of the Livestock Marketing Commission or as the member for Morris?

MR. SHEWMAN: Madam Speaker, that is a fair question but not a very intelligent one. I was speaking as a member of the Legislature and trying to explain my experience in handling livestock. When the Livestock Committee makes a report, the Leader of the Opposition will hear from us.

MR. MOLGAT: Thanks very much, Madam Speaker, because I've been really waiting for a report from the Livestock Commission for some time now, and I was hopeful when I saw the member get up that maybe at long last we were going to find out what this Marketing Commission is doing, or should I say is not doing. However, it seems that the member isn't quite ready to give us the full details yet and I'll be prepared to wait for, I suppose, another Session.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I don't want to spend any length of time on this resolution. I feel the resolution is a good one. The preamble to it might be a little harsh, or a little strong, but I know that there is a certain amount of shrinkage taking place and I think it would be well worth our while to find out just how much shrinkage is taking place at the yards when cattle have been delivered and before it's sold. I know for one when calves are brought in and they have to stay over a day, sure there's a lot of shrinkage in calves. In the larger cattle, well I don't think the percentage is as high, but it stands to reason when you feed cattle on a certain ration and then transport them on the truck and deliver them to a strange place that their appetite won't be there and they will not feed as well, and therefore a certain amount of shrinkage is taking place. So I would certainly endorse the resolution to find how much shrinkage does take place.

MR. McDONALD: Madam Speaker, would the member from LaVerendrye permit a question please?

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would defer to the Minister, but in any case I only have a couple of sentences to say in this regard. I agree with the member for Rhineland and I take the same point of view that while the preamble may be unnecessarily harsh, I believe that the resolution does have some merit. I would sum it up as follows, that I for one believe in orderly marketing, and anything that contributes even indirectly to orderly marketing or allied matters should be supported, so I think that this resolution deserves support.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I'm just not quite convinced that if you weigh the cattle as they enter the stockyards that you are going to prove very much. You might prove that one man puts more water into his cattle before he markets them than another. I could foresee the case where someone shipped their cattle extremely full, had them weighed out at unloading and then would be extremely unhappy with the shrinkage that he experienced. It wouldn't necessarily prove that the shrinkage, or it

(Mr. Hutton cont'd)..... wouldn't necessarily be conclusive proof that the shrinkage that he experienced was unreasonable, because it all depends on the shape that the cattle are in when they get to market.

I think also that one cannot expect to get this kind of service at the yards for the same fees as they are now charging the farmer, and I'd want to be pretty certain that the service that was requested was indeed worth the extra cost to the producer. One of our great concerns in this Legislature has been with the ever-increasing costs of production, and the cost-price squeeze. I think we in this Legislature of Manitoba want to be pretty cautious about advocating any change in the handling of cattle that will contribute in any way to increased costs.

There's something else here that concerns me a little bit though. I believe that there are few in this Legislature that would disagree that the greatest safeguard to the farmer's interest in terms of his returns and in terms of strengthening his bargaining position have been the Public Stockyards, and I think it doesn't help agriculture, or our producers, to attack an institution that has preserved over a half a century and maintained the farmer's bargaining rights in the market place. I would hate to think of a marketing scheme in Manitoba that did not enjoy in the services and the contribution that the Livestock Markets here -- the stockyards have made over the years.

I think it was rather ironic though that the Honourable Member for St. George should have raised this question in the year and almost in the week in which the public stockyards were celebrating their Golden Anniversary. I think it was regrettable, because even though they have their faults in this marketing mechanism, they have done a real service to the farmers of this province. They were established after some efforts on the part of the farmers of this province to get a square deal and they have protected the opportunity for the farmer to get a square deal for these many years. So until we have been able in this House to devise a better system than that which the public markets offer, I think we don't want to use our position to undermine the confidence of the farmers in this system. I will say this, that if more of us farmers utilized the public market system and took advantage of the competition in that type of selling, we wouldn't have nearly so many complaints about the marketing of our animals.

For these reasons, and for the reason that I don't believe there's any conclusive evidence that the farmer is going to be any better off for having his cattle weighed when they come in, I think that the results might be quite misleading, quite misleading. For this reason, and for the fact that at this time it might only mean an increased cost, an added cost to the farmer's marketing cost, I would suggest that we have a little bit of patience and that we await the recommendations and the findings of the committee that has been established to investigate all phases of livestock marketing in Manitoba.

MR. VIELFAURE: Madam Speaker, I would like to make one thing clear. If I was interpreted as criticizing the yards, I did not have that in mind. I just said that I approved it because I thought it was more information to the farmer, but I sure don't want to be interpreted as criticizing what's going on in the process.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I will close the debate. I'm sorry I was called to the telephone and didn't hear the remarks of the member for Turtle-Mountain, although I have been told what some of those remarks were and I'm surprised that he should have made them.

A lot of things have been read into this resolution which are not correct. This resolution wasn't introduced by me on my own accord, I did it because of representations made by the farmers who are concerned in this matter and asked me to introduce this resolution. When I introduced it, I made no allegations of any kind about the stockyards, and just for purposes of clarification I'll read the beginning of the resolution. It says: "Whereas many cattle shippers to the Winnipeg stockyards believe that their cattle undergo a period of starvation." I never made any allegations, but this is the belief of many farmers, and anyone in this House that doesn't believe that this situation exists, is certainly not aware of what's going on in the minds of the farmers.

The farmer is not making any allegations either. A lot of them are, but there are many that believe that this situation exists and they are the ones that want this scale put in to determine whether their beliefs are well founded or not. It's quite possible that after a scale is

(Mr. Guttormson cont'd) installed, if it were installed in the yards, their suspicions would be found to be groundless, but they are asking that a scale be put in the stockyards to determine whether their beliefs are right or wrong, and that is what the resolution asks. No allegations are made. I never made any. If this resolution was passed, this situation would be clarified for many cattle farmers in the Province of Manitoba.

The Minister of Agriculture I'm sure knows, even if the member for Turtle Mountain doesn't know, that this resolution was unanimously adopted by the Farmers Union in Manitoba, because they were interested and concerned over this situation. Now I'm not saying that they should be or shouldn't be concerned, but they believe that this situation exists, many of them do, and therefore they want to find out. If, after a period of trial this suspicion is unfounded, then they'll rest easier in their own minds and they won't have any more thoughts along this line, but until such time as action is taken, the belief in the farmer's mind is going to be that there is a period of starvation and means that they are losing money through the waiting period that goes on at the stockyards.

As many of us know, there is a period of two or three days from the time the animal is unloaded until it's sold in the yards, and it's for this reason that some of the farmers are suspicious that their animals are not being cared for. So I think the Minister's remark saying that I'm trying to undermine the stockyards or attack this institution is just not the truth. It's just distorting the whole meaning of the resolution. Some of the speakers have confined their remarks to the cruelty section of it. What I'm concerned about is the economic loss to the farmer, if there is any, and we'll only determine it by taking some action.

I regret that some of the speakers have cast their reflections on the thinking of the farmer just because they want to determine in their own minds what is going on at the yards, and I would suggest that the members of this House who have spoken against this resolution give the farmer a little bit more credit and support the resolution, because it's the farmer whose asking for this resolution, not me. I'm only acting on their behalf to introduce it into this House.

MR. SHEWMAN: Madam Speaker, would the Honourable Member for St. George permit a question? He made the statement "that many farmers believe their cattle are being starved". I would appreciate it very much if he would give me the names of those farmers.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, I'll speak to the farmers first, and if they are prepared to let their names stand, I'll give them to you.

MR. McDONALD: I wonder what farm organization you are speaking for, or is it just a small group of farmers. I belong to three farmers' organizations, the Cattle Graders; The Stock Growers, which takes in the whole province, and The Hereford Breeder's Association; and at no time had I ever heard this brought up from a farmers' organization. I would appreciate it.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I'm not speaking on behalf of any farm organization in particular. I said this was brought to my attention by farmers in my constituency who have frequently complained about the situation. They even drafted the resolution and forwarded it to me to present in this House, but I did say that the Manitoba Farmers Union did have this resolution in their brief to the government, and I know when they had their convention it was unanimously passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HUTTON: Before you put the question, Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask a question. We know what the farmers think and we know what the farm organizations think, I'd like to know what the Honourable Member for St. George thinks.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Think about what? Did you clarify your question?

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McGregor,

(Nays cont'd) McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Peters, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 15; Nays, 31.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. The Honourable the Member for Roblin.

MR. EVANS: In the absence of the Honourable Member, Madam Speaker, I wonder if we could have this debate stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. EVANS: I'm sure that the honourable member would not object if anyone else spoke.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, if anyone wishes to speak on it we have no objection. Otherwise, I'd like the matter to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. PAULLEY: I would ask, Madam Speaker, if we could allow this to stand. It's a sweet resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, could we have this matter stand please?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Second reading of Bill No. 70. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne), in the absence of the Honourable Member for River Heights, presented Bill No. 70, An Act to amend The Greater Winnipeg Gas Distribution Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MCKELLAR: Madam Speaker, I'll promise to be very brief. I'll read the recorded statement as it is that the Honourable Member for River Heights has wrote out for me here. "This Bill provides that this Gas Company can provide services beyond the Metro area and also provide a change of names of certain municipalities that have recently been made cities."

MR. SCHREYER: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable 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: Second reading of Bill No. 103. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON presented Bill 103, An Act to amend The Flin Flon Charter, for second reading.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 73. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE presented Bill No. 73, An Act to amend The Land Surveyors Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, this original Act I think is about 32 years old. There never have been any amendments in it until now and these amendments are purely internal. They deal with the examinations of students, the setting up of the office of a registrar and discipline matters respecting the members of the association.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 98. The Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. MCKELLAR presented Bill No. 98, An Act to incorporate Victoria Park Lodge and to authorize the Town of Souris in the Rural Municipality of Glenwood to make certain grants thereto, for second reading.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I wonder if we could have the proposed Resolution standing in the name of the First Minister stand at this time.

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

MR. EVANS: I wonder, Madam Speaker, if I could have the agreement of the House to allow Bills No. 89, 88 and 87 to stand at this time.

..... continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 81.

MR. WITNEY presented Bill No. 81, An Act respecting the Administration of Conservation of Wildlife in the Province, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, I had a suspicion that I would be called upon to explain, although the mood of the House seems to be tonight to get through as soon as possible, so in dealing with the principle of this Bill I shall endeavour to be as brief as possible.

I think, Madam Speaker, that I mentioned when the Bill was before the whole committee of the House some time ago that we were splitting the Game Branch and the Fisheries Branch, or we had split them some years ago and that we were now going to operate them under their separate Bills. In order to do so we were going to repeal and re-enact The Game and Fisheries Act, and in the House at the present time is an Act which will do that with respect to Fisheries and set up a separate Fisheries Act, and this Act which will set up a separate Wildlife Act. The reason for doing so, Madam Speaker, is that as we were making our amendments to The Game and Fisheries Act, after much trial and tribulation, we noted that the general trend of the various administrations, not only in this country but also in the United States, was to classify Game as Wildlife and to operate their Wildlife Department under a separate Act, and so we decided to do so with respect to The Game and Fisheries Act and we are splitting it into a Fisheries Act and a Wildlife Act.

We are doing so for the other reason that we would like to have a deeper connotation of Game, and we feel that we can get it through Wildlife. Game up to now has had the connotation of the hunting of animals only principally, and we feel that Wildlife will give a broader concept to the whole problem and it will also help us in the problems that we face ahead in the matter of conservation and preservation of our wildlife and of the habitat which we need for it. There are for instance activities of the old Game Branch now which really did not deal with deer and moose and upland game bird and waterfowl, but were dealing with such things as predators, raccoons and skunks, or wildlife in general.

We have in this province people who are not only interested in the harvesting of moose or deer by means of hunting or upland game birds or waterfowl, but also those people who are interested in just observing nature with a camera or such people who wish to go out birdwatching, and those who wish to have game and wildlife available for scientific investigation. Apart from such organizations as The Game and Fish Associations and the Air and Gun Club here in Winnipeg, we do have a Natural History Society, and we feel that if we expand the connotation of what the Wildlife Branch or the former Game Branch will be responsible for, that we will have a deeper appreciation of the needs which we have in this province, as I have mentioned, for the conservation, the preservation and the wise use of our wildlife and our wildlife habitat. I trust that the new Act will be able to convey that. There are many areas where you can't do this and you can't do that, but I think there are less areas where you can't do this and you can't do that and I believe that the whole approach is a different one in the Act, at least I trust that the members of this House will find it as such.

The Act, of course, is based on the principle of multiple use and you will note that in the Act there are sections that call for the primary use of such areas as our Wildlife Management areas and Refuges for Wildlife. We are spelling it out here in this Act, something which has not been done before. It has been done in other acts, particularly those with respect to forestry, and we have in effect transferred some of the concepts and the protections that have been contained in The Forestry Act into the Wildlife Act. For instance, one rather broad clause that we have transposed from the other acts, or have taken a lead from them, the acts such as The Forest Act and The Fires Prevention Act, is the permission to be able to expropriate land where necessary for wildlife purposes. We also have taken such matters as providing punitive action and being able to obtain back to the province costs where wildlife habitat has been deliberately destroyed, either through a deliberate act or by negligence. This is not new in the concept of renewable resources, because as I have mentioned it's contained in The Forest Act and in The Fires Prevention Act.

We have embodied in here a new principle now with respect to bears. Up to about two years ago the bears were not on the protected list, but because there had been some trafficking of wild bear cubs we put the bear on the protected list, but we hope that we had provided for

(Mr. Witney, cont'd) people to legitimately protect themselves and their property. In this Act we are now adopting the principle whereby when it is necessary to do so, that we will be able to have a bear-hunting season.

Another principle that we have embodied here is that with the exception of two or three sections, one with respect to hunting while intoxicated or hunting in a dangerous fashion to the public and with respect to night-lighting, we have taken out minimum fines and we are allowing more leeway to the magistrates in the country in handling this matter. We do so because we would like the Act not to be considered as a restrictive piece of legislation but more as legislation that has been designed and framed for the best use of wildlife and wildlife habitat.

A new principle which is embodied in the Bill is the establishment of commercial shooting preserves for birds, an area in which we are going to move very carefully. We have taken considerable information and advice from other areas that have utilized this principle, and one of the areas of advice that we received is that we should go slowly and that we should not expand them too fast or to too great a rate, and so the commercial shooting preserves which we will be designing for this province are for what can be considered as exotic birds such as the pheasant, the chucker partridge or the quail, but not the native game birds of this province and no migratory birds. But it is a new concept that we are starting to move into and we trust that it will help to alleviate some of the rushes on hunting that have developed as people have more leisure time and as people have the availability to credit systems to obtain guns and hunting equipment with relative ease.

We have embodied in The Wildlife Act -- I suppose you could call it a principle -- but we have two areas here where we take action for dangerous hunting or for hunting where the hunter is intoxicated or under the influence of a narcotic drug.

You will note that there is a section in the Act dealing with Indians. We are clarifying the position of the Indians. We trust that it is clearer than in the former Act and also we are providing punitive action for those who assist Indians in committing an offence or aid and abet them, which was not in the former Act.

The matters of search and seizure and confiscation -- while there is redrafting in the Act, the principles are essentially the same as those contained in the old Game and Fisheries Act. We have retained the principle of licence suspension which was called for by this House some two years ago when we introduced amendments at that time to The Game and Fisheries Act. We are still providing for such matters as party hunting and wild animal farms, for such matters as the raising of pheasants, and I was interested to note that last evening when I was in one of our local restaurants that pheasant was advertised on the menu.

The section dealing with procedure and evidence - the principles contained there are essentially those that have been contained in the former Game and Fisheries Act but they have been reworded.

Those briefly, Madam Speaker, are I think the main principles of the new Act, and as for details and questions with respect to the particular sections, I trust that we will be able to deal with those when the Act is given a committee hearing.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, it's not of course my intention to suggest that this Bill should not go to committee. I think all of us will be glad to see it go there, but I would like to mention now that some particular matters that are raised in the Bill, I think, should receive further scrutiny there. I'm not sure whether the definition of a farmer that is given here is or is not changed. My guess is that perhaps it is not changed, but I think there's a restriction now to the effect that he can hunt only on his own land rather than that he gets an exemption from a game bird licence.

I would like to check further on the Section 6, Subsection (4) I believe it is, that deals with expropriation. It seems to me that expropriation is necessary in a good many cases and many public works where very great public interest is involved, but I think it should be used always with great care and I rather doubt if the acquisition of public shooting grounds are important -- though I admit them to be -- are important enough to expropriate lands, but we can look at that in committee.

Similarly, Section 19 I believe is the one that deals with confiscation and that old recurring trouble comes up about the unequal penalties that can result from indiscriminate confiscation. I used to be, as the Minister may remember, one of the members of this House that

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) was inclined to support the confiscation principle because I always held that a person who went out on night-lighting knew what he was doing and deserved the penalty that he got, but I have been told of some cases that seemed to me to entail such great hardship that I'm inclined to take another look at my stand on that matter.

Then I think that Section 77, dealing with search without warrant, should be very carefully scrutinized. Offhand I would be inclined to object to it, and particularly to that subsection of Section 77 that refers to a private dwelling being subject to search without warrant if that private dwelling is situated 10 miles or more from the place where a justice of the peace resides. I don't like the principle of search without warrant and I think that it should be applied only in cases of greatest necessity.

There may be many other matters that will come before the committee. I don't want to take the time of the House at the moment to discuss them but I would like to enter this qualification along with my support of the Bill going to the committee.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I wish to say that I will vote for the second reading of this Bill, but like the Honourable Member for Lakeside I have some very serious reservations as to some of the provisions therein contained.

MR. WITNEY: Just to comment briefly on the comments made, the definition of the farmer is the same as the former Act except that we have added in here -- we have defined fur rancher and fur farmer, but as for a farmer himself, owning 40 acres of land, that is the same definition that was carried over before.

I regret, Madam Speaker, that I neglected to advise that in the principle of the Bill we had changed the principle with respect to farmers hunting for upland game bird or waterfowl. We are providing that they can do so on their own land without a licence, but when they move off of their own land we are calling for them to have a licence. I had it here on my notes and I regret that I neglected to bring it up because it is an important change in principle.

I have noted the honourable member's reservations with respect to expropriation. I would like to say to him with respect to confiscation that in amendments of two years ago we took out all confiscations from the old Game and Fisheries Act with the exception of confiscation with respect to night-lighting. We did have provision for that but upon submission to the committee, the Law Amendments Committee I think at that time, the submissions were sufficiently strong, from one group at any rate, the Game and Fish Association, that the Law Amendments Committee put it back in along with the other principle of taking away a man's licence for a minimum of one year if he committed an offence against the Act.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the section that has to do with search without warrant and entering into a private dwelling, they are essentially the same, with the exception of rewording, as were in the former Game and Fisheries Act. I must confess that I had some reservations about them too, but I was assured after the matter had been debated several times that this was not onerous and in some areas was necessary, but as the honourable member says, we can discuss it before the committee.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 83. The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne) presented Bill No. 83, An Act respecting Elevators, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, this bill is essentially a consolidation, with some revision, of the present Elevator and Hoist Act. There are some additional definitions. There's an added definition for the owner which would include tenants and managers; and there is a section that provides for setting up of a new board under this Act, and the principal change is that an employee representative would be dropped. The reason for dropping an employee representative is that it has been found difficult in the technical areas here to have the operator of an elevator meet with the installers, repairers and the manufacturers and make a contribution to the board. I think there was some fair discussion on the technical aspects of this bill the other night and I would recommend to the members that this bill be sent to committee, and that we have the technical members of the staff at committee for complete answers of the technical details of the bill.

MR. PAULLEY: I have no objection to the bill going to the committee for second reading, and I presume it's the Industrial Relations Committee to which this bill will be sent. It may not be.

MR. BAIZLEY: It will be Law Amendments for this one.

MR. PAULLEY: Will it be Law Amendments? But I want to say to the Minister that I do hope that he will have his experts present at the meeting to explain why it is that it appears that there's no concern for the employee who operates the elevator, and if there's anything wrong with the elevator it is the employee who has to suffer the consequences, as has happened because of faulty elevators in the Province of Manitoba at least on three occasions that I know of, Madam Speaker, within recent years -- three deaths I believe as the result of faulty elevators. I think that it is only fitting and proper that the department do tell us why they're excluding those most vitally concerned insofar as getting hurt or injured or killed respecting the operation of elevators.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 95. The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

MR. BAIZLEY presented Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Operating Engineers and Firemen Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, primarily this bill is designed to overcome two undesirable and unrealistic situations. Under the present Act, an operating engineer who is trained mainly to operate the steam boilers is required to be in constant attendance supervising the operation of air compressors. Now this requirement is particularly unrealistic in mining operations where large air compressors are employed to ventilate the mines. Also, this requirement is a hardship in certain industries where large refrigeration systems are used. Now to overcome these situations, the bill will create two new types of licenses, namely compressor operators and refrigeration operators; and, in addition, would permit the operation of these types of equipment without a licensed operator at all times provided they are adequately equipped with safety devices.

The present Act provides that portable compressor plants such as those used in street excavation work and factory assembled or package air-condition units be operated only under the supervision of licensed personnel. These requirements, too, have been found in practice to be unrealistic. The enforcement problems are obviously most difficult, and I'm advised that the hazards involved are limited. The bill would eliminate the necessity of licensed personnel on these types of equipment. These specific changes would improve the situation in the operation and inspection.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 96. The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

MR. BAIZLEY presented Bill No. 96, an Act to amend The Steam and Pressure Plants Act, for second reading.

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

MR. W.G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if this is the plant, the steam and pressure plant which he took with him to Brazil in order to land the Pan American Games here.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 111. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON presented Bill No. 111, An Act to amend The Animal Husbandry Act (2), for second reading.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 113. The Honourable the Minister of Health.

MR. JOHNSON presented Bill No. 113, An Act to amend The Registered Nurses' Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I think there's a point of extreme importance, as I

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) read this bill, contained in this Act, and I would like to hear an explanation from the Minister.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, Madam Speaker, actually the changes in the Act are fairly clear. Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Section 4 -- the principle in this bill actually in the first section is to enlarge the composition of the Board of Directors of the Association mainly to include members of the Sisterhood. The main other section is listing the qualifications for memberships, and these have been modernized. There is, however, no fundamental change in the qualifications required. The other Section 12 referred to in 13, at the present time the standards for the schools of nursing and the curricula detail are set out to date and are out of date really, and are cumbersome in that they list the specialties the girls are to take -- or the subjects. The amendment makes detail a responsibility of the Accrediting Committee. No change in day-to-day policy is involved here as the Accrediting Committee has a majority of appointed members. A two-year term is suggested for appointment of the members to the above Committee. At present there is no term. That last section simply rewords the present provision, but makes surrender of certificate a responsibility. I don't find any real fundamental changes here. I'd be glad to hear those sections that may be concerning my honourable friend.

MR. PAULLEY: There's the section, and I know that it's not usual for us to talk on sections, but I do want to refer the Honourable the Minister to the third section of the bill, 10(c), which deals with the question of academic standing insofar as qualification for registered nurses in the Province of Manitoba. Now we've had a considerable discussion in this House as to whether or not a boy or a girl taking the general course in the Province of Manitoba will be qualified to undertake nursing training in the Province of Manitoba. I raised the point during the consideration of the Department of Education estimates that I thought first of all that any boy or girl in the Province who was taking the general course should be told what professions that they would be debarred from taking after going through the general course.

I raised in particular the question of nursing, and I find, and it seems to me that at that particular time when the Minister of Education was listing those professions that a student taking the general course was not going to be debarred, at least nursing was not one of those occupations or professions that were excluded to any person that was taking the general course. I think he mentioned that radio or X-ray technicians and one or two others -- that the students from the general course would not be able to take the X-ray Technicians' Course at MTI because of the fact that they didn't have matriculation or because they only had the general course.

And now I find, Madam Speaker, in this bill that we have before us, that one of the provisions for a person becoming a nurse, a registered nurse -- one of these provisions is that they must, in accordance with this section, have completed Grade 11 Junior Matriculation. The section does go on to say "or a course equivalent thereto in the opinion of the Minister of Education." Now, Madam Speaker, when I raised the question of "what was the equivalent", the Honourable the Minister of Education pointed out to me that when you were dealing in the question of equivalent, we're talking about some other jurisdiction. If I remember correctly, he used an example, that the equivalent of Grade 12 in the Province of Manitoba would be Grade 13 in the Province of Ontario. In his opinion, the equivalent did not mean the general course here in the Province of Manitoba as being the equivalent for Junior Matriculation.

Now I would respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, and I'm not going to delay the sending of this bill for second reading, but I would appreciate very, very much the Honourable the Minister of Health looking very, very closely into this provision in The Registered Nurses Act, because I think that I have a supporter -- if I recall his words correctly, or previously -- in the Honourable Member of Lakeside, that there may be too many restrictions at the present time, or at least it should be a little bit wider field.

I suggest, Madam Speaker, to the Honourable the Minister of Health, that if we're going to attempt to have our young men and women take the general course, school leaving course, termination course, or whatever it is at Grade 12, that many, particularly of the young women, would be desirous of going into the field of nursing. But if they're going to be debarred -- if my interpretation of this section is correct, if they're going to be debarred from going from their graduation of the general course into the field of nursing simply because they haven't to the letter of the law, Junior Matriculation, I would suggest and respectfully ask that the Minister of Health take a very close look as to what the consequences of this particular

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) phraseology in this bill might have on the future of many of our young men and women in the province.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, if nobody else is going to speak, I would like to mention that this is the provision in the present Act which was passed in 1953, and since drawing up the bill -- I should have mentioned in talking to the principle of the bill, but I'm getting a little dull at this time of the night, I guess -- I had mentioned, had intended at Law Amendments to look at the -- I think the terminology expressed here is not correct either, because I think the Department of Education would change that to "University Entrance" or whatever it is to describe the Grade 11. However, I would have to look into the general course aspect of it in the next day or two before we come to Law Amendments. But the honourable member's point is well taken.

However, I would point out to the committee that the Accrediting Committee, as expressed in the Act, has representatives from the Association; the Minister has two appointments; and other statutory members. Now I would point out that each school of nursing in the Province of Manitoba is operated by the autonomous hospitals, and the schools of nursing themselves have set certain standards of entrance. However, one of the provisions that I wish to see maintained in the Act was the minimum qualification for entrance, so I would like to talk the general course matter over with the Minister of Education and the Nursing Association.

However, as a matter of fact it could be argued there was no need really for that being stipulated in the Act in view of the fact that the schools of nursing in themselves, as autonomous schools, set the minimum standards. However, I thought that in case a school were to go too far too fast, that I'd like to see something in the Act giving the minimum that the girls should have.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 115. The Honourable the Minister of Health.

MR. JOHNSON presented Bill No. 115, An Act to amend The Physiotherapists Act, for second reading.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, perhaps the Honourable Minister would explain why it was found necessary to reduce the age to 19.

MR. JOHNSON: Reducing the age to 19 in the present Act. The present Act provides that every person must be 21 years of age before becoming registered with the Physiotherapist Association. We are graduating our first students now, and it's two years after Grade 12. Some of them are only 19 years old and we would like to put them into practice in restoring the health of the people of Manitoba, so I thought "give youth a chance".

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 120. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON presented Bill No. 120, An Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act, for second reading.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that the House do now adjourn.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.