

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 5th, 1965

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library beg leave to present the following as their first report: Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Cowan as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that, for the remainder of this Session, the Quorum of this Committee shall consist of six members. Your Committee has considered Bills: No. 45 - An Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Convalescent Hospital of Winnipeg; No. 46 - An Act to incorporate Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature; No. 55 - An Act to amend an Act to incorporate "The Ice Club of Greater Winnipeg"; No. 59 - An Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba; and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee recommends that the fees, less the costs of printing, be refunded with respect to the following Bills: No. 45 - An Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Convalescent Hospital of Winnipeg; No. 46 - An Act to incorporate Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature; No. 59 - An Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba.

Your Committee also recommends that the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be extended to the 26th day of April, 1965, and that the time for presenting Private Bills to the House be extended to the 3rd day of May, 1965, and that the time for receiving reports of the Committee on Private Bills be extended to the 10th day of May, 1965.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

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

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, in accordance with the Committee's report, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the fees paid in connection with the following bills be refunded, less the costs of printing: No. 45 - An Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Convalescent Hospital of Winnipeg; No. 46 - An Act to incorporate Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature; No. 59 - An Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba.

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

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, in accordance with the report of the Committee, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be extended to the 26th day of April, 1965, and that the time for presenting Private Bills to the House be extended to the 3rd day of May, 1965, and that the time for receiving reports of the Committee on Private Bills be extended to the 10th day of May, 1965.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley), in the absence of the Honourable the Attorney-General, introduced Bill No. 119, an Act to amend The Mortgage Act.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN, in the absence of the Honourable the Attorney-General, introduced Bill No. 27, an Act to amend The Trustee Act.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights) introduced Bill No. 86, an Act respecting Consumer Credit Protection.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions standing in my name and in the name of the Honourable the Minister

(MR. HUTTON cont'd) . . . of Education.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first resolution before the Committee is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act by providing, among other matters, (a) that the government be authorized to reinsure a portion of the liability of The Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation for payment of indemnities under contracts entered into by the corporation; and (b) that the government pay all the costs of administering the Act that is not contributed by the Government of Canada.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, these amendments to the Act will provide for the entering into reinsurance agreements with the Government of Canada, whereby the risk which is inherent in any crop insurance program will be borne, or shared by the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba. The most significant aspect of this sharing of risk is the provision in The Crop Insurance Act of Canada and the new provisions that will be provided for in our own Act -- is for the assumption of the two governments for the cost of carrying the program whenever the Crop Insurance Corporation does not have the necessary reserves to pay out the claims on the Corporation under the contracts. It is anticipated that the average cost to the province over the years, annually, would be in the neighbourhood of \$100,000.00. Now this is just an estimate; it can vary but according to our actuaries this is what they would anticipate. There will be a special trust fund established and reinsurance premiums will be paid, both to the Province of Manitoba -- into the Treasury of the Province of Manitoba, and into the Treasury of the Government of Canada.

The other principle involved here is the amendment which will permit the Government of Manitoba to pay certain administrative costs which the Government of Canada have not recognized and are unwilling to treat as shareable, and in order to clear up the books of the Crop Insurance Corporation, we are amending the Act so that the Government of Manitoba can pick up the necessary monies. There's about \$14,000 outstanding.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I think that over the past years the Minister has made a number of representations to the Federal Government regarding crop insurance insofar as the Province of Manitoba was concerned, and the recommendations that we felt were the necessary ones to be able to expand it. Has the present offer of the Federal Government been pretty well along the lines that the Minister recommended in the first place?

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, if I understood correctly, we're entering into a new contract with the Federal Government. Is there any change in formula from the present one, or the one that's in force? Secondly, in connection with the reinsurance, are we just reinsuring with the two governments, or is there a private insurance company entering into it as well? Or has the matter been explored as far as private insurance companies?

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Will this proposition be effective for the 1965 crop?

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I understand that presently and, as a matter of fact, since the inception of crop insurance in Manitoba, that the Federal Government has paid 100 percent of the administration costs and approximately 25 percent of the premiums set out on Page 18 of the Annual Report that is before us. I wonder if this has changed. Perhaps this is what my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland had in mind. I recall that I maintained that the cost of administration -- that is, the entire acquisition costs and the cost of administering the Act -- was altogether too high in relation to the premiums that the farmers paid, and I still hold that position. I also hold the position that in those areas of the province where it is a recognized fact that hail is the number one hazard or peril -- in those areas -- that it is still necessary for the farmer to put on both -- that is, both Manitoba crop insurance and hail insurance -- to provide adequate coverage, and of course this places him in a difficult position. It increases his over-all cost of farming. I wonder if there has been a change in this regard.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, since the Member for Gladstone raised the point, could the Minister tell us whether this matter has been explored, whether we could attach an

(MR. FROESE cont'd) additional hail insurance policy to the crop insurance that would work in a different way. Presently, when you are to benefit under crop insurance, your income must be very low on it. On the other hand, if you purchase hail insurance you can purchase for so much an acre and the moment you have some harm immediately you can put in a claim and you get some return on it. Could the Minister tell us has this matter been explored? I think this would be very valuable. In this way a farmer need not have two types of policies. He could have it all in one.

MR. HUTTON: The amendments to the federal statute followed Manitoba's recommendations very closely. We were, I don't mind saying, very pleased at the provisions that were made in the federal statute. However, I think it was last November that the amendments to the federal act were put through the House of Commons. We have been negotiating since the first of the year with respect to an agreement under which we could operate in 1965. We are hoping daily to consummate this agreement but I must say that we have had some difficulties in the interpretation of the federal statute, but as I say, we are hoping daily that we can resolve these differences and get an agreement which is acceptable both to the Government of Canada and to Manitoba.

We had hoped -- in answer to the question raised by the Member for Inkster -- we had hoped that we might double the area to which crop insurance would be available in 1965. The time is running out on us, however, and it remains to be seen as to whether we can expand the area to the extent that we had hoped earlier in the year. Nevertheless we'll do the best we can to offer it to as many farmers as possible.

There are no private companies involved in the financing of crop insurance in Canada. Manitoba did explore the possibilities of writing a reinsurance contract with insurance companies like Lloyds of London or companies which undertake rather extraordinary -- undertake to protect rather extraordinary operations.

The question of hail insurance. Well, if we were to attach a hail insurance rider clause to crop insurance I know very well that we could sell more crop insurance. I am not sure that the Government of Canada would entertain a clause which would be tantamount to putting all the private companies out of business, because I think that this would be the result of it, that the line companies would be put out of business if we attached a hail insurance rider clause to the crop insurance contract, and the reason they would be out of business is simply because there are no administrative costs attached to the indemnities payable to the farmer -- there is in fact a 20 percent subsidy on the premiums -- so I think I don't need to draw a picture to show you what the implications are if we ventured into the hail insurance field on the same payment basis as the line insurance companies are recognizing loss today. Even though Manitoba wanted to get into the hail insurance on a loss basis or the same basis as the hail insurance companies are now operating, we couldn't do so, because under the federal statute we cannot protect more than 60 percent of the long time average yield of any specified crop.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the Minister one question in particular. He speaks of the estimated \$100,000 that will likely be the cost to the Province of Manitoba. Is this just in the nature of what we might call a reinsurance premium? And then, does that reinsurance follow the usual line of reinsurance, that above a certain stipulated amount, that the Federal Government will then pay all the cost? My recollection of the present Act is that if the losses exceed a certain amount -- I've forgotten the figure; it's \$175,000 or \$250,000 or something in that area -- that above that figure the Federal Government will loan the province the money. I would be interested to know if any loans have been made under that provision to date.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the -- I suggested when I was on my feet before that I thought that it looked like the Federal Government was paying 25 percent of the premiums. I understood my honourable friend to say 20 percent, but the annual report says "charge to the Government of Canada being 25 percent of the premiums."

MR. HUTTON: overall --

MR. SHOEMAKER: I'm using my own report when I say it. That is, it's conflicting advice, I . . .

MR. HUTTON: . . . Well, it's very simple.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I'm just quoting exactly what the Minister says in his report. It says 25 percent of the premiums paid, a charge to the Government of Canada.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, if I may answer -- 25 percent of the premiums paid by the farmer or 20 percent of the total premium. He could be right either way.

(MR. HUTTON cont'd)

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question raised by the Member for Lakeside. Yes; there were loans. I can't just offhand tell you the extent of them but there was a deductible of \$200,000, and any year when the reserves have been used up and the deductible of \$200,000 had been used up, then Canada shared the balance, or financed the balance through providing loans at 5 percent interest, on 75 percent of the balance of indemnities payable over and above current premiums, reserves and the \$200,000 deductible. The new agreement -- or the amendments I should say -- the amendments to The Crop Insurance Act Canada, provide here again for certain deductions before they begin to share, but under the new agreement they will receive annual premiums and will be liable for their portion of the risk at any time they might be called upon to pay.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate when he expects that there will be coverage available throughout the Province of Manitoba under the new scheme?

MR. HUTTON: We had hoped a little earlier that we would have doubled the area this year, which would have left 30 percent, and we would attempt to -- this was our schedule -- we would attempt to extend it to the very large proportion of the province in 1966. There would only remain some mopping up operations in areas where we do not have adequate soil surveys and yield statistics on which to base premiums and indemnities.

MR. MOLGAT: The Minister says "we had hoped . . . according to our schedule" -- I presume he has revised his schedule. What is the present schedule then? How much more is going to be taken in this year and what is the actual schedule at the moment?

MR. HUTTON: Well, the schedule that we had established was to double the test areas this year. It's a question of our physical ability to extend a selling program in the new areas. We'll shoot at our original goal of doubling the areas. Whether we can find enough time in the next three weeks to provide it in all of them is an open question. I can't answer you at the moment.

MR. MOLGAT: When was the federal decision taken and announced to the Government of Manitoba?

MR. HUTTON: Which federal decision?

MR. MOLGAT: To proceed on the sharing that the province was requesting which permits us to proceed here in the Province of Manitoba to expand.

MR. HUTTON: Well we have yet to receive the latest draft agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution adopted? The second resolution before the Committee is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Public Schools Act by providing, among other matters, (a) that certain further and additional grants be paid to school divisions on behalf of the school divisions and of school districts included therein; and (b) that certain school districts, school divisions, and school areas, may pay indemnities to members of the boards of trustees thereof, as a result of which additional grants may be paid thereto.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, this resolution has to deal with a bill which is the third bill coming before this Committee concerning changes in The Public School Act. It's a series of amendments, many of which have to do with grants. First of all, it will provide that the Minister shall provide a fidelity bond for all trustees. At the present the fidelity bond covers all rural trustees only. There's an amendment, for example, which increases the living allowance for trustees attending conventions from \$7.00 to \$15.00 a day. There's an amendment that calls for the remuneration of trustees according to a schedule which will be accompanying the Act. As you know, from time to time and from year to year various individual bills have been presented to the Committee, to the House, by different divisions and districts, asking for alterations in the payments to trustees, and a schedule is being brought in which lists the maximum amounts which shall be paid, or may be paid by -- under the bylaws of any of the boards or divisions, or districts. This will, I think, regularize what the divisions and districts have been looking for and will make our task more simple. It also provides for the -- covering a master agreement, that where a master agreement is signed with Treaty Indians, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council sets the tuition fees paid to the receiving school districts or divisions. This is, of course, in connection with the agreement which I'm happy to advise the Committee has been approved by Ottawa a few days ago. I've just received a letter from the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration which agrees to the master agreement that has been devised.

The other amendments in this particular bill call for the payment of a superintendent in those divisions who adopt the new legislation under Bill 39, and presently to those divisions,

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) of course, who have this in effect at the moment. It provides for the establishment grant for a school division who is taking over financial authority; it provides an additional transportation grant where -- or provides transportation grants for those divisions where it's necessary to transport children from their own high school to another for the purpose of taking another course. Also in this particular bill there's the increased grant from 40 to 60 percent for elementary schools who develop more than -- schools in excess of eight teaching classrooms. So there's a series of money matters in that bill which will be coming before you, and I think I've pretty well outlined each of the items in that particular bill which involve the expenditure of public funds.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I have one or two questions in connection with this resolution. I would like to ask my friend the Minister of Education if the grants are retroactive to include the current municipal and school board budget for 1965. If they are, while I commend him for increasing grants to the school districts and possibly in particular the increase from the 40 to 60 percent, if this is so may I also criticize him for delaying in bringing this bill before the House. It is now well into April, the 5th day of April; many of our school boards and municipalities have already compiled their budgets and the mill rates have been set in respect of many municipalities. I note that my own municipality, the City of Transcona, has set its mill rate with a slight reduction over what it was, I'm glad to note last year, due to the municipality not going to allow any reductions by way of rebate for prepayment of taxes, not because of any governmental action. But if this bill and the provision of the additional finances are to apply for this current year, certainly that will alter the picture as far as the municipalities, as far as the school boards are concerned. So while I say to my honourable friend I welcome the increases in the responsibilities of the government, I do suggest to him that this matter, if it is again applicable for the current year, should have been done before, because I can see that it might result in a considerable amount of confusion in respect of those school boards and municipalities who have already pretty well set their budget.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, my first question was similar to the first one that the Leader of the NDP asked about the grants being retroactive, and then in Number 3 there's an amendment covering a master agreement which sets tuition fees to be paid by government to local school districts. I wonder if this applies to both high school and elementary students entering the school district. And the last one, re Bill 39 -- 40 to 60 percent -- there's a change of grant from 40 to 60 percent in the case of construction of an eight-room elementary class. Now this applies only to those districts, I presume, taking advantage of the provisions set out in Bill No. 39. The other schools who do not take advantage of the provisions probably will remain as they are, still on the 40 percent. I just want clarification on that. I don't think this will amount to very much if that is the case, if it only applies to those districts who give over their financial responsibilities -- it applies to all of them? Oh well then, in that case I'll not complete what I had to say.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . another question that I had in mind that I omitted to ask my friend, the Minister. I believe he mentioned that there would be provision for the payment of grants for transportation in respect of transferring pupils from one school to another for purposes of -- as I understood the Minister -- taking some subjects in other schools rather than their own. Has this any connection with the recommendations which have not been tabled in respect of the committee that considered the question of shared services?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the fidelity bond that was mentioned. What is the high and what is the low under these bonds that we'll be providing, and I take it the government is going to pay for this cost like it has for the rural districts in the past? I'd like to get some enlargement on that.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, the fidelity bond which is now being paid by the province for the rural districts and so on will now cover all school districts and divisions within the province at provincial expense.

With respect to construction and so on, the grants for any -- whether under Bill 39 or not -- any school developing, an elementary school of eight or more rooms, will now receive the 60 percent grant this year. It won't be retroactive; it will come into effect on royal assent. I imagine any that are in operation since the program was announced would qualify here, as I understand it.

Insofar as transportation is concerned, this is mainly to assist in those areas where the school division is putting on, say, a general course in one school and an academic course in

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) another school. We have some of these working right now. In the past year we've had in two or three divisions a four-room school putting on the general course and one the university entrance, and we want to assist with the extra transportation grant as we've pointed out.

With respect to -- one other question there was shared services. No, there's no -- the resolution on shared services -- these transportation grants were mainly considered for the multiple courses that we know of to date, and the university entrance course seminar felt that this would be a thing to do and to assist in, helping divisions as multiple courses came in. I believe that's all the questions that were asked, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TANCHAK: . . . question. They apply to both elementary and secondary?

MR. JOHNSON: What's that?

MR. TANCHAK: The tuition covering this master agreement, on the Indian children coming into the school districts. Does it cover both elementary and high school students?

MR. JOHNSON: Both elementary and high school wherever that arrangement is made, and as a matter of fact is in effect immediately.

MR. FROESE: What has been the experience in connection with fidelity bonds for school districts? To my knowledge I haven't ever heard of any claims but maybe the Minister could just briefly tell us.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . not heard of any claims. I'll try and get any information and take it as notice if I may.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, while I'm not quite clear on the reply of the Honourable Minister I attributed the non-clarification to me and not to him -- in respect of retroactivity of the increase from the 40 to 60 percent, as to how it applies in the current fiscal year in respect of municipalities and school districts.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, as soon as this bill receives approval, Mr. Chairman, it becomes effective. It has no retroactive feature.

MR. PAULLEY: But Mr. Chairman, the point that I raised is the school boards have compiled their budgets for this year. If, and notwithstanding the reply of the Honourable Minister -- and I agree with him it doesn't become law until it is given the royal assent -- but certainly it can affect the amounts of grants ensuing to school districts and school boards for the current year, and this is the point that I'm trying to get at, because of the fact of the lateness of the bill and the fact that many school districts have already compiled their budget for this year.

MR. JOHNSON: A little over two weeks ago when I was starting my estimates we made an announcement, as you recall, I think that's where it first came out. As the honourable member knows, the school districts that have projects before our Building Committee that have not yet been approved -- you know, they may have been planning this starting last year or they may be in the process now -- as soon as this becomes effective they will qualify for the 60 percent grants, and I can assure my honourable friend that I haven't approved any of such schools since -- well it just so happens there haven't been any of them that I can recall coming before me in the last little while, but I imagine that those that are before the Building Projects Committee now will take advantage of the new legislation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution adopted? Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions and has instructed me to report the same.

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. HUTTON introduced Bill No. 113, an Act to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act.

MR. JOHNSON introduced Bill No. 111, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (3).

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to table a Return to Order No. 53, on the Order of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, and may I also say that my colleague the Attorney-General will not be in the House today owing to a death in the family, and therefore when we come to Supply we will probably proceed with

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) Health. I think honourable members should just get this brief notice that Health will be on deck when we get to the Committee of Supply.

I think also that the House might like to know the arrangements that have been agreed to between the province and the federal government respecting the financing of the Pan-Am Games, which agreement will be considered by the City Council tonight in their meeting, who have to decide their views on this matter. The arrangement that we have come to is that the excess costs over revenues, we share on the basis of 1 1/4 million dollars from the federal government, one million dollars from the Province of Manitoba; \$460,000 from the City of Winnipeg, plus whatever contributions may be made by area municipalities -- I believe there are some. Costs in excess of this amount to be shared on a one-third, one-third, one-third basis between the City, the Province and the federal administration. Federal administration have put a ceiling of \$250,000 on their one-third sharing, so it means that we can run up to 3.5 million dollars extra cost under that ceiling and with that formula. I regard -- I think, myself, this ought to be ample, but in case it should not be ample and as these matters have to be provided for, the government of the province has undertaken to share any further excess cost with the city, on a fifty-fifty basis. So this formula is now before the City Council and no doubt will be considered by them this evening, and we'll know what their views are.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the First Minister for his statement on the matter of the Pan-Am Games. We have asked him some questions over the past week and I'm glad to see that this matter is now resolved. I'd just like to ascertain on two points: If there is an excess and the sharing is to be one-third, one-third, one-third -- the one-third that is municipal I presume would include any contributions from area municipalities as being part of that -- that would not necessarily be the City of Winnipeg as such. My first question. Secondly, did I hear him correctly to say that if it went beyond the contribution that the federal government have offered that the sharing would be fifty-fifty, city and province?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, the contributions of any area municipalities are part of the formula that is put together before excess costs are arrived at, so that in dealing with excess costs, the three partners are: The City of Winnipeg, the Province and the Federal Government. This formula will provide up to \$3.5 million. If there is an excess cost over and above that figure, that is shared fifty-fifty between the Province and the City, because we have been unable to convince the federal government that they ought to share in that portion. So we've just had to give that up as a bad job.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, should the City of Winnipeg be able to convince some of the area municipalities that they should participate in this because they will get certain benefits, will their contribution be considered as part of the City of Winnipeg contribution or part of the provincial contribution?

MR. ROBLIN: They are considered on their own merits as part of the formula, and in effect they are pooled with the province, the City and the federal government share. If, for example, the City of St. James continues to make good their grant of \$40,000, that goes into the basic formula of which I have just described.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the First Minister? Will the buildings that will be put up, if everything is approved, will they be the property of the province, the city, or the public? Who would have anything to say about it and who could stop the promoters to demolish it?

MR. ROBLIN: Under the proposed agreement there will be a supervisory committee set up, consisting of a representative of the federal government, the City of Winnipeg, the province, and the Pan-American Games Society, which will approve the budget and will also have the final say as to the location of any structures that are built. After the Games are over, the structures will become the property of the persons who own the property on which they are built. If they are constructed in the City of Winnipeg, they become the property of the City; if they are constructed in a provincial park, for example, they are the property of the province. That's how the ultimate disposition of the facilities is to be made.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the First Minister would table copies of the agreement when it's fully formulated?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes. I've been a little hesitant about making my announcement today because I really haven't any permission from the federal government to table their documents, but owing to the fact that this is now going to be debated by the City of Winnipeg Council in the full glare of publicity this evening, I thought it only right that members should have this advance notice of what was contained in the proposals that are being made. I think probably if my

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) honourable friend would be good enough to give an Order for Return, I would get the consent of the federal administration and table all documents in connection with this.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if he could let me have the five publications set out on Page 188 of the Annual Report? Now I realize I could get this by Order for Return, but I would like it if I -- the five publications appearing on Page 188 of the Annual Report. Thank you.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order No. 10, March 15th, in the name of the Member for Elmwood.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (Ste. George): Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Could he indicate whether we'll continue through the estimates of the Health Department until they are finished, or will we resume the Department of the Attorney-General when the Minister returns?

MR. ROBLIN: I think the best thing to do would be to continue with the Department of Health. I'm not sure when my colleague is returning; probably tomorrow, but I don't know for sure. So I think we'll just continue with the Department of Health, clean them up, and then go back to Attorney-General and finish them.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I requested an Order for Return of certain documents from my honourable friend in respect of agreements between INCO and the former Government of Manitoba. The other day he mentioned his department was working on it. I am wondering if my honourable friend could not supply me with copies of the original agreement quicker than the full report might be tabled.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I think a copy of the original agreement is on file as a sessional paper. I believe it was filed in 1957. But if that proves not to be the case, certainly we could make a copy available to my honourable friend.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to ask a question to the Minister of Education. Is there an oath of office for school trustees, either at the elementary level or at the division level, when they take office? Is there an oath of office as there is for members of this House or municipal councillors?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, there is.

MR. MOLGAT: Who administers this oath of office, and is it administered in all cases?

MR. JOHNSON: I believe it is administered in all cases, but of course this is left up to the individual trustees. It's in the Act, for example, that all school trustees coming on, must be sworn in and take the Oath of Allegiance. As a matter of fact, in the past year we've had the matter brought to our attention in one case where this was challenged by a trustee. I wrote to the chairman of the board and asked him if this was true, or that it was possible somebody had not been sworn in. I received a letter back from the board and their solicitor that this section of the Act had been complied with. I don't know of any other policing of this that is done, other than left up to the trustees themselves to carry out the intent of the Act. If it is not carried out it is in contravention of the Act.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question. Is it correct then that the Minister has received only one complaint of this nature in the past year?

MR. JOHNSON: That's all I can recall, on my

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. John's, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) Have any efficiency surveys been made in Departments of Government? (2) If so, what departments? (3) What are their recommendations, if any? (4) How many permanent employees in each Department of Government? (5) How many temporary employees in each Department of Government for the years 1953-1958; 1959-1964?

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, with respect to questions 1, 2 and 3, I'm taking it for

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) granted that my honourable friend wants the information from the period beginning 1958 until the present time; and secondly, I am making the stipulation that we do not include in the Return any intra-departmental or inter-departmental surveys without to the government. With respect to questions 4 and 5 may I suggest to the honourable member that he refer to the report of the Civil Service Commission that is tabled here annually and he will find the information therein.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return . . .

MR. ROBLIN: I would suggest that my honourable friend not move the order in view of the absence of the Attorney-General and move it when he returns. It has to do with legal matters.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon) : Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister without Portfolio, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed Resolution standing in my name.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution, recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The resolution before the Committee is: Whereas the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba -- agreed? suspend . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: This brings up the point, about dispensing with the reading of this, that I have mentioned on a few occasions here, and I'm sorry to put you to the extra trouble but I think we should have it in Hansard. It wasn't read when it was moved, we dispensed with Madam Speaker's reading of it, and I have no objection in the world to that, but inasmuch as we have now come to look on Hansard as the place where we find practically everything that happens in here, I think it would be advisable if you would read it. You are a good reader, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whereas the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at its Second Session of the Twenty-seventh Legislature, on the nineteenth day of March, 1964, constituted a Special Committee of the House consisting of nine members to examine, investigate, inquire into, study and report on all matters relating to the determination of the proper role to be filled by dental technicians and denturists in the provision of dental services consistent with sound public health policy, and to make such findings and recommendations as are deemed advisable with respect thereto;

And whereas at the Second Session of the Twenty-seventh Legislature on the ninth day of April, 1964, Hon. Messrs. Lyon, Witney, Messrs. Bjornson, Cherniack, Groves, Guttormson, Klym, Molgat and Stanes were appointed members of this Special Committee;

And whereas on the tenth day of April, 1964, the House ordered that the names of Messrs. Guttormson and Molgat be removed from this Special Committee and that the names of Messrs. Shoemaker and Johnston be substituted therefor;

And whereas at the Third Session of the Twenty-seventh Legislature on the seventeenth day of August, 1964, this Special Committee was reconstituted and re-appointed with the same powers and the same personnel;

And whereas the said Committee has not completed its work; and whereas the said Committee has submitted an interim report and has requested to sit during recess and to report at the next session of the Legislature;

And whereas it is deemed advisable that the said Committee be reconstituted and re-appointed to sit during the present session and in recess after prorogation, to complete its work;

Therefore be it resolved that the Special Committee of the House constituted at the Second Session of the Twenty-seventh Legislature on the nineteenth day of March, 1964, and whose members were appointed on the ninth day of April, 1964, and the tenth day of April, 1964, and reconstituted and re-appointed at the Third Session of the Twenty-seventh Legislature on the seventeenth day of August, 1964, be now reconstituted and re-appointed with the same purposes and with the same powers, that is to examine, investigate, inquire into, study

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) and report on all matters relating to the determination of the proper role to be filled by dental technicians and denturists in the provision of dental services consistent with sound public health policy and to make such findings and recommendations as are deemed advisable with respect thereto;

And be it further resolved that Hon. Messrs. Lyon, Witney, Messrs. Bjornson, Cherniack, Groves, Johnston, Klym, Shoemaker and Stanes be re-appointed as members of this Special Committee;

And be it further resolved that the said Special Committee have power to sit during the present session and in recess, after prorogation, and to report to this House on the matters referred to them at the next session of this Legislature;

And that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund to the members of the said Committee the amount of expenses incurred by the members in attending the sittings of the Committee or expenses incurred by the members in the performance of duties ordered by the Committee in recess, after prorogation, as are approved by the Comptroller-General;

And that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund, all other expenses of a kind and nature required to assist the Committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution, provided the same have received the prior approval of the Treasury Board.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister speaks, may I ask a question? In the meantime, the situation of the denturists and the dentists remains as it is. Am I correct in that?

MR. WITNEY: As mentioned the other day, Mr. Chairman, I trust that this committee -- and I'm quite sure that we will be able to complete our deliberations before the session's end and present our report at that time. In the meantime the situation is the same.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate to us at this time the expenditures of the Committee to date. Now he's asking us to authorize the continuing of the Committee after the session, if I understand the resolution, and I'm not so sure that I'm prepared to support that idea. I think the Committee has now had a full year to make the decision on this; they have travelled fairly extensively; and before proceeding with any further expenditures I would like to know how much has been spent and exactly where we stand on the whole subject.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I can't give the honourable member the figure as to how much has been spent at the present time, but it can be obtained from the accountant and I will endeavour to do so.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, just what else are the committee proposing to do? Do they intend to go out to further -- other places in the U.S. or what is the proposition? Is it just a matter of finalizing the report now?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, it's just a matter of finalizing the report. We do not intend to go any further than Winnipeg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution adopted?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, when I asked the Minister about this committee he indicated to me that he expected they would give their report to this session, and now in this resolution he is asking for the right to sit after this session. Now I'm afraid that if we proceed and accept this resolution as it stands, that what will happen is that the committee will sit after the session, they'll find reasons why they can't get the thing done now, and that the thing will simply drag along, and I think we would be better advised at this time to leave this matter sit, let the committee have its meetings during the course of the session and if at the end of the session it should find itself in the absolute impossibility of making a report, well then I would be prepared to look at the matter again, but I don't think I am prepared to look at this stage. After the statement of the Minister here that he expected to have a report at this session, I don't think that we should be asked to consider a resolution empowering the committee to sit after the session. I think this is exactly in line with what the Minister said, and I think the House at this time should tell this Committee "Well, get down to work; have your meetings and see if you can get a report to us and if you can't get one we will see what you have to say in, say, a week before the session rises." But not at this point, otherwise I suspect that we will simply find the committee carrying on after this present session.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, further -- are submissions available for perusal by members of this House or what is the situation?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, the committee has to be re-constituted in order to sit and finalize its report, which is all that we are asking to do. All of the meetings that we have had and the various interviews that we had -- we have hammered out certain principles. A draft report is now ready by me to be submitted to the members of the committee and they will be called together at the very first opportunity as soon as I can get the report in the mail once the committee is re-constituted. When the committee is re-constituted the draft report will go out for the consideration, and they will be called together, and I am quite sure that none of the committee, as with myself, want to continue any longer than this House, and that we will be bringing our report down. As for the documents that have been presented to us, they were public meetings and when the final report is submitted by the committee the documents of course will be public with them, or with the report.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the committee was appointed by the House, the members were named on the 10th day of April 1964; the committee was re-appointed at the other session on the 17th day of August 1964. Could the Minister indicate to us when the meetings were held and where?

MR. WITNEY: The list of the meetings were in the report that was read at the time we made our interim report to the . . . just the other day. I can't recall the exact dates but they are in the report -- they are filed with the information of the House now.

MR. MOLGAT: Could the Minister, in view of his statement that he hoped to have a report at this session, be prepared for the time being to remove from this resolution the power to have the committee sit after the present session? If that were the case, I would be prepared to consider this, if he would simply for the time being remove that portion about sitting after the session.

MR. WITNEY: No, Mr. Chairman. The resolution is before us. I want to get the committee constituted again -- re-constituted -- and to get on with the work and to bring the report in.

MR. MOLGAT: I agree completely, Mr. Chairman. That's my point. I want the committee to get to work, too. I think that the committee has travelled extensively through Canada. It's been to Alberta and British Columbia and Toronto and so on, and it seems to me that surely they are in a position now where they can come forward with a report, and that the House should not consider giving this committee another extension of another year, which is what we are being asked. I recall another committee of this House that lasted virtually eternally. It seemed to be re-constituted every session and carry on and carry on. Now I want to see the committee get to work and I think that the way to get them to work is to have them report before the end of the session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution be adopted?

MR. MOLGAT: No.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): I wanted to speak on this, if I may. I've been listening to this discussion as to whether the committee should be compelled to meet during this session or be permitted to meet after the session and before the next one, and I would express my own opinion as a member of the committee that we ought to be able to bring in the report this session. On the other hand, I would oppose any attempt by anyone on the committee to steamroller through a report. Now I'm not suggesting that anybody has that intention -- I just don't know and if there's any attempt to force the report before it is ready then I would want to oppose it right at the committee meeting. Therefore I'm inclined to feel that the resolution as presented is the more flexible one, to give us an opportunity to present a report which has the fullest background material to it, so that I'm inclined to say that the resolution should be accepted as it is just in case I, for one, find at the committee stage that I'm not happy with the proposed report and I want an opportunity to explore it further. I do say again that it seems to me that we ought to be able to bring in the report this session, but I wouldn't like to have my hands tied to that extent, and if that's the vote then I would be inclined to feel that we ought to accept it as it is now to give us that opportunity. I don't know how other members of the committee feel -- there were nine of us altogether and I'm the first one to express this point of view, so I'm only speaking for myself, of course.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Chairman, I was also a member of the committee, and I think that on a subject that has been as controversial over the years as this one that the committee has to take upon itself a great deal of credit. I think the discussions that we had have been very constructive, and surprisingly enough I think we've found a great deal of common ground. It would be a shame, as the Honourable Minister has said and as the Honourable

(MR. GROVES cont'd) . . . Member from St. John's has said, if we -- because now that things are going to start speeding up in the session, if we would be forced to bring in a report at this session if there's some hope of bringing in a better report by being able to meet after the session. I think the resolution as it is gives us that flexibility, and I think the committee should be encouraged on this type of problem to not have to rush and to try and bring something in that will solve this in a permanent manner.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . just one observation I would like to make, following the Honourable Member for St. Vital. He mentioned the speeding up of this session may preclude arriving at any final report. My colleague from St. John's had a little bit different approach in that he is of the opinion, if I understood him correctly, that the committee should meet during this session -- I mean now. And if the Honourable the Minister of Health, who I understand is the chairman of this committee, would give to me as an individual member of this committee the assurance that the committee will be meeting during the present session, which might obviate the necessity of continuing after prorogation, that this would be quite satisfactory to me, and then I could feel that I too could support the resolution on that basis. Not however, Mr. Chairman, with all deference to my friend from St. Vital, that we may not meet because we're going to be busy. We're always busy in these sessions, even from the day they start, at least some of us are, and I would like that assurance from the Minister that the committee will meet to consider what they have and to see whether or not they may be able to bring in a report at this session. Then I'll feel as though I could support the resolution that's before the committee at the present time.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, if the intention is there that this committee will be meeting during the session and probably finalizing the report and bringing in the recommendations, why wasn't this report brought in earlier? Here it's a month and a half after we've started our session and still this resolution or this report just came in recently. Why couldn't they bring it in at the beginning of the session so they'd have had a full month to work on it?

MR. GROVES: . . . speaking apparently, to say that I was under the impression that the committee would meet at this session and I'm inclined to think that it's possible that we could bring in a report.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, it rather looks like the committee is holding a meeting right now, but I wonder if the chairman of that committee isn't a little hopeful when he thinks that he has a report that the committee will accept all prepared. Knowing the committee members as I do, and have found them to be in the course of the last year, I would think it would be rather wishful thinking to say that he hopes that the report would meet with their unanimous approval. I don't know whether he used the word "unanimous" or not. However, I too hope that we will be able to table a final report at this session. However, I, like the Honourable Member for Rhineland, I wish that we had got started earlier. I find myself working about 14 hours a day now -- (Interjection) -- well at least 14 hours a day now, at least 14 hours. I don't know, Mr. Chairman, where I'm going to find time to study a very lengthy report in the next two or three weeks, but however, I think that in order to satisfy certain members of our group that probably it could be amended here to say that in the event that a final report is not tabled at this session, then have it amended to allow us to sit during the recess. However, the chairman perhaps knows what progress he is making in this regard and perhaps he can pretty well assure the House right now that a final report will be tabled, whether it is unanimous or not.

MR. WITNEY: I can assure the House that the committee will be sitting, and once we are reconstituted, if it will satisfy the House we can sit on Wednesday morning of this week at 9:00 o'clock, and possibly by 12:00 noon at least have come to some conclusion.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I will confine my few remarks to a term that I find disturbing in the resolution. I will not speak about anything to do with the committee -- I'll leave that to the committee chairman. But I have found as a member of the committee, in our travels and interviews with people to do with the dental profession and public health in general, the term "denturist" is a term that is self-given by a group of people who through the use of this term sometimes mislead people into believing that they are professional people, and I would like to see the word, wherever it appears in the resolution, struck out and the term "dental mechanic" inserted in its place, the reason being that this will give the true meaning of the word as it is understood in any places where we have had meetings or people we have talked to were knowledgeable with the subject. Therefore I would move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that the word or words "denturists" or

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) "denturists" appear, they be struck out and the wording "dental mechanic" or "dental mechanics" be substituted.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Chairman, before this motion is put, it isn't I think very important, however I think that we have to bear in mind that this original resolution was set up in respect to a problem that existed in Manitoba, and there were three groups of persons concerned. There was the dentist, the dental technician who deals with the dentist, and the denturist, who is dealing now with the public. Now in Manitoba they have always been known as denturists and never known as dental mechanics. In Alberta and also in B. C., I think, under the Acts regulating the dental profession and the technicians, those technicians who are operating directly or practising directly for the public are called "dental mechanic"; so dental mechanic is really a term that has been established by legislation in Alberta and B. C. It really has nothing to do with the problem in Manitoba. These people have never been known as dental mechanics here, and personally I really couldn't care less what you call them, the problem remains just the same. So as far as I'm concerned, on the grounds that we're dealing with the terms used in the Province of Manitoba, then I would oppose the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member for St. Vital has already more or less clarified what I was going to say. We recall that some two or three years ago we had three bills before the House at that time, one in connection with the dental mechanics and I think another one with the denturists and another one with the dentists. All I'm concerned with is that by passing this motion that we're not restricting the committee in any way, that they will still look after the denturists as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have the original motion before the committee. Shall the motion be adopted?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, coming back then to the original motion. I now have before me the report of the committee which indicates that the first sitting of this committee was on October 29, 1964, and then meetings were held on -- no, pardon me, October 27th and 28th in Alberta, October 29th in Regina, October 29th in Vancouver, back in Winnipeg November 16th, 17th, Toronto December 6th and so on. Now this committee was first of all established in March of 1964. Now we went all the way from March 1964 and nothing was done until October. There was a good deal of time, Mr. Chairman, when this committee could have been at work, and I can't see why, having spent some six or eight months, from March on, the committee not meeting, that the House should not be asked to support a resolution giving them the possibility of sitting after this session again. I repeat, if this is essential, if we find that there's new information to be obtained and they have to do this, well I'll be prepared to look at it at that time, but surely between April 10th when the members were named, and October, the Minister had ample time to call meetings and get to work on this committee. Why they waited until October I'm sure I don't know, and why -- the House having adjourned or come into session here the third week of February -- we are now being asked in the first week of April to allow this committee to sit after the present session when they haven't done a thing so far in this session, is again beyond me, and on that basis, Mr. Chairman, I move that the motion be amended by deleting the words "and in recess after prorogation" -- that's in the second last paragraph on Page 3 of Orders of the Day, remove the words "and in recess after prorogation" and remove the word "next session" replacing it by the word "present session" and on the first paragraph at the top of Page 4, removing the words "in recess after prorogation" -- (Interjection) -- Do you want that written?

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion adopted?

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, before you proceed with the main motion, I would like to reiterate the stand taken by my leader in respect of being given information as to what the expenses of this committee have been to date. Now it's perfectly true that the Honourable Member for St. John's takes the stand that he would like to have flexibility in the resolution. I can appreciate that point, but at the same time I think we are, in this House or this committee, entitled to know what this committee has cost to date, and I think we're also entitled to know what the anticipated future expenses might be if this committee does sit after prorogation and whether or no there is any intention of this committee making any further safaris.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion adopted. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the committee has adopted a certain resolution and instructed me to report the same.

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister without Portfolio, whereas the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at its Second Session of the Twenty-seventh Legislature --

(See the motion of MR. WITNEY in Committee of the Whole regarding dental services, on pages 1225 and 1226.)

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I wanted to raise just a couple of points on this bill, and one was in respect to the \$25.00 fee that is required to be paid by the uninsured owners of motor vehicles, and in Section 3 where it states "Whereas unless the owner of a motor vehicle satisfies the registrar that he is financially responsible, he shall at all times when registering his vehicle in each year pay an additional fee of \$25.00". Now I'm not quite sure and fully satisfied just to see how this thing is working out at the present time. I appreciate and fully realize that in the next section in this bill there is provision made where anyone that does not carry insurance and has not paid a \$25.00 fee is liable to a fine or penalty, but I know from my own experience it's so easy for anyone to get insurance and then a couple of days later, or a couple of weeks later, have it cancelled by himself or have it cancelled by the insurer for non-payment or for many different reasons. Now I think that this is going to happen to some extent, and surely the government's not going to go around trying to investigate and check who has insurance and who has not. My point in raising this is that there should have been better means at the present time to show to the registrar of insurability in the way of any agent cancelling insurance in the way of notifying the registrar or something to that effect.

I would also like to raise a point in respect to payment of property damage, and it states "where a person recovers in any court in the province a judgment for an amount exceeding \$200.00." I would like to know why should it exceed \$200.00? Why isn't it for any amount of damage that happens?

There's one more point that I wanted to raise and that was in connection with maximum property damage. It states in the bill that the maximum property damage shall not exceed \$3,000.00. I wonder if this is sufficient, because we must fully realize that some damages could happen in the neighbourhood of \$5,000 or \$6,000 or \$10,000 and in the last couple of years I think we've had good examples of it from pictures in the paper where we've had cars or trucks involved in accidents striking different buildings or automobiles. I know in the building that I am in in St. James there was a truck went out of control and went right into the building. There was damage there; it could have been serious. At the time, the damages could have been much more serious, so I'm concerned, why is the limit placed at \$3,000, together with the other points that I have raised with respect of over and above the \$200.00 damages, and the first one of course, the \$25.00 additional fee for uninsured motor vehicles. I would like to have these points answered.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I'd like to raise only one point, subsequent to the questions asked and the points made by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

On this question of the \$25.00 fee there seems to be the thought that the registrar may waive this \$25.00 fee if he is satisfied that the applicant, or the owner of a motor vehicle, is financially responsible. Well, there are various ways that people may contend that they are financially responsible, and the only way I'm aware of that the Act contemplated this in the past was by filing a certificate of insurance and show therefore that there is the backing of an insurance company to this effect. Now there is an attempt by the government to say, well, now, if you are not insured we will establish an additional licence fee, or a special licence fee of \$25.00, for the assurance fund and in that way it may be hoped or expected that this would

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . compel somebody to go out and get the insurance, without actually calling it compulsory insurance because it's not compulsory insurance except to the extent that it may prove to be financially advisable or attractive to take out insurance because of what appears to be a penalty, that is the \$25.00 fee.

Now I don't want to debate at this moment whether or not it is compulsory insurance that we're dealing with or a fee of a penalty, but I do want to question the absence of a guide to the registrar as to what is to be considered as financially responsible. I would hate to think that a difference will be made between an individual who decides that he wants to self-insure, and a company which operates a group of vehicles which may decide that it wants to be self-insured. There may be municipal corporations; there may well be private companies that have delivery vehicles and that may have found in their experience that they're better off to self-insure rather than take out insurance, and I would not like to think that the registrar would look at a name and say, "Well, that's a big company so they must be financially secure," and waive the \$25.00 fee, and look at another name and say, "Well, I don't know that person so he may not be financially secure." I don't know whether a financial statement alone would be sufficient to satisfy anybody as to financial responsibility, but I would like to think that there will not be any discriminatory rules of thumb applied as between one owner and another, and it would have been better, to my way of thinking, if the Act had actually spelled out the manner in which the registrar will determine whether or not the motor vehicle is owned by a person who is financially responsible. To be specific, I would say, suppose John Doe living on Jarvis Avenue in the City of Winnipeg applies; Richard Row living in Tuxedo applies; or the X-company with an operation on Marion Street; or the so-and-so Department Store on Portage Avenue and Donald; just how will these various applicants be considered by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles as to whether or not each one or the other is financially responsible? I'd like to suggest that a reply to this question is in order and I am looking forward to hearing it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, there are a couple of points that I would like to raise at this time. For the entire month of February I don't think that we ever had a more interesting time in our office than we had this year, because we had people coming in and we had to fill out the backs of their application forms for insurance, and about four times a day the office that was issuing the licences phoned us to see if so-and-so did in fact have insurance on their vehicle. They had come in, made application for the renewal of their licence, and they neglected to bring their pink cards with them, and so on and so forth. But to me one of the interesting features of it all was this, that if the applicant said in fact that they had coverage up until midnight of March 1st or March 2nd, then they could issue them a plate. If it expired 24 hours prior to that of course they couldn't issue them a plate, unless they wished to pay the \$25.00. But there was no guarantee on anybody's part that the policy which could expire on the next day would ever be renewed, and it seemed to me that if -- I know what the intentions of it, of the amendments were, to make certain that everybody carried insurance or paid \$25.00. To me it looks as if this has not been accomplished at all, unless of course, as one member has suggested, that it is the intention of the government to see henceforth and forever more that their policy is renewed.

I notice, Madam Speaker, on the notice that went forward to everyone who owned a vehicle in the Province of Manitoba, headed "An Important Notice", it says and I quote "It is an offence punishable by fine or imprisonment, to operate a motor vehicle at any time during the registration year without insurance coverage, if the additional sum of \$25.00 has not been paid." Now, I don't know what the fine is nor what the maximum jail term is under this Act, but surely the government does not intend to check up on half a million people who own vehicles to see whether or not they have renewed their insurance. I don't mind admitting that already we have cancelled one insurance policy that was taken out two or three weeks ago, for non-payment of premium, and we may have to do some more because I believe the statistics show that something like four or five percent of the cars have not been insured, have never been insured, and for a number of reasons -- of course the main reason being that these four or five percent are considered very bad risks, I think, by everyone, including themselves. They've had difficulty obtaining it in the past and that's why they haven't had insurance.

Now, Madam Speaker, there is another group that it has worked a bit of a hardship on, and that is farmers who have in the past been licencing a farm tractor. Now it is a fact that the increase in fees didn't affect them too badly because the registration fee for a farm tractor was only a dollar so it went up 25 percent, so it's \$1.25. But, they either had to pay \$25.00 or go and get their tractor insured, which was quite a hardship. Now I think all insurance

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) companies that I know of -- and I said this before Madam Speaker -- all of the insurance companies have implemented a \$15.00 minimum premium, and if a farmer has no other vehicle other than his tractor he would have to pay \$15.00 for his insurance or pay \$25.00 to the government. Now I have reason to believe that it was intended to amend The Highways Traffic Act at this session of the Legislature, to take care of this situation. And I hope that it is. I hope that the government intends to do that. As I mentioned before, that just about every farmer in the province now, I believe, carries comprehensive Farmer's Liability Insurance, and if he doesn't licence the tractor, then the liability of that machine is automatically included in his farmers comprehensive liability policy. The minute that he puts a licence on it, it is excluded. And I hope that there will be an amendment forthcoming to The Highways Traffic Act to correct this situation.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I think the question of a certificate of financial responsibility is pretty well settled under The Highway Traffic Act. I think it's set out in Section 141, which says that where proof of financial responsibility is required to be given, it can be given in any of the alternative forms set out in that section. And I think the choice is in the person who produces, not on the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. But it's defined fairly well in Section 141 of The Highway Traffic Act and this new bill of ours, Bill 67, doesn't affect that situation at all. It still remains in The Highway Traffic Act.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I realize the Minister isn't here today, but I suppose he will be reading in Hansard of the various comments that have been made. And I have only one particular comment to make, Madam Speaker. Some members of the motorcycle set have talked to me in the course of the past several weeks. And it has been brought to my attention that there is a difficulty that has arisen as a result of the \$25.00 penalty which is being levied on those who do not obtain insurance on their vehicles. Now, I recall the First Minister saying that there are one or two insurance companies in the city here who will write insurance on motorcycles. But there is really quite a bit of awkwardness, if I might use that expression, in the sense that I understand no insurance company will insure motorcycles beyond the six or seven months of the spring, summer, fall season. You can't get insurance for year-round use of the motorcycle.

Secondly, I am under the impression that there is some sort of municipal ordinance in the Winnipeg area, which puts a ban on the use of two-wheel motorcycles after the first substantial snow fall; that if it's a three-wheel motorcycle, it's all right. But if it's a two-wheel, it's banned from use until the concrete reappears on the streets, or paving, the next spring. Now then, if this is the case, how does that affect these motorcycle owners? It would seem to me that if they are going to get their licence, they're going to have to take out year-round insurance. But year-round insurance is in the first place, to my knowledge, not procurable, and secondly, it is of no value to them in that they are banned by ordinance or bylaw from using the motorcycle in the winter. They wouldn't in any case want to, in 20 below weather. And so it seems to me that some special regulations will have to be, or some amendment to the statute here, will have to be incorporated in order to remove what appears to be an inequity vis-a-vis motorcycle operators.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Adjourned Debate on the Second Reading of Bill No. 68. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, this is an important bill in the sense that it provides for the whole organization of a department and for its method of operation. Now the Minister upon introducing the bill indicated that many of the sections were in fact merely lifts out of the old act and that there were only a few changes in principle -- additions of principle.

I would first of all suggest to the Minister that in a case such as this where you have a substantial bill of considerable length, it would be very helpful to the members here if the lifts, the repeats of the existing sections from the old act were to be marked by some star or asterisk or something. This would eliminate much going back and forth between the new bill and the old act. It would be helpful and I think not too difficult a task for the ones who are drafting the legislation.

I think honourable members when they read this Bill 68 will notice two things in particular. First of all, it provides for a great deal of delegation of legislative power and a great deal of regulatory power, or regulation passing power. This certainly arrested my attention, and I think would arrest the attention of most members.

Secondly, the bill does show from section to section a great deal of discretionary power being given to the Minister if not to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Now the Member for Ethelbert-Plains, the honourable member when he spoke to this bill last week made some pretty extensive legal-type commentary on many of the sections. I don't propose to repeat many of them except to say that I agree with what he said then, and after reading it a second time in Hansard, I do agree with his observations that there is some cause for concern in some of these sections.

For example, Section 5 of the bill provides for the delegation by the Minister of power to subordinates to enter into agreements to sign documents on behalf of etc. Then further on in the bill, I think it is Section 23, there is a clause or section which seems to be flatly contradictory in the sense that in Section 23 it says that the government or the department shall not be held liable for any act unless that was due to or was brought about by the expressed signature of the Minister. How can you have the Minister delegate power to sign to subordinates and then several sections later say that the department shall not be liable except -- except or unless the action involved was one that involves the signature of the Minister and only by him.

Then in Section 7, Madam Speaker, Section 7, Subsection (5), there is reference there to trade-in, a trade-in of Crown property, departmental property, not being a sale. This leaves me rather confused and I would ask the Minister to elaborate on that when he answers to the questions and observations when he closes the debate.

Also in Section 7, this time Subsection (7) of Section 7, there is authority there for the Minister to sell departmental material -- and I presume material includes equipment and supplies -- authority for the Minister to sell material without tender to municipalities -- well that's fine -- to boards and commissions, to the university, etc. All this is fine, but in the last sub clause, he may also sell this material -- and I presume again equipment -- to individual contractors. I'm not so sure that this sort of leeway should be permitted in the statute here, for the reason that it would present a sort of temptation under certain circumstances, the kind of temptation that the Minister and the department and the government should not have to be faced with at any time.

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, in Section 9 there is reference to the effect that municipalities shall be held responsible for the repair of municipal works that go under or over or alongside departmental highways. Now this I suppose is quite acceptable and normal, but it seems to me there should be some reciprocal concern on the part of the department, in this respect, that in many villages where provincial roads or highways go through, there is inadequate street lighting. The street lighting is a cost to the municipality or the village or the town.

Now it rather made me reflect, Madam Speaker, when driving on some of our provincial highways and you cross some of the new bridges, they are lit up like Christmas trees -- like Coney Island. If members have ever driven on Highway 15 crossing the bridge there over the Symington Yards -- and I've noticed it on other bridges too -- lit up like Christmas trees the year round, then you drive along the provincial highways through certain villages and the highway happens to be the main street, if the town is wealthy enough to afford really impressive lighting there is good lighting, but where there is a small impoverished village with a low tax base, there is skimpy lighting, if any. It seems to me that the department should be more

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) prepared in the future to assume the cost of lighting along provincial trunk highways in the vicinity and inside villages and hamlets. -- (Interjection) -- Well municipalities with a big enough tax base wouldn't face that problem. The lighting bill would be the smallest consideration. I just don't see why a bridge should be lit up the way some of them are, and the villages be left unlit the way some of them are.

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, in Section 17 we have perhaps a classic example of the extent of ministerial discretionary power, because Section 17 says that the Minister may declare any road to be a provincial road; he may declare any provincial road abandoned and then it reverts back to the municipalities and apparently the municipalities don't have the slightest say in whether this road should come back, be put back on their shoulders. Well I don't think that this should be left to such a one-way street, Madam Speaker. If only for the sake of form, there should be some sort of consultation before a road is thrust back on the shoulders of a municipality, but according to this act it can be done. You might say ipse dixit, the Minister needs merely to declare it, say it, and that's that; and the municipalities can lump it.

In this connection too, Madam Speaker, I would say that whenever we come to consider in this House the rearrangement of drainages and roads under this new program that we shall have a lot to say, because the municipalities are in many cases being left with very little to say about what drainages should be taken over and which ones will be given back 100 percent and so on. I suppose that was a digression, Madam Speaker.

Then Section 13, I find Section 13 actually amusing in that it says, "The Minister may plant trees, shrubs or plants or plant or sod lawns." I realized that the Honourable Minister was a former undertaker and he may have laid greens alongside the plots, but I didn't realize that he had such a green thumb to be planting shrubs and so on all over the province. I suppose what they mean there is that he may order or have planted, etc. In any case, Madam Speaker, what is disturbing is that the Minister apparently may order the removal of certain shrubs and trees alongside provincial highways. It can be on private property. He may enter into an agreement with them, with the property owners, to have these shrubs removed, and then again he may not enter into an agreement but may order their removal. That's what I interpret from Section 16 for example.

Section 15 is nothing new in itself. It provides that buildings, etc., may not be built within a certain distance of provincial roads, etc., unless by permission of the department or the Minister. Now we have that at the present time, but I want to take this opportunity to ask the Minister if he doesn't consider his department obligated to live up to its own rules and regulations. What I am saying is this, Madam Speaker, that at the present time if you wish to build a house along certain provincial highways, you can't build that house except a certain number of feet back from the highway, and then the government or the department comes along and expropriates land affecting that same person who was forced to build a certain number of feet back. The department comes along and expropriates the land, builds a road, a service road or whatever you like, and the house is no longer the required distance from the highway. It seems to me that if the department were living up to its own regulations, it would then feel under obligation to move that house back if the owner so wished. I happen to know some owners who have so wished and the department has refused to move these houses back.

Now it seems to me that what's sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. The rules and regulations which are imposed on individuals should be lived up to by the enforcing agency as well. I would hope that the Minister would comment on this particular problem because I know it is a problem, especially the closer you get into the periphery of Winnipeg where there is more road work going on, highway building and so on. It certainly can aggravate people to see that they are forced to build a certain distance from the highway and then the government or the department can come along and build a road right in front of their nose, outside their living room window apparently, and then refuse on top of it all -- and then refuse to move the house back when it's requested by the owner as part of a settlement package.

Finally, and I will close with Section 21, Madam Speaker, and perhaps Section 21 is the most disturbing of all, because Section 21 provides that the Minister may at any time and for any reason declare certain roads and streets in a village, town, etc., to be eligible for departmental grants and for departmental construction agreements, and that the Minister may declare that that particular town or village street, the construction thereof shall be paid for in whole or in part by the department. It's completely discretionary.

Now I wonder if this is tied up somehow with the access roads program, and if it is, then it's all the more disturbing because it seems to me that there should be some sort of formula,

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) either mileage formula or traffic density formula, I don't know, but some sort of formula whereby the Minister would be able to declare a certain village or town street eligible for departmental grants either in whole or in part. This way he can extend departmental grants to pay for part or all of the cost of a certain street and he can do so by discretion alone. I don't like that at all. I don't think that members on either side here really like this provision.

So with these observations, Madam Speaker, I have had my say on Bill 68. I suppose it's part of progress but it's also disturbing, so much discretionary power being given out that it might just become a little too much of a temptation to some subsequent Minister — not necessarily the present one.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Emerson, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 65. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, may this matter stand in the Minister's absence.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne) presented Bill No. 92, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, several amendments of this bill provide for coverage of volunteer and commandeered fire-fighters. It also raises the maximum earning ceiling from \$5,000 to \$6,000. It authorizes payment of costs for the administration of The Employment Safety Act by the Compensation Board and it authorizes the Board to allocate such costs among the various classifications of employers. I might say, Madam Speaker, that it authorizes the Board to institute a system of merits and demerit ratings in connection with the compensation assessments.

There's another important provision here in that it provides for the identification of silicosis by other than by specific X-ray. The final amendment clarifies the coverage of a member's family of an employer.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I'd like to say a word or two in connection with this bill. I think there is a lot of merit in the bill. I'm particularly intrigued with the reference in the bill regarding silicosis and the establishment of the fact of the disease on an employee. I think this is good. The increase in the rates are coming along in the general trend of increase of the base on which compensation is paid.

I regret though that the bill does not include any provision for recurring attendances in hospital or absence from work in respect of an accident that happened a few years ago. A number of employees I'm sure, as the Honourable the Minister is aware of, have had considerable increases in wages in the last two or three years. The fact is, Madam Speaker, however, when they have to have treatment as a result of a recurring injury their compensation is not based on what their income is at the present time and they're penalized doubly. They are first of all penalized because of the fact that they only receive 75 percent of their compensation based on the maximum; and secondly, they're also penalized of course in the fact that the injury that they sustained at the time is a physical handicap to them and they have to go through suffering and pain once again. So I note this omission in the bill and I respectfully suggest to the Minister and to the government that they give greater consideration to this fact, possibly in the committee stage when dealing with this bill that this point might be considered.

I'm also rather intrigued, Madam Speaker, and I know you've enjoined us not to deal with specific sections but rather the principle of a bill, and I'll try to do this. One of the principles of the bill is an endeavour to establish average earnings for a person who may be commandeered to fight a fire under The Fire Preventions Act or The Municipal Act, and I note in the bill the base is \$25.00 and also, however, the average earnings of the individual who may be commandeered. Now it might be a person who hasn't had any average earnings for a considerable number of years, so I would suggest that \$25.00 as the base for the income of a person who hasn't been able to establish average earnings over a period of years is rather small. Unemployment insurance for instance, Madam Speaker, I believe at the present time is \$36.00 a week, and if a person is out of work and has been on unemployment insurance for some time I wonder if the Minister means that he would get the \$25.00 a week. While he was getting unemployment insurance he was getting \$36.00, but if he gets injured as a result of an accident while

MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . fighting a fire, the individual concerned will most likely not be able to get his unemployment insurance with the \$25.00 as well.

The Minister also mentioned, Madam Speaker, about the merit and demerit rating insofar as safety is concerned. This to me, Madam Speaker, is quite a deviation from the principle that was established and still is established in Section 60 of The Workmen's Compensation Act, "Whereby industry by industry recognition was given to the various hazards or likelihood of hazards in different industries" -- and it was established in the Revised Statutes of Manitoba and maybe this is a carry-over from years previously -- "the Board could have these classifications and sub-classifications in conjunction with the industry that may be more hazardous than the other."

Now then, Madam Speaker, the principle has been changed because you now come down to an individual basis of an individual employer, and I agree that there are employers who may not be quite as cognizant of safety hazards as others, but I think, Madam Speaker, we are getting too much power when we come down to an individual employer basis, because having had some experiences in industry and in particularly in regard to some industries that are more hazardous than others, as far as safety and recurrence of accidents are concerned, you can have a vast difference in the number of accidents that occur year by year or month by month. It sometimes happens that an employer might just have a series of accidents. Now what is the Board going to base their judgment on? The amendment as suggested by the Minister of Labour clearly says that the Board can institute -- it isn't exactly this way -- a system of merit or demerit.

Now then, there's no provision in here at all that I can see either in the original act or in the amendments as being proposed by the Minister for anybody to be able to appeal to the Board after the judgment that they make respecting merits or demerits, and we here in this House, Madam Speaker -- as a matter of fact just a moment ago the Member for Brokenhead on speaking in another debate mentioned about the power that's being vested in the Minister -- well the Minister, Madam Speaker, is responsible inside of this Legislature for his actions and we can go after him because of omissions in our opinion or in fact, but with this type of provision, Madam Speaker, I suggest that when you come down to the individual employer basis as to assessment either up or down, that the Minister should consider some method whereby an appeal can be made by the employer concerned as a result of the Board's action. I certainly think the idea behind this, the basic principle behind this merit or demerit is worthwhile, but I can see, Madam Speaker, where some difficulties could be encountered, and I suggest to the Minister that he give this particular point consideration when the committee on Industrial Relations is considering this bill.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, the guiding principle as outlined in this act is that workman incapacitated should receive 75 percent of his annual earnings as compensation while injured. It can be assumed that an employer paying a workman over the present ceiling of \$5,000 per year is doing so because the workman is worth more, and we need not go far afield to see workmen who fall into this category. There are many hundreds of miners up north who have high earnings but they also have high costs of living. There are electronics people, television people, telephone linemen and the like, all high income workers who certainly will welcome this legislation that raises the ceiling to \$6,000.00. I make mention of this fact because last year at about this time the Honourable Member for Assiniboia proposed an amendment in the Law Amendments Committee to this very effect and, if members here will recall, the government voted this amendment down. We're very happy to see it this year.

The other item I would like to mention is that I believe there should be a further clause in this bill to take into account the Canadian Pension Plan, and I'm thinking now of workers who were totally disabled and who will be pensioned for the rest of their days. I believe that there should be some way that this person's contribution to the Canadian Pension Plan can be made, so that when the age of 65 is reached this person who has been totally disabled may join into the Canadian Pension Plan. I think some consideration should be given to implementing a scheme whereby persons who are placed on workman's compensation for long periods of time should have their contribution to the Canadian Pension Plan kept up.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 94, An Act to amend The Change of Name Act for second reading.

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

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 96, An Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, the present act provides that the Hydro can borrow up to \$10 million in the way of short-term funds. They find that a change in the money markets makes it more profitable for the Hydro to invest funds in short-term money. It is a new type of borrowing that was practically unknown here a few years ago. You will recall that this had previously been \$2 million and it had been increased in 1963 to \$10 million. They have now requested that this be increased to the amount of \$20 million and that's the purpose of this amendment.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I'd just like to ask the Minister is it really then an investment situation rather than a case of having this area to operate in for funds for the Hydro use?

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, will this involve at any time also capital borrowing? Do you plan to use it as a means of borrowing for capital purposes as well?

MR. STEINKOPF: The money can be used for borrowing of any type, whether it is capital or for ordinary day to day operations. It's a type of roll-over procedure. They'll borrow the money for 60 or 90 days, and then if it's expedient or the money markets are still favourable, then they would renew the notes for a further period of time; or if it is to their advantage to go into the money market and to borrow on a long-term basis, they then could convert their borrowings from short-term to long-term.

In answer to the Honourable Member from Lakeside, it is really a method of obtaining money on a more favourable basis, and that is the reason. Based on money rates in 1964, and on a much smaller amount than \$10 million, the Hydro saved in excess of \$100,000 in interest during the last year.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN, in the absence of the Attorney-General, presented Bill No. 98, An Act to amend The Charities Endorsement Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I don't usually trespass on the territory of the legal fraternity, but the import of this bill is so clearly stated in the bill itself that it really requires no great explanation on my part. This merely makes it perfectly clear that any powers granted to a corporation by its act of incorporation or letters patent is not deemed to be an authority to do something under The Charities Endorsement Act. In order to get the authority to do something, one has to comply with The Charities Endorsement Act, in spite of the fact that certain powers may be granted in the original act of corporation. This matter has been brought to our attention by the Charities Endorsement people and we've decided that we should follow their recommendation as set out herein.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 101, An Act respecting the Control of Predators, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, there are one or two changes in principle involved in this legislation which are evident from the reading of the bill. The first one under the consolidated Predator Control Act which is before the House for approval is that the former control of this matter that was shared between the Department of Mines and Resources and the Department of Agriculture is now being ended; and the Department of Mines and Resources will assume the responsibility for The Predator Control Act. The other principles involved: the definition of "predator" is the same as in the old Act except that a timber wolf or timber wolf pup has been included in the list of predators.

On the question of bounty, this is perhaps the main change in principle, reflecting the thinking that has occurred or is occurring in all of the wildlife branches across the country and in the United States and reflecting in large part the thinking of the municipalities in Manitoba today. The province under this act will not be participating in bounty payments in the future. However, authority is given for municipalities to pay bounty on predators and nuisance animals under the new legislation. The payment of bounty is not compulsory. The municipality that wishes to pay the bounty may set the amount of the bounty to be paid, the dates and the areas

(MR. LYON cont'd.) where it will be paid, and whether it will be paid to residents only of the municipality or residents of the province. As I have mentioned, there is no provision to reimburse a municipality by the province -- the municipality who wishes to pay bounty.

The main part of the predator control program that is dealt with by the act is that provision is made for the Minister of Mines and Resources to carry out programs for the purpose of controlling predators in all parts of the province. This will revolve largely around the paid poison bait and other deterrent programs that have been found to be the most effective programs in the control of predators in recent years.

The Minister is permitted under the act to enter into an agreement with any person with respect to hunting and killing predators. The Minister may also on behalf of the government enter into an agreement with the municipality with respect to any control program within the municipality. The agreement will provide the extent of financial assistance to be given by the government to a municipality which will not exceed 50 percent of the estimated cost. But I stress again that this kind of control program that is envisaged is a poison bait or program other than the bounty kind, which will be run solely by the municipality.

There are further supporting provisions in the act which relate to these main basic principles that I have just attempted to outline. I should mention for the benefit of honourable members that the type of program envisaged in this new act is one that has been in operation now in the Province of Saskatchewan for a number of years, the province which has a predator problem in some areas quite similar to the Province of Manitoba. Our wildlife people are advised that it works quite satisfactorily in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I should also mention that discussions were held with the executive of the Union of Municipalities with respect to the general principles outlined in The Predator Control Act that is before you, and that that executive passed -- I shouldn't say, I won't say it's unanimous -- but passed a resolution favouring this type of approach to predator control and expressed to our people concern that so many municipalities were on their own opting out of bounty payments at the present time in any case.

It is interesting to know that over the past 19 years under the shared provincial and municipal bounty payment programs, the two levels of government have paid out over \$1.7 million in bounty payments, and still the predator problem remains with us. It is the feeling of those charged with responsibility for organizing predator control that a much more effective program can be run on the poison bait and controlled shooting basis, and this is one of those few areas of government where I'm able to say that the experts feel it could be run more economically on that basis than on the bounty basis which has obtained heretofore.

So those are the main principles, Madam Speaker, that are outlined in this new legislation, and I commend it to the House.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert-Plains): Madam Speaker, I am rather disappointed in that the government sees fit to discontinue the participation in the payment of bounties with the municipalities. The reason we had an act of this nature is two-fold. One of the reasons for it is to protect domestic animals and especially fowl, but there is a deeper and a more important reason and that is protection of our wildlife, such as our upland birds, our waterfowl, our deer, and all the other big game. I think it's highly unreasonable to expect the municipalities to protect our wildlife when they derive no benefit from wildlife. The government has laws regarding hunting, and they sell licences to hunt. They have a source of revenue.

I believe it is very much needed that the government take another look at this idea of stepping out of the participation in the payment of bounties. If we want a proper control of predators in order to protect our wildlife, it is not enough to have a control program in some given areas at one time or another, because your predators are not going to stay in that given area. They'll be all over the province and must be controlled throughout the province.

I notice that the only place where bounties can be paid by municipalities is in the predator control area. In other words, the municipality has nothing to say as to whether their municipality is a predator control area or not. This is designated by the Minister. If he reads -- I see him kind of query me with a kind of a look as if he doesn't quite agree with me -- well if he looks at (2) (f), it states, "predator control area means an area within the municipality designated as such by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council." And if he goes on to Section 13 (c), "for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act according to their intent, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make such regulations" -- and then it says -- "as designating an area as a predator control area." Having repealed all the existing acts, I would say that at the moment we have no predator control area, and no municipality at the moment can

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd.) . . . bring in a bounty system until such time as predator control areas are designated by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council which may be now, a year from now or ten years from now.

I don't think that the term "Predator" -- I think the term "Predator" should have included the skunk. We've had that discussed on many occasions on the floor of this House and I don't see why it is omitted from there, because if there is a predator insofar as upland birds are concerned, the skunk is the worst of the whole lot of them, and why isn't he included in this definition?

I don't think that there is anything more than those two matters that I am concerned with, and I am concerned with the fact the government is stepping out of the participation in bounties because I think it is wrong in principle and I believe that it is going to do considerable hardship insofar as our wildlife is concerned.

There is one other thing. Under Section 8 where the Minister can set up a program, that's quite all right. I'm in agreement with that. But then there is a sub-section in that section which says that he can enter into an agreement with the municipality, and if he does, then he doesn't pay any more than 50 percent of the bounty. Well I think that is wrong. I think if the government want to set up a control area, they go ahead and set it up, and there is no need of mentioning the municipality here at all. The municipalities have their rights set out in other parts of the statute.

At the moment, Madam Speaker, that is all I can see that I can oppose in the bill, but there is -- oh yes, there is one other thing. In Section 33, clause (d), "a municipality when paying bounties can refuse to pay bounties to a person who is not a resident of the municipality." I think this is wrong in principle, because the bounties are not paid for as a remuneration. The idea is to control the predators in that municipality, so what difference does it make whether the person who kills a predator lives in or outside the municipality. He's being paid because he has destroyed a predator, not because he's getting remuneration for spending 15 minutes or an hour or half a day finding the predator and shooting it.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I am disappointed in this new legislation here. We on this side, there are several of us, have been advocating that the government assume complete control, financial and otherwise, of predator control -- controlling the predators -- and I think this is a retrogressive step.

Instead of doing what we have been advising here, the government simply throws up or sheds its former responsibility. I don't know what some of the experts had to say to the Honourable Minister, what advice they have given him, but I do not agree with what the Minister has just told us that it wasn't very effective. I can speak of the area that I represent and I think, and I know that wherever this former policy was properly adhered to and properly applied, that the results were very encouraging.

We have been asking the government to adopt a uniform policy throughout the Province of Manitoba whereby the government would pay or assume complete financial responsibility for the predator control. The trouble in the past was -- and that's where I presume the control wasn't effective -- was because the government did not pay in full for the destruction of these predators. Some municipalities felt that it was too much of a burden for them therefore they did not pay any bounty, and if the municipality didn't pay, then the government didn't pay either. Therefore, you would have a situation where say out of two or three municipalities, adjacent municipalities, one might be paying bounty on the predators; the other would not. Then the people from adjoining municipalities would bring in these animals, because quite a number of them have been doing that, and the burden of the municipality which did pay bounty was so much higher the municipality became discouraged and they dropped it too.

We had in our own municipality, the Municipality of Franklin, we had a predator control system there whereby our municipality paid bounty, the municipality to the west did, and then about four years back the former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources included the area east of Franklin Municipality and I think it worked very well. The people who were engaged in the production of poultry there realized that the system did work, because after adhering to this policy for two or three years the losses to the predators were practically negligible.

Last year, the Municipality of Franklin discontinued the predator control, so the people in that area organized on their own. They hired some people from the nearby Indian Reserve who went and cleaned out these predators. They paid in full for -- a small association of the growers paid in full, paid the bounty in full. It helped. One year when we didn't do it -- that's the year before -- we could see the difference, and I'm really disappointed in what the government

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) . . . is attempting to do at the present time. I do not think that this kind of predator control is going to be satisfactory. I think it's a retrogressive step.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, many of the points that I intended to raise were brought out by my colleagues from Ethelbert-Plains and Emerson. One of the items I'd like to emphasize again is that of the definition of "predator". I really believe it should include skunk because it's one of the main reasons why we are losing all of our upland game. Thousands and thousands of duck eggs and prairie chicken eggs are being destroyed every year by the skunk, and their population is growing because their fur is of no value any more and nobody is bothering to trap them. It's not uncommon to drive down the highway and see hundreds of them -- their bodies -- that have been killed by cars and it gives you an indication of just how bad the situation really is. I think the Minister should really reconsider the definition and include the skunk, because it certainly is the worst predator we have as far as our game is concerned.

As far as the bounty is concerned, I think you will find that none of the municipalities will even consider entering into a bounty system if they have to go it alone, because they will be faced with a problem of paying bounty on animals which may be shot outside their municipality, and they won't feel it is their responsibility to pay bounty on animals shot outside the municipality. As far as I can see, no municipality will be implementing a bounty program under this present bill, so I suggest that the Minister give every consideration to the suggestions that have been made.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, the way I interpret the bill is thus, that a municipality can -- any municipality in the Province of Manitoba can, if it sees fit, declare a nuisance animal, and I understand in effect it then would become a predator insofar as that particular area was concerned.

Then I understood the Minister to say in his introductory remarks that the department has found the expert hunter -- I believe that was the term he used -- to be much more effective in the control of predators than the bounty system -- (Interjection) -- Poisoned bait -- poisoned bait. Well any type of program that is implemented there is, I believe that the department does have expert hunters. I don't know whether my honourable friend the Minister considers that he is in that category or not, but I believe that the department does have people, and I don't know whether they are employed on a permanent basis, but people that are readily available and that are hired to control nuisance animals or predators.

Now my question is, if the Honourable Member for St. George feels that the interlake country is over-run with skunks, could he or his constituents plead -- plead with the government to send out some expert hunters to bring them under control? Not at election time but any time during the year. I remember quite well, Madam Speaker, when I obtained all of my spending money from trapping and snaring and shooting gophers back in the days, and I think perhaps I and 10,000 other kids have reduced the gophers to the point that they are no longer considered a predator or a nuisance animal.

But if I'm correct in my assumption that if any municipality feels that they have a problem, just phone my honourable friend the Minister and he will send out an expert hunter and the problem will be solved in no time. That is what I understood him to say. I hope that I'm correct in my assumption in this regard.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I'd like to add a few words. I think there is merit in what the Honourable Member for St. George said, that certainly we shouldn't leave it up to the tourists that come to Manitoba to kill all our skunks on the highways, and this is what it seems to be like at the present time.

I notice that from Section 14 of the bill that they are repealing the former Predator Control Act with several amendments made in '55, '57 and '62. Now in replacing it with the present bill, are we just eliminating the bounty section part as far as the government contribution toward any costs or so on? Is that the only change that we have from the old bill to the new one?

I had another thing that I was -- oh yes, in connection with bounties, there was mention made by the Member for Gladstone that this had been part of his income in his earlier life. Well I think we have on some of our Indian reserves the people who go out to other municipalities and they are collecting money in this way and making a living out of it. I think this could affect our Indian population and therefore we might have to give them more money in relief as a result.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert-Plains, that the debate be adjourned.

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, will you call the debate on the Committee of Ways and Means.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the proposed sub-amendment by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate for the Member for Emerson, but I understand he's not prepared to go on today.

MR. TANCHAK: May I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand please?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, if you would call the proposed motion of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary next.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I adjourned this debate, Madam Speaker, for the Honourable Member for Gladstone, and I understand he's not prepared to go on today.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, this is unusual that I'm not prepared to speak, but I'm waiting on some information and I would ask to have this stand.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of Health. Resolution No. 54, Page 13.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, before starting into the -- thank you very much. Before starting into the Estimates and the statement that I wish to make on these estimates for the Department of Health where we're going to be spending \$24.4 million this year, in answer to a question from the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, I advised that I would announce who was going to be the new chairman of the Manitoba Hospital Commission, and I think possibly I should begin the estimates today with this announcement so that when we come to the section dealing with the Hospital Commission the members will be apprised of who the new man is. Gordon W. Holland, the 35 year old Executive Director of the Hospital Commission has been appointed the Chairman of the Manitoba Hospital Commission.

Mr. Holland is an Honours Graduate in Commerce and he has been with the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan since it was established in July of 1958. He started as the Director of the Claims and Statistical Division; he was then seconded for two years to the Manitoba Hospital Survey Board, the Willard Commission as Secretary, and with that Board he toured all through the Province of Manitoba and met with many of the Boards and saw all of the hospitals in the province. On completion of the work with the Willard Commission, Mr. Holland was appointed Assistant Commissioner of Hospitalization, and when the Manitoba Hospital Commission was established in July of 1962, he was appointed its Executive Director. In this capacity his responsibility extended to the examination and review of all hospital construction and operating budgets in the province. In 1962 he was awarded a Certificate in Hospital Organization and Management by the Canadian Hospitals Association.

He was born in New Brunswick in July of 1929 and he came to Winnipeg in 1945. He took up high school at Daniel McIntyre Collegiate and he graduated in 1951 with a Bachelor of Commerce Degree with honours. He joined the Great West Life in the administration of group pension plans. In 1954 he went to Blue Cross as Manager of the Underwriting Department and he joined the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission in mid-1958. So the new chairman will be Gordon Holland.

I think during the past year, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Health has made progress in the various fields that it has under its responsibility, the fields of prevention; the field of education; and in the fields of rehabilitation. Last year at the request of the members a more detailed report was given to them, provided a month or so ago, of the summary of activities for the calendar year of 1964. It is devoid of the picture of the Minister, but I trust that it has all of the other information that was sought by the members at that time. Some of it has come back across the House to me already in previous debates.

(MR. WITNEY cont'd.)

I'd like to start off by just dealing briefly with the section of Health Education. I'm rather pleased to note that we were able to get the "Elmer" program under greater activity than we had in 1963 to the point now where we have some 70 elementary schools in Winnipeg, some 15 in St. James, 15 in East Kildonan, 15 in St. Boniface, and I blush to say this but we have 10 also in Flin Flon, and during the coming year we will be expanding this activity throughout the whole of the province through the Health Services Division with the co-operation of service clubs and with the RCM Police. THE RCM Police helped us tremendously and we generally have a service club in the community to assist in the operation. With this we will train children in traffic safety and trust that fewer of them will end up in our hospitals with broken arms and broken legs and perhaps more serious injuries.

We were rather pleased during 1964 we were able to produce a First Aid flip chart, and I will see to it that there will be one of these placed on the desks of every one of the members of the House. We have some 5,000 of them now available through the Health Units throughout the province. The health units and the health educators under the Health Education section have had one or two interesting activities and perhaps the House would like to know of them. They weren't mentioned in the book. In Neepawa we had a series entitled "The Education for Responsible Parenthood," with 25 community leaders from home, school, church and news groups attending, and out of the Health Unit at Neepawa there was material on family life education that was distributed to some 370 teachers in the area. This section has also been active in distributing the smoking hazard kits through the Health Units and through the schools. Within the Selkirk area -- there was a special pilot program at Selkirk which had some 2,700 students and over 100 teachers involved, and the results of that are still being compiled.

In the section under Vital Statistics we are calling for one new person because of the fact that the number of events in vital statistics have increased over the period of years, and the staff requirements there are directly geared to the activity within the province.

In Rehabilitation during the past year we were able to increase the numbers of people for whom we had a co-ordinated rehabilitation program. In 1963 we were able to service some 3,000 adults and children, and during the year 1964 we were able to increase that figure to 3,500. We work in conjunction with the agencies such as the Society for Crippled Children, the Workmen's Compensation Board, the Association for Retarded Children in Manitoba, the Sanatorium Board of Manitoba, the Alcoholism Foundation, the Salvation Army, The Canadian Institute for the Blind, and the Sheltered Workshop Activities and Skills Unlimited in Selkirk and in Winnipeg.

We have also had under the section of Rehabilitation the co-ordinating committee for the various agencies dealing with the problems of alcohol in the province. During the year there have been several meetings held and I can report that there has been progress. I met with the first establishment meeting and have met since that time with this committee. While there have been problems arising out of the meetings, we have been able to overcome them to a considerable extent and I think can generally report progress.

In this matter of alcohol problem, in the section dealing with rehabilitation we are providing in the estimates for a new facility in rehabilitation. The members are familiar with the Nassau House operation which is for men only and operating under the Alcoholism Foundation, and during this past year has been working to capacity. In the estimates before you right now there is provision for a similar type of facility for women. We are also providing for an expansion of the Salvation Army Harbour Light facility which in itself has increased its activities during 1964 and we feel that the expansion is quite necessary. We are providing mainly money in 1965 for expansion of our rehabilitation facilities in the problems of alcohol, but the progress with respect to education has continued throughout the year and will continue through 1965. The Alcohol Education Society has been augmented by the counsellors operating out of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba who have also been going into the schools particularly to speak to young people about the hazards associated with alcohol.

During the year of 1964 we had another Skills Unlimited operation established in Winnipeg. It was set up initially with a government grant and then has been proceeding on its own on a self-sustaining basis as has been the one at Selkirk. The Skills Unlimited in Selkirk and Winnipeg have done good work in the rehabilitation of people from the Mental Hospital at Selkirk and also from the Psychiatric Institute. During 1964 there were some 13 people who were fully rehabilitated into the community by Skills Unlimited in Selkirk, and while the number may seem small, these are people who would probably still be in a bed at Selkirk if it hadn't been

(MR. WITNEY cont'd.) for the new drug therapies and the operations such as Skills Unlimited.

In Winnipeg the new one there will be able to provide for the work assessment and work training of some 100 people, and it is working to capacity at the present time since it was opened in July of 1964. We are now endeavouring to establish another Skills Unlimited operation in Brandon to work in conjunction with the Brandon Mental Hospital. Negotiations and discussions are under way at the present time with the hope that we can establish another one this year.

In 1964 we broadened the activities of the Broadway Home for Mental Retardates. Previously we had been taking the people from Portage la Prairie into the Broadway Home and then into employment, either into sheltered employment in the community, but last year, 1964, we expanded that to include people from the general area outside of the Portage la Prairie Training School and we have now about some 100 people who are actively being taken care of by Broadway Home. Some of them have now gone out into full employment and some of them are in partial employment. The progress that we have been able to make in 1964 has been considered to be encouraging too.

In order to continue with the rehabilitation program, we are providing in the estimates under the Rehabilitation section for new staff, some four new rehabilitation counsellors, and we are also providing for an additional employment placement officer to be working with the Society for Crippled Children.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is now 5:30 and I will leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.