

Name	Electoral Division	Address
ALEXANDER, Keith	Roblin	Roblin, Man.
BAIZLEY, Obie	Osborne	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
BJORNSON, Oscar F.	Lac du Bonnet	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
CAMPBELL, D. L.	Lakeside	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARROLL, Hon. J.B.	The Pas	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
CHRISTIANSON, John Aaron	Portage la Prairie	86-9th St., N.W., Ptge. la Prairie, Man.
CORBETT, A. H.	Swan River	Swan River, Man.
COWAN, James, Q.C.	Winnipeg Centre	512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
DESJARDINS, Laurent	St. Boniface	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
DOW, E. I.	Turtle Mountain	Boissevain, Man.
EVANS, Hon. Gurney	Fort Rouge	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORBES, Mrs. Thelma	Cypress	Rathwell, Man.
FROESE, J. M.	Rhineland	Winkler, Man.
GRAY, Morris A.	Inkster	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
GROVES, Fred	St. Vital	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
GUTTORMSON, Elman	St. George	Lundar, Man.
HAMILTON, William Homer	Dufferin	Sperling, Man.
HARRIS, Lemuel	Logan	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
HARRISON, Hon. Abram W.	Rock Lake	Holmfild, Man.
HAWRYLUK, J. M.	Burrows	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
HILLHOUSE, T.P., Q.C.	Selkirk	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
HRZHORCZUK, M.N., Q.C.	Ethelbert Plains	Ethelbert, Man.
HUTTON, Hon. George	Rockwood-Iberville	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
INGEBRIGTSON, J. E.	Churchill	Churchill, Man.
JEANNOTTE, J. E.	Rupertsland	Meadow Portage, Man.
JOHNSON, Hon. George	Gimli	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg
JOHNSON, Geo. Wm.	Assiniboia	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
KLYM, Fred T.	Springfield	Beausejour, Man.
LISSAMAN, R. O.	Brandon	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
LYON, Hon. Sterling R., Q.C.	Fort Garry	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MARTIN, W. G.	St. Matthews	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
McKELLAR, M. E.	Souris-Lansdowne	Nesbitt, Man.
McLEAN, Hon. Stewart E., Q.C.	Dauphin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MOLGAT, Gildas	Ste. Rose	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
MORRISON, Mrs. Carolyne	Pembina	Manitou, Man.
ORLIKOW, David	St. John's	179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9
PAULLEY, Russell	Radisson	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
PETERS, S.	Elmwood	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15
PREFONTAINE, Edmond	Carillon	St. Pierre, Man.
REID, A. J.	Kildonan	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15
ROBERTS, Stan	La Verendrye	Niverville, Man.
ROBLIN, Hon. Duff	Wolseley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SCARTH, W.B., Q.C.	River Heights	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
SCHREYER, E. R.	Brokenhead	Beausejour, Man.
SEABORN, Richard	Wellington	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
SHEWMAN, Harry P.	Morris	Morris, Man.
SHOEMAKER, Nelson	Gladstone	Neepawa, Man.
SPELLIE, Robert Gordon	Birtle-Russell	Russell, Man.
STANES, D. M.	St. James	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
STRICKLAND, B. P.	Hamiota	Hamiota, Man.
TANCHAK, John P.	Emerson	Ridgeville, Man.
THOMPSON, Hon. John, Q.C.	Viriden	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WAGNER, Peter	Fisher	Fisher Branch, Man.
WATT, J. D.	Arthur	Reston, Man.
WEIR, Walter	Minnedosa	Minnedosa, Man.
WITNEY, Hon. Charles H.	Flin Flon	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WRIGHT, Arthur E.	Seven Oaks	4 Lord Glenn Apts. 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 3rd, 1961.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notice of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

HON. G. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville) introduced Bill No. 89 - An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act.

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q. C. (River Heights) introduced Bill No. 94, An Act for the Relief of the Estate of Charlie Young, Deceased.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. JOHN THOMPSON (Minister of Public Works) (Virден): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the resolution standing in my name on the Order Paper.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Highway Traffic Act by providing, among other matters, for the expropriation by the government of means of access to or from certain highways and for the restriction of certain rights of access to or from certain highways and for the payment of compensation therefor in certain cases from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, this Bill gives the Highway Authority, that is, the government or any municipality, the right to apply for limited access on certain highways within their respective jurisdiction. It provides that the application shall be made to the Highway Traffic Co-ordinating Board and that there is an appeal from that Board to the Public Utility Board, and that the final decision must be approved by the Governor-in-Council. It proposes that the controlled area on any highway which is designated as a limited access highway shall be a maximum of 250 feet from the outside edge of the right-of-way, except at intersections of a provincial trunk highway or a limited access highway with another limited access highway or any provincial trunk highway or a 100 percent road or a secondary road. At these intersections the controlled area is a radius of 1,500 feet from the centre of the intersection. It also provides in addition to limited access roads provision for the designation of freeways. Freeways will have the same dimensions which I referred to in respect to limited access roads but the method of designating is a little different. The Traffic Authority shall declare the freeway; the application is not made to the Highway Traffic Co-ordinating Board. In each case where there is a loss by an individual of right of access to the road, either in a limited access road or a freeway, compensation is divided in the normal manner under The Expropriation Act.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, there is only one question I would like to ask the Minister. I haven't got a copy of The Public Works Act before me, but it seems to me there is a provision in The Public Works Act, is there not, giving the government limited control over the use that can be made of lands adjoining a provincial trunk highway. Now is it the intention of the government to amend The Public Works Act and have all the provisions relating to the use made of lands adjoining public highways -- transfer them to The Highway Traffic Act?

MR. THOMPSON: No, the provisions in The Highway Traffic Act still stand. That is, the measurement to which my honourable friend has referred is 125 feet from the edge at the present time, that is, the present control which the Highway Department already has over the

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.) area of the highway, but this sets a maximum; that would be the minimum. The minimum would be 125 feet which has been in force for some years; the maximum would be 250.

MR. HILLHOUSE: The question was, Mr. Chairman, does the government intend to take that provision out of The Public Works Act and rely entirely upon the new provisions that will be in The Highway Traffic Act?

MR. THOMPSON: That provision, as I understand it, remains in The Public Works Act, that that control is still there. This adds to it in limited access and freeway highways.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Those property owners that were adversely affected by restricted access in the past, will they be able to avail themselves of an opportunity now for compensation because of restricted access to property?

MR. THOMPSON: No. No, they would not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: resolution be adopted. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same, and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. THOMPSON introduced Bill No. 88 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2).

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Mr. First Minister, in view of the fact that in your flood statement of March 18th, 1959, you announced that your government was proposing an immediate start on different projects including, "E - Further studies to protect the rich agricultural area and the town in the upper Red River Valley south of Winnipeg". My question is, have these studies been made? If so, by whom and what are the recommendations?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to what the Honourable Minister of Agriculture said when he discussed the matter in the House not long ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to draw your attention to a group on your left, 15 cubs of the 23rd Kitchener Pack of Home Street United Church. They are accompanied by Mrs. J. A. Waddell, the Cub Master, and by Mrs. Jessie Carlson. In your behalf, Sir, I would like to express our welcome to them. They are the young cubs. Perhaps as they look down upon us they think we are the elders, we are the lions, and I must admit, Sir, perhaps you think at the present time, we are very quiet down here, but there might be occasions when you would think that Daniel was a courageous man. We trust that you will have a very enjoyable time with us and that you go back to your pack and talk about what you have seen, what you have heard, and it will not be long before you will be with us again.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Agriculture if he would be kind enough to refer me to the particular speech in which he mentioned the studies in the valley.

MR. HUTTON: I have quite a reputation for making speeches and even I have trouble keeping track of them all.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. PREFONTAINE: a statement with respect to the studies going on in the Upper Valley with respect to preventing these areas from flooding?

MR. HUTTON: I suppose that that could be covered, Mr. Speaker, in the control of flood waters in the Pembina to the extent that they contribute to flooding on the upper reaches of the Red River. This matter is under consideration by the International Joint Commission at this very time at Ottawa.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Did your government initiate any further studies as was promised two years ago by the First Minister?

MR. HUTTON: the whole problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 49. The Honourable Member for Rhineland. Order stand? Second reading of Bill No. 27. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to ask for this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Second reading of Bill No. 79. The Honourable the Minister of Health and Public Welfare.

HON. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Public Welfare) (Gimli) presented Bill No. 79, An Act respecting The Winnipeg General Hospital, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, at the time of speaking to this at the resolution stage, I gave really the principle of the bill, and as I said at that time, this makes it possible for the Winnipeg General Hospital to lease property to the Cancer Foundation for a 99-year period on a lease and to allow the new treatment facility to be proceeded with. The legislation here is necessary because the part of the property in question was held by the province as security on old outstanding debentures which are now being paid at an agreed rate and for which the province has really ample security in the buildings of the hospital, and this legislation merely reverts the title of this land back to the Board of the hospital.

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

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) presented Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Election Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, this bill, of course, refers largely to the recommendations made by the special committee of the House which convened during the last recess to consider amendments to The Election Act. I think all members of the House have copies of the report of the Election Committee, and the amendments that are before us now in Bill No. 83 are the result of those recommendations. I don't believe that there are any -- of course there's no one principle running through the whole bill. It deals with a number of matters appearing throughout the act. I believe this, that if there are any points upon which clarification might be desired by members of the House, that I would attempt to answer any questions now, or perhaps when we get into Committee further points can be discussed in more detail. Aside from that I think the only, perhaps two of the outstanding departures from the present means of conducting elections were mentioned at the resolution stage of this bill, namely, the provision in it for the taking of votes of persons who are unfortunately in hospital at election time, and secondly, the taking of votes from fishermen on the lakes in Manitoba who are away from their home polls. That is not to say that there are not other amendments of substance in the bill, but I mention those two in particular as being indicative of the type of work that was done by the committee.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, the Minister has mentioned -- most of these I believe do emanate from the special committee, and I'd just like to ask the Minister if there are any matters in here in addition to those. If there are any in addition to the ones that were recommended by the committee, would he be kind enough to point them out.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I happen to have the honour of being on the committee, the Election Act Committee, which sat during the recess, and I've perused the bill now before us. I want to say to the Minister that because of the fact that there are certain omissions in the bill of matters that we discussed, I reserve the right to, of course, draw them to the attention of the committee, and will do so. Also, Mr. Chairman, as is the practice of the House, there's no question of a minority report coming in from a special committee of the House such as this was. I want to state, Mr. Speaker, that one of the points that I will raise in the committee on consideration of this bill is the question dealing with the lowering of the voting age for voters in our Legislature in provincial elections. This question was considered by the committee; all of the various groups in the committee, I think, were agreed in principle that there should be a general lowering of the age from 21. There were no conclusions as to what that particular age should be. The Attorney-General did undertake to carry on at the Attorney-Generals' Conference, I believe it was, conversations with other jurisdictions. I'm sure that the members of the House would appreciate hearing from him in full on this matter either at the committee stage or in closing of this debate.

Another matter that was raised during the committee which was not contained in the

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) report of the committee, was the question of having the political affiliation of candidates marked on the ballots. It may be that the committee to which this bill is referred to will be requested to give further consideration to that matter. Another matter that was considered by the committee that met during the recess which is not contained in the bill at the present time, and which may be drawn to the attention of the committee, is the question of the reduction and the amount of fee required of a candidate in an election. As the House is aware at the present time a deposit of \$200.00 is required of every candidate who seeks a seat in this Assembly, and we suggested that during the committee hearings that this should either be eliminated or should be reduced, in order to give more opportunities to those who may not have the required financial assistance in a campaign. The rest of the Act -- I note, Mr. Speaker, that there are references in the Act itself to questions of liquor and I ask the Honourable the Attorney-General in respect of those sections, whether or not these may be in conflict with the provisions of the amendments to The Liquor Control Act which are before the House at the present time.

MR. PREFONTAINE: a question with respect to the definition of the word "hospital". Is it clear that this would apply also to an Old Folks Home where there are ten or more beds?

MR. SPEAKER: We're on Bill No. 83, The Election Act. I hope

MR. PREFONTAINE: right, right to the section; one of the bills, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: With respect to the last question put by the Honourable Member for Carleton, I couldn't give him a categorical answer right off-hand as to whether or not an institution for the care of sick or infirm persons other than a mental institution would qualify, but I think we can discuss this in committee and see whether or not it would apply.

With respect to the points raised by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party, I'm aware of no conflict between the proposed amendments to The Liquor Control Act and any amendments which may be in here because, of course, the proposed amendments to The Liquor Control Act do not purport to affect provincial elections. They only refer to municipal elections. The amendments that were made in here in The Election Act I think can stand on their own feet in that regard. He raised the point, upon which he conducted rather a lonely vigil, with respect to the question of deposit and so on. These points can all be raised of course again in committee. I was attempting to deal with what was in the bill rather than what was not in the bill, but I'm sure that my honourable friend will avail himself of the opportunity to discuss these matters at length when we get to the committee stage, if that is his wish.

The point raised by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition concerning whether or not the bill contains any material not recommended by the committee, I've double-checked with the Clerk and we're both of the same opinion that all of these amendments to the best of our knowledge were amendments that arose out of firm recommendations made by the committee. Now I know of none that are not in that class; when we get into it, clause by clause, we can perhaps look at it more carefully but I certainly know of none that were not recommended by the committee itself.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: Errick F. Willis, Lieutenant-Governor. The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba estimates of sums required for services of the province for capital expenditures, and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the message of His Honour, together with the estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if the Committee of Supply motion is in order now, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the House now resolve itself into committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department XIII - 1. Administration.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, I have a few general remarks that I would like to make on the introduction of the estimates for the Department of Labour. During the year, the services of the department have been expanded to meet the growing needs of an increasing labour force and a growing industrialization of the province. Inspection services carried out by the department included 39,293 inspections which included inspections into employee safety; minimum wages; hours of work; conditions of work; field of public safety; fire prevention; electrical and theatre inspection; elevators, boilers and pressure vessels; gas and oil burners; and things of that kind. In the field of industrial accident prevention, we participated in the formation of the Manitoba Accident Prevention Association as well as the Canadian Industrial Safety Association.

The Department also promotes safety committees in plants; on the job inspection to identify hazards or potential hazards; investigates accidents; distributes pamphlets and literature and calendars and things of that kind. We promote first aid classes and try generally to instil a safety consciousness among both employees and employers. One of the accomplishments of the department, we feel, is the general acceptance of hard hats in construction and those industries where there's a danger from falling objects, and our records show that we have prevented several accidents which might have been fatal except for the use of this particular safety equipment. During the year we've participated in the celebration of three one million hour accident-free periods. We believe that the department has shared some of the credit possibly for the safety-conscious atmosphere in these particular plants. It's a credit to the plants, I think, and those who are working for safety in them. The three plants are CIL, the Brainard Division, Christie-Brown Company, and the Barrett Company Limited. Our inspections show that a vast majority of employers in the province are operating in accordance with the laws of the province, and the surveys with respect to minimum wages indicate that payment of wages is substantially above the minimum level in the province. This enables our inspection staff to concentrate on those areas where they do have problems.

Apprenticeship training is becoming increasingly popular in the province, and I'm advised that the only limitations to the program are the apprenticeship openings that are available through the various industries, the various employers that engage apprentices. In 1946 there were 214 apprentices in the province, in 1950 - 756, in 1955 - 1,003, and at the end of 1960 - 1,840 apprentices. Most of these attend our Manitoba Technical Institute as part of their program, and we understand that graduates in apprenticeship are in very keen demand by industry. The training of the unemployed workers under Schedule M, we understand, is utilized more in the Province of Manitoba than any other province in the Dominion of Canada. We think that this is a credit to the close association and co-operation between the National Employment Service, the Department of Education and the Department of Labour. It's often been said that some three-quarters of our unemployed are unskilled and lacking in basic educational qualifications. We know, too, that there is a shortage of fully trained and skilled tradesmen and technicians on a year round basis. One of the real problems, of course, is the drop-outs by students, preferring jobs to the difficulties of continuing in education and getting an improved education. We believe that greater emphasis must be placed on higher basic education and the provision of the kind of education that will best suit these people to prepare them for their life work, and prepare them for the kind of work in which they have the most chance for success. We must encourage the development of education and skills for the job opportunities of the future; to produce the long-term advantages for individuals rather than the short-term advantage of the present highly paid unskilled occupations that many of them get into.

Our apprenticeship program is designed for flexibility to be able to accommodate all of those in the province who earnestly seek apprenticeship training. At the same time, of course, we must maintain our high standards in this particular field. We believe that our program is second to none in the Dominion of Canada and we're co-operating with other provinces towards uniform adequate standards in the various trades. We have three trades now that have uniform qualifications; two more are being introduced this year.

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.)

The work of the Mechanical and Engineering Division is increasing annually as a result of expansion in the province. During 1960 there were 982 affidavits for new boilers and pressure vessels. Fifty-eight of these were for high pressure boilers, 135 for low pressure boilers and 789 for pressure vessels such as air tanks used in mines and garages, refrigeration tanks, propane tanks and things of that kind. There were 90 new refrigeration plants installed during 1960. There were 67 new elevators installed in the province. This shows the rate at which the province is expanding in these fields and the additional burden on the department for regular annual inspection. Permits were issued for 15,378 new gas burner installations, which is an increase of 3,378 from the previous year. There were 2,120 new oil burner installation permits issued during the year as well. In the field of gas safety, spot checks were made on gas installations; licenses of installers were checked; courses conducted for gas fitters; checks made on the kind of equipment that is being used to make sure it meets the standard requirements of the Department. Complaints were investigated with respect to gas installations. Explosions and fires which were thought to have been caused by gas or oil are inspected by the Mechanical and Engineering Department.

The Fire Commissioner's Office has been a centre of a vastly intensified program during this year. The Commissioner's Office has been assisted by an advisory committee; a municipal man, insurance man, and fire fighting specialist. They have been of great value to the Commissioner in considering the responsibilities of the department to the public. The Department is responsible for fire inspections, fire education and investigation. In the inspection division the Department works in close co-operation with the fire departments and with municipal officials. In so doing they attempt to create the desire on the part of municipal people to establish fire departments and to improve the existing fire departments in the various municipalities in the province. The investigation department is responsible for determining the causes of fire. All fires are investigated that occur in public buildings, where there is loss of life, or where there is evidence or suspicion of arson. In the fire prevention education roll, the division engages in the work of training fire fighters throughout the province in the best way to use and handle hose, pumps, ladders and various fire fighting equipment.

The Department also receives requests for training of staffs in hospitals and other institutions. The Department co-operates in the Manitoba Annual Fire Fighters Conference and school, and also works in conjunction with the Civil Defence authorities in the province in the training of their personnel in fire fighting. During the year there were over 28,000 pieces of literature distributed in various cities, towns and villages; fire drills were conducted in various schools and education films were shown throughout the province.

During the year the Workmen's Compensation Board had 27,426 accidents reported to it compared to 26,371 in 1959. This is an increase of approximately four percent, only four percent in spite of the much wider coverage that resulted with the changes in Workmen's Compensation legislation which became effective from January 1st of 1960. There were 35 fatal accidents during the year compared, at least there were 25 fatal accidents during the year compared to -- I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, there were 27 fatal accidents in 1960 compared to 35 in the year previous. The Board together with the Crippled Children's Society and the Sanatorium Board of Manitoba sponsored a symposium on medical rehabilitation. Orthopedic surgeons were brought in from all over the North American continent to discuss and give lectures and demonstrations on various aspects of this subject, and we feel it will be helpful in the rehabilitating of injured workmen. The new Medical Board of Reference proved to be successful during the year. Under this system an injured workman who is dissatisfied with the decision of the medical officers of the board or their specialists, if he can produce contrary medical opinion, then he has the right to a medical board on which he appoints a member; the employer has the right to appoint a member; the Workmen's Compensation Board appoints a specialist in the field in which there has been a conflict of evidence; and the chairman and vice-chairman of the board are appointed by the Manitoba Medical Association. They examine the injured workman, review his case history, report their findings to the board who then consider the case in the light of the medical evidence that they have before them. During 1960 there were 32 cases reported to the Medical Board of Reference.

Now the other day, Mr. Chairman, in announcing the change in the extending of the

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) Winter Works Program I gave some figures with respect to winter works in the province. I would like to read into the record at this time a recap of that. There have been one or two more applications since that date. I'd also like to report on our provincial program. Total number of federal projects forwarded to Ottawa for approval are 274 as compared to 83 in the previous year. The total cost of the federal projects amounts to \$7,239,701.87 as compared to \$3,589,000 the year previously. The number of provincial projects this year, 14 compared to 10 of last year. Provincial projects amount to \$94,325 as compared to \$108,640 for the year before. Total direct payroll cost in the federal program \$2,119,555. This compares to \$1,207,000 the previous year. Provincial projects \$49,600 compared to \$55,750 for last year. The men hired on the federal projects, the men involved, 3,283 compared to 1,409 for last year. Provincial projects 103 this year compared to 101 last year. Total man days this year in the federal projects 163,016 compared to 95,824 for last year. The provincial projects 3,204 compared to 4,282 for last year. I'd just like to say that we've had excellent co-operation this year from the Greater Winnipeg Employment Committee who are promoting the "Do It Now" program, and the Department assists them in the advertising campaign which they conduct to make people in general conscious of the availability of men and materials for employment during the normal off-construction season. We also have an inter-departmental committee of the government to consider our role in matters of winter employment. We also have a provincial-municipal committee on winter employment which has been sitting all summer and throughout the year. All of these people have done a very wonderful job in helping to promote and make this winter work program as successful as it has been during this year.

In the Department of Labour, the Labour Relations Division is the one which probably provides the greatest interest to the public and to the press. Manitoba has traditionally had a very enviable record with respect to the infrequency of work stoppages. It's recognized, however, that from time to time there will be vigorous clashes between those who pay and those who earn wages. If compromises cannot be worked out by collective bargaining assisted by our experienced conciliation officers and by conciliation boards then the only alternative appears to be a work stoppage. In Manitoba, in past, we have been able to find acceptable compromises in almost all of our labour disputes. In 1960 we have had some notable exceptions. Two of these were the Brandon Packers strike and the strike involving the various Dominion Bridge companies -- the Dominion Bridge Plant itself, the Manitoba Bridge and the Manitoba Rolling Mills. The Judicial Enquiry Commission into the Brandon strike has been acknowledged as being helpful in bringing about a settlement to this dispute. The newspaper accounts of the hearings have been -- have informed us of some of the facts involved in the strike, as well as contributing to a better understanding of some of the events, at least, which led up to the strike.

The Dominion Bridge strike involved two major principles; one was nation-wide bargaining and the other was pensions. The Union dropped the proposal for national bargaining when the company acknowledged that pensions were negotiable and that employees were entitled to information with respect to the pension plan. In both of these cases the Department was available at all times for any assistance which the parties felt that they might require. We met frequently with both parties and gave all possible priority to activities which either believed might lead to a settlement. It is encouraging to note that we received excellent co-operation from both sides in spite of the very soundly held conflicting views on the issues that were before them. It is encouraging to note that the vast majority of the differences between labour and management are settled by negotiation, either directly or with the assistance of the Department of Labour.

I would like to pay tribute at this time to the contribution of the members and alternate members of the Manitoba Labour Board. This board must weigh the merits of an increasing number of difficult and involved cases which come before them. They have earned a reputation for excellent work which they have done over the past years. For 14 years the Chairman of the Manitoba Labour Board, Mr. W. E. Wilson, Deputy Minister, a few months ago tendered his resignation. We are pleased to acknowledge the valuable service which he has rendered in his capacity as Chairman of the Manitoba Labour Board. I am personally impressed with the private views which have been expressed to me by people on both sides with respect to his service as Chairman of the Board.

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.)

We are also pleased to announce that Dean G. P. R. Tallin, Q. C. has accepted the appointment as Chairman of the Manitoba Labour Board to assume the duties within the next two months. Dean Tallin has sat as Board Chairman on over 20 conciliation boards in the province. Most of these have been the joint recommendations of the parties involved. He's also been chosen as chairman of arbitration boards dealing with disputes under agreements. He has also sat as Chairman on a number of federal conciliation boards and federal arbitration boards as well. He has lectured on labour relations in the Manitoba Law School in addition to being Dean of the Law School. He is a Rhodes Scholar and has a degree from Oxford University.

Mr. Chairman, the members will recall that in the Throne Speech it anticipated the report of Mr. Justice G. E. Tritschler of the Brandon Packers Strike Commission, that it would be received and tabled during the present session. This report has now been received. However, you will recall that there are presently before the Courts of Manitoba criminal proceedings based in part on evidence and exhibits taken and filed during the sittings of the commission. Portions of this report refer to matters in issue in these criminal proceedings. After very careful consideration, it is considered that the publication of the report at this time might conceivably tend to prejudice the fair trial of the persons charged. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of ensuring no tendency to prejudice the fair trial of persons presently charged with criminal proceedings, bearing in part upon matters contained in the report, it has been decided not to make public the report of the Brandon Packers Strike Commission at this time. However, I give the committee notice that the report will be made public and placed in the hands of members either immediately upon the conclusion of the pending preliminary enquiry if the accused are not committed for trial, or immediately upon the conclusion of the trial if the accused are committed. I trust that this statement will meet with the approval of the members of the committee.

The Department of Labour maintains a very active membership in two associations of governmental labour officials. These associations meet once a year to discuss labour legislation, exchange views and experiences and studies on labour matters. The activities of the two associations assist us in Manitoba to keep up to date on the latest developments in this fast-changing and important field of labour. The International Association, which includes all provinces in Canada, most of the States in the Union, and both Federal Governments, this year honoured Canada, and Manitoba particularly, by conferring the presidency upon our Deputy Minister of Labour. His election to this office is an expression of the high regard with which Mr. W. E. Wilson is held throughout North America for his knowledge and experience in labour matters. I would like at this time to pay personal tribute to our Deputy Minister for his guidance and dedicated assistance during the past year. I would also like to acknowledge the excellent work done by the administrative officers, the division heads and all those members of the staff who have been such an excellent help to me during a rather difficult and busy year in the Department of Labour.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I have always felt that the government, any government, should be very careful in enacting any labour management legislation. Before the big national rally that the Liberals had in Ottawa early this year, we were asked to send some of our ideas to a policy committee, and in view of the fact that my feelings are the same now as they were then, I would like to read a couple of paragraphs on what I did have to say, or what I thought at the time. "The field of labour management relations is a challenging one. It is easier to go with the mass, but we must look at the problem existing in the States as well as in our country. I feel that we should try to get a representative of management and labour to sit together and discuss the problem with some intelligence, not a special industry, not a special union, but preferably some retired people from both groups. People known for their honesty should meet with representatives of the government, and an honest effort must be made to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. Money talks, and at times big business gets away with murder. Politicians are also known to count noses and are swayed by unions. We are not interested in pleasing big magnates or union leaders such as Hoffa. We are interested in Canada; we are interested in fair profits and we are interested in the rank and file of the labour force.

"Because of the position in which legislatures find themselves, it would be well to set

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) up a special court of specially appointed specialists who would make laws governing labour management relations, contracts, strikes, etcetera. This would take away the pressure from the elected representatives and therefore make it more difficult for dishonest officials of industry and labour to operate. As a prominent leader stated several years ago, neither collective bargaining nor arbitration, nor all the directives of the most progressive legislation will be able to provide a lasting labour peace unless there is a constant effort to infuse the breath of spiritual and moral life into the very framework of industrial relations. This formula anchors labour peace and not primarily in legislation, but rather in the hearts of man and in the spirit of economic institutions. Accordingly we must basically place our hopes for the future in voluntary actions by free associations of workers and employers, and only secondarily in the instrument of legislation. Only to the extent that organized labour and organized management are presently unable or unwilling to assume their joint responsibilities towards promoting economic order is government, through law, obliged to take whatever steps are necessary to advance the common welfare."

Mr. Chairman, unless labour and management compose their differences and make a go of collective bargaining, they may be saddled with some form of compulsory arbitration. I would say that many Canadians are losing confidence in the ability of union leaders and management representatives to make collective bargaining serve the public interest, and worse yet, are losing faith in the very institution of bargaining itself. It is alarming to see the increasing demands for compulsory arbitration. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the government of the province should try to foster a government labour management conference preferably to start with the province, only here in this province, and eventually to try to make this a national conference. This problem of labour management relations is without a doubt one of the biggest problems confronting any democratic country at the moment. We have been informed that we can expect a full-time Minister of Labour soon, and I feel that his first duty and main concern should be to try to bring in management and labour closer together. Mr. Chairman, above all we must place the liberty and freedom of individuals. The hands of big companies, granted, are not always lily white, but let no one kid himself that the hands of labour leaders are always pure also. I think that all of us here agree that there is a place, there is a job to be done by organized unions. We definitely agree that we should have those unions, that the workers certainly have the right to organize themselves and insist that they be treated fairly, but to do the job that this union is meant to do, these unions must be careful, and they should work for every individual member and not just for the leaders of these unions, and it should not be permitted to become an instrument of power exactly what you have now, for an individual, a group or a political party.

I would wish to say here, before concluding, Mr. Chairman, that I certainly do not accuse any of the labour leaders of this province of being dishonest. I think that Manitoba is fortunate in this respect, but I certainly do claim that many of those big unions, national unions and international unions need cleaning up. It is clear and obvious that in many instances, the one that Hoffa is the leader of, for one thing -- I said international, and from what I understand, Hoffa is trying to come here in Canada now; that's exactly my motive and my reason to speak like I am today now, because I think we should be warned of this danger. I don't think that the ordinary worker should be placed in a position where he becomes the slave of big union leaders, and I said that I am not accusing, I'm certainly not accusing any leaders here in Manitoba -- labour leaders -- of being dishonest, and I also stated, Mr. Chairman, that I know that the big businesses are not perfect. This is not the point at all. We agree that we need unions, but it is a big problem right now, and we should be very careful, because after all, the people that are more or less opposing those big businesses, those leaders are acting exactly the same way as any big businessman would do, and a few of those leaders at the top are now living on the avails of the union dues. I don't know why people belonging to parties, who are always saying that they are the friend of labour, I don't know why they are not more interested in cleaning those unions. Maybe they should qualify their friendship. Are they friends of the ordinary working people or are they the friends of the big influential union leaders? No single man should have the power of a Beck or a Hoffa. No single man should be ready to paralyze a country. Canadians are not faced with the same problem as our neighbours to the south are. I doubt if here in Canada we could find a Mafia-led or Mafia-organized union. We can find some

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) in the States certainly, but I think that it should be the duty of every person here in Manitoba also to pressure the Federal Government into disallowing the undesirable, such as Hoffa and his associates, of coming here to organize Canadians in their vast empire. We are often speaking of nationalism. Let us not allow residents of foreign countries to dictate and come and run our country. I don't think that the companies run anything here in Canada. I don't think that they come here and try to force people to join them and pay dues to them. I don't think there is that at all, and I would like to repeat again that I am not trying to choose sides between unions and companies, but we have a group of people that are dedicated to practically opposing these companies, to running them down all the time, and I think that it is time that we acknowledged the danger there is now confronting us. We started by saying that we believe in unions, that we do not accuse anybody here in Manitoba, but things are coming and we don't want to wait until it's too late. That is exactly my point. If this is the case -- questions from the left here -- I wonder if those people that feel that they are so friendly with the people, if they feel that it's right that as a party they should receive money, they should accept money from the dues of those people. I mean, what kind of position is this going to leave the people in, if every single member, if he wants it or not, if his union has decided or voted in favour of this, that means that they have no say? They

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): That's not true at all.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, if it's not true, so much the better. This is what we're led to believe and I hope it's not true, but certainly from what we've seen in the papers, that seems the main reason and the only reason why there's a change of name. It's the same party, because every member here is endorsing a party without a platform. It must be the same thing; they're all working for it. It's just to get a little more finance on their side -- as the Honourable Member for Brokenhead has acknowledged one of my questions last week. A good party -- call themselves Socialist Democrats -- by acting thus, accepting these funds, whereas I said previously aren't we faced with this creeping socialism, that will enslave, that could enslave the souls and minds of men, that could make slaves of the free man, because if you start paying everything for them, doing all their thinking, there is no more freedom and we are certainly not helping the mass, not helping the rank and file of labour.

Now Sir, I would like you to understand, I would like all the members here and the members of the CCF Party to know that we of the Liberal Party are also interested in every citizen of Canada, in the ordinary worker, and we agree -- again I say that we agree -- that there is a place for unions; that there should be unions, but we feel that they should serve the rank and file. And again let me repeat that I am not discussing labour as compared to any large businesses or firms. I know that management has a long way to go, but I feel that unions also should be made clean, should be kept clean. I don't think that they should only have the right to demand but they certainly have certain responsibilities, and we should see that they respect those responsibilities. If this Manitoba of ours is to grow, this province of ours is to grow, Mr. Chairman, to progress, then every single man should remain free, and men of good will should sit together and try and iron out their problems with consideration for each other, but the way it's going now, this arbitration -- there's no such a thing as arbitration. I think that should be an improper word. I think that it is more this bargaining than -- we are not trying to give and take; we are not trying to be unionist management; and this on both sides of the fence -- management comes in with certain things they're ready to do, certain demands, and they will acknowledge ready to do less, and labour will do the same thing. I certainly think that there's not enough honesty on this, and I think that probably because this is dealt with predominantly by elected representatives of the people, people that are counting votes, and also because a certain party is trying to make a big appeal to a certain class of the people in Canada, and I think this is wrong; that it will weaken this province and it will weaken the country in general, if you have a certain group that will all join a certain party to try and fight against the rest of Canada. I don't think that they will profit by it, and I don't think that the rest of Canada will profit by it.

MR. ORLIKOW: Last week, in discussing The Fair Wage Act, I pointed to the almost complete silence of the members of the Official Opposition with regard to all the questions of social importance which have come up, and lo and behold, today when we get to the Labour estimates, the one member of the Official Opposition who comes from the urban area, from the Greater Winnipeg area, avails himself of the opportunity of making some comments. And what

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) is the gist of his comments? A lecture to the House and to the people of this country on the iniquities of the labour movement. Now far be it from me, Mr. Chairman, to try to tell this House or to try to tell the public of Canada that every single person -- and let's realize that there are a million and a quarter people who belong to trade unions in Canada -- that every single person associated with the labour movement in Canada has a perfect record. I would no more say that than I would say that every single bank employee has a perfect record, or every single employee of retail stores has a perfect record, but we have, Mr. Chairman, here today, an indiscriminate attack on labour by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface. He qualifies it; he says it doesn't apply to Manitoba; it doesn't apply here; it doesn't apply there; let's look at the record, Mr. Chairman, and I think the member should know these things before he gets up on his feet to talk. First of all, I want to say to the honourable member that to my knowledge there hasn't been a single prosecution of a labour official for acts committed while they were in their capacity as trade union officers, in the Dominion of Canada. Certainly much less -- if there are any I don't know about them -- and the percentage is certainly much less than the percentage having to do with business. I'm not now saying business is worse than labour; I'm saying the fact is we don't have this situation in Canada. I want to say to the honourable member that I personally may not be enthused by the fact that the Teamsters' Union headed by Mr. Hoffa has announced that it is going to come into Canada, but surely it is the right of the people of Canada who want to join unions to belong to the Teamsters' Union or to any other union, and it is not for me or the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, or the Minister of Labour, or anybody else here to tell them where they should belong. That is their free democratic right. I may have my opinions about Mr. Hoffa; I want to tell the honourable member, in case he doesn't know it, that the highest law enforcement agencies in the United States have been trying for the last three or four years to get a conviction of Mr. Hoffa for various reasons, and have so far failed. I'm not saying

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would permit a question, wouldn't it be right then and our duty, especially in the way that he feels, to try, as I say, put the pressure on the government to try every possible means to keep an undesirable man like that out of Canada, out of our affairs. That is what I suggest, and I didn't accuse anybody in here at all.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, it's not my job or the job of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, or anybody else's, to tell people to what union they will belong. Certainly when a person is asked to join a union, the ability, the record, the history of the people leading the union to which they're asked to join, will be a factor in their deciding whether to join that union or another union, or no union, but that's their business and not the business of the members of this House or anybody else in Canada, until the people involved are guilty of breaking the law, in which case they should be prosecuted. I want to suggest to the member -- (Interjection) -- Well, we'll come to that in a little while. My point, Mr. Chairman, is a very simple one; surely it's a basic principle of British justice that people are considered to be innocent until there is some proof of their guilt, and the honourable member comes here with a number of allegations, very few of which have any basis in fact.

Now the honourable member tried to create the impression that labour leaders aren't interested in anything but -- and I tried to take down what he said -- "leaders living off the avails of the dues" and so on and so on. I want to tell the honourable member -- and it's no secret because we put in an order, either a question or an Order for Return -- last year, in which the Minister has already told us that we had some considerable more difficulty than we have in other years; last year the number of man days lost as the result of strikes in the Province of Manitoba -- and I'm not happy with this but this is a fact -- was just over 88,000 days, Mr. Chairman. Now this sounds like a lot, and it is a lot in comparison with other years. I want to point out to the members of this committee, however, Mr. Chairman, that this is less than the loss of three days of unemployment in the Greater Winnipeg area where we have in the neighborhood of 30,000 unemployed every day for the last four or five months, so less than three days unemployment, three days unemployment in the Greater Winnipeg area lost more days than all the days lost as a result of the strike we had last year. I think the honourable member would have done a great deal more if he's spent some time on that rather than on his attack on the labour people in this city.

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.)

Now I don't want to get into a debate today with the honourable member about the New Party. We're here to discuss the estimates of the Labour Department. But I want to tell the honourable member, and I can show it to him very easily and very clearly, that no union in Canada, no national, international union, no local union is being forced to join the New Party. Every local union or national union or international union will vote on whether they want to belong or not. If they decide not to belong, then no money at all will be paid for them into the New Party. If the local union, the national union or the international union decides to affiliate with the New Party, then every single member who decides that he does not want to belong to the New Party needs simply to inform the financial officer of his union that he doesn't want any part of his dues to be paid to the New Party, and there will be not one cent paid to the New Party on his behalf. And I want to tell the honourable member that as far as I personally am concerned, I make no apologies for this. I would rather belong to a party which is financed in part by the contributions of five cents a month from the workers who belong to Canada Packers Local of the United Packinghouse Workers or the Swift Local of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, or the Westeel Local of the United Steel Workers of America, all of which are in the honourable member's constituency. I'd much rather belong to that kind of party than to the kind of party that he belongs to -- the members over there who get their finances from the companies concerned. I make no apology for the fact that we will be getting money in the New Party, as we did in the CCF, from these people. But I emphasize again that not one cent will come from any person who informs the financial officer that he doesn't want to belong to the New Party. So much, Mr. Chairman, for the remarks of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface.

I want to deal, Mr. Chairman, with the estimates of the Department. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to object on my part and on behalf of all the members in this group, to the fact that we are being asked to consider the estimates of the Department today when the report of the Department, the Annual Report of the Department, has not yet been tabled in this House. I don't think that

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, the report has been tabled. I must regret that it hasn't been printed. Oh yes, it was tabled quite some time ago. Only one copy. One of the difficulties is that this is an annual report for the calendar year and there are some difficulties with the printing of the report. You'll recall last year that we did get the report out a few days before the estimates, but only just, on account of it being a report for the calendar year, rather than the fiscal year.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that it is extremely difficult for members who are interested, and let me make clear that I don't say for one moment that we are the only members who are interested in the report. Every member, certainly every member from an urban area is interested in the report, and I think it is extremely difficult to discuss the estimates when we do not have the report, and I think with all due deference to the Minister, that a little more effort could have been made for us to have the report so that we could study it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are now into the month of April. On February 14th the House met; on February 14th we had the Speech from the Throne; on February 14th, Mr. Chairman, here is what the speech said with regard to labour, and I want to quote; it's on page 4 of Hansard, "Legislation will be submitted respecting the Manitoba Labour Board to carry out the recommendations of the Department, with respect to the Chairman of that body and other matters of concern." Well, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that if we're going to give serious consideration to this and other matters that we might by now have had copies of that legislation. They're going to come in in the dying days of the session; they're going to be rushed through. I think that this is not the proper way to conduct the business as far as the members of the House are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister made reference to the dispute at Brandon between Brandon Packers and the Union representing their employees. He made reference to the inquiry conducted by Judge Tritschler and to the report. I can understand the difficulties of the government in tabling this report while the matter's before the court, and I'm not going at this time to question the reasons why the government has decided to follow the procedure which the Minister outlined. I do, however, think it is unfortunate because, unless the matter is disposed of by

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) the dismissal of the charges of the preliminary hearing, we could very well be into a situation where this may take -- there may be a case, and an appeal, and another appeal -- and this may take two, three, four years. I'm not the legal expert, but I think that this is unfortunate for the government and the House and everybody concerned. I do want to say this, Mr. Chairman, that it's not my intention today to discuss the inquiry. I do want to say, however, Mr. Chairman, that I have read the transcript of the inquiry, and if members in the committee this morning were concerned about hearsay evidence and leading questions and guilt by association and allegations unsupported by fact, then they haven't heard anything until they read, not the report -- I haven't got the report -- until they read the transcript of the evidence. But I'm not going to discuss this in detail. I will wait, Mr. Chairman, until the report is in and we can go into this in detail, and if I'm here I can assure the Honourable Minister that I will go into it in some lengthy detail.

I do have a question, however, Mr. Chairman, which I would like answered with regard to this. I was informed as late as today by the Counsel for the Union, that after the first volume of the transcript was delivered to him that he was called by the people who were in charge of keeping the records, of taking the transcript -- I think it's Metropolitan -- I had a note here but the Minister will know -- it's Metropolitan Securities, I think, Metropolitan Securities and Investigation Limited. He was called by them, and asked to return the copy because they were making changes in the transcript, they said, on the basis of typographical errors and so on. Now, Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that it is not proper in the type of report to change the transcript at all. And I would like the Minister -- I don't expect him to have it today; it may be that he will have to get a report on this; this is a pretty serious matter -- I would like to know whether anybody has the right to change the original transcript; whether anybody had the right to edit the transcript; and I want to tell the Minister now, that some time, not today or tomorrow, but at some time I, for one, want to have a look, not only at the transcript that the Minister put in the library here which I have been reading, but I would like to look at the original transcript to see whether it is a fact that they were only clerical typographical changes made in it. This is a very serious matter, Mr. Chairman, and I think that the Members of the House and the public are entitled to an explanation of precisely what happened.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are several other matters which I would like to raise at this time. The Minister will know that almost every week there are complaints made, because I hear some of them, certainly not as many as the Minister or the Deputy Minister; there are complaints made that when unions exercise their right under the law to try to organize workers, to try to encourage workers to join union, that the employers very frequently discharge workers who take their democratic right seriously and take an active part in helping or organize unions. Now I know the Minister's had delegation after delegation appear before him. The law at the present time, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, and I'm not saying anything which hasn't been said before, is one which, I think, is completely unfair. Somebody breaks the liquor laws or breaks the traffic laws or breaks any other law in the Province of Manitoba, the department concerned will very quickly go to the Attorney-General and say "Let's prosecute the offender." But if somebody breaks the Labour Relations Law which says that people have the right to belong to unions, they shall not be intimidated, what happens? They have to lodge a complaint with the Labour Relations Board. And the Labour Relations Board hears the evidence, and if it feels there is sufficient evidence that possibly an offence has been committed, what do they do? They don't do the prosecution. No. They say to the individual concerned, or to the union concerned, "Well, we will be very magnanimous; we will give you the right to take this matter to court and to prosecute the offender." Now, Mr. Chairman, this is not a very generous attitude, to say the least, on the part of the government, because very frequently individuals, and even unions, don't have the financial resources to follow these cases through court. Now I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this ought to be the responsibility of the government, of the government. When the department of the government given the responsibility of administering the labour laws of this province feels that there's evidence that the law's been broken, then in my opinion the government department ought to make the prosecution. I want to suggest to the Minister, as I did last year, that this is not a very radical proposal which I make. This is a proposal which is in fact the law in the Province of Quebec. Section 21 A of The Labour Relations Act in the Province of Quebec says, and I read it into the record, Mr. Chairman, "When

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) an employee is dismissed, suspended, or transferred by the employer or his agent, because of the exercise by such employee of the right granted to him by this Act, or because of trade union activities permitted by it, the Board may order the employer to reinstate within eight days of the service of the Board's ordinance to that effect, such employee in his employ with all his rights and privileges, and pay him as an indemnity the equivalent of the salary and other advantages of which he has been deprived by such dismissal, suspension or transfer, and the employer shall be bound to comply with the Board's ordinance to that effect. " So, Mr. Chairman, what I'm suggesting is that we follow the procedure which is in fact now followed in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak for a moment about the job which the Department does. The job of enforcing laws which have been enacted by Legislatures in this province. I'm thinking particularly of The Minimum Wage Act and The Fair Wage Act. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, these two are not being enforced by the Department as they ought to be. The inspection ranks of the Department is not up to the size which it ought to be in order to do an adequate inspection. I asked the Minister, arising out of a report which I received at the Indian and Metis Conference, a report that a certain place in northern Manitoba, people working in the fish filleting season, working 12 and 14 and 16 hours a day, were being paid a flat rate of \$5.00 a day, I asked the Minister whether the Department inspected these places and other places as a routine matter, as I feel they ought to, to catch any infractions of the law, to explain to employees and employers what the law is, and to make sure the law is being lived up to, and as I remember it, the Minister told me -- and if I'm wrong he can correct me -- that they didn't do these things until they got a complaint. Now, this in my opinion -- or very often at least they don't do this until they get a complaint. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, this is completely wrong. If the inspection division of the Department was large enough to do the job, these things would be found out early, and more than that, there are many cases where I understand people have to take these matters to court themselves. There are provisions in the Act that there is only a limited period for which they can collect money which is owing to them because the law has not been lived up to. Now obviously if they don't know about the law, if the period goes on too long, even if the law is then in force, they cannot get the money which they are entitled to. To me this seems completely wrong.

Another Act which I think there has been a good deal of misunderstanding about, and I am sure the Minister will know about this, is The Vacations with Pay Act. Now it was my understanding, and I've talked to a number of members of the House, it was my understanding that when we passed the last amendment to the Act, I thought, and nearly everybody else thought, that in fact every single worker in the Province of Manitoba who had worked for an employer for one year would be entitled to the minimum of two weeks vacation with pay. This in fact is not happening, Mr. Chairman, in all cases. I understand that there is another section of the Act which permits an employer to average out the vacations with pay, and that under this provision the employers are taking the position that where an agreement provides for more than two weeks vacation with pay -- let's say three weeks after ten years, or three weeks after 15 years -- that this is being used to deny certain new employees less than their two weeks vacation with pay. I think, Mr. Chairman, that this is a wrong interpretation of the Act, and I am not sure whether this has gone through the Labour Relations Board. I understand it has -- some possibility that it go before the courts -- but it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if I'm right in my interpretation, and I think I am, that the government ought to move to amend the Act to make it clear that every single person, every single employee in the Province of Manitoba who has worked for a year, is entitled to at least two weeks holidays with pay. This was, in my opinion, the provision of the Act which we passed, I think at the last session, or it may have been at the session before, but certainly there ought not to be that ambiguity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I had a good deal to say about Grand Rapids. I don't intend at this time to go into any long details about this, but I did have a phone call last week from Grand Rapids that there are new difficulties there. Now I asked the people who phoned me to send a wire to the Minister, so that he could look into it, in his capacity both as Minister of Labour and the Minister of Public Utilities, and I know that he got a copy of the wire, and I would like, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister to tell the House what the latest situation is. One other matter with regards to Grand Rapids, Mr. Chairman, the people up there had the impression,

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) rightly or wrongly, that when Dr. Martin was appointed, at the time of the strike, that not only would he try to get a settlement with regard to future wages, but that Dr. Martin was empowered to handle the grievances prior to the strike, the claims that people had received less than \$1.35 an hour, and that, arising out of that, their claims would be settled. Now I've received a number of complaints that this has not, in fact, happened, and I would like the Minister, Mr. Chairman, to tell me -- not to tell me, really, but to make a statement in the House so that the people at Grand Rapids who feel that they submitted claims in writing to Dr. Martin, to tell them where they are to go now, to process their claims if Dr. Martin is not, in fact, the person authorized to handle those claims. If they have a claim, to whom are they to go to? The Department of Labour, to the Hydro-Electric Board, precisely to whom are they to go? I think they are entitled to know this, if there is money coming to them, because they were underpaid; they're entitled to know to whom they are to go for redress.

And Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet, I think that there is one other matter with regard to Grand Rapids which I think I ought to raise. Now in answering me, Mr. Chairman, in answering the first statement which I made about Grand Rapids, the Minister on page 1152, had this to say, and it won't take too long, Mr. Chairman, and in any case I think it's important enough that it ought to be raised. The Minister said this, and I quote: "Now what about Mr. Orlikow's friend out there? Mr. Desbrow. You recall Mr. Desbrow? Well, that's the man who guided your party, isn't it? He's your contact man from the liaison committee. He's the man that you're looking to for further advice. You know he got into a little trouble after you fellows left. He may have been in trouble when you were there, and the Attorney-General's magistrate up there fined him. He paid \$104.50 in fine and costs. He paid it in cash. No evidence of poverty from this man. Now, I was told by one of the construction companies -- it is a report to me, February 2nd, some Indians were working for them, came and reported to the Superintendent that there was bootlegging going on in the Drake Lines, selling wine, liquor, beer to Indians on the job." Now, Mr. Chairman, I assumed and I said so in my reply, which I can read, that I didn't excuse this man for breaking laws for selling liquor. Well, Mr. Chairman, this was the impression which I got from the Minister's statement which I have just read. I have since checked it with a half a dozen members of the House, not only in our group; they all got the same impression. Well, Mr. Chairman, to my amazement, last Thursday I was called by Mr. Desbrow and I chided him for this, and Mr. Desbrow told me, "Yes, it's true that I was fined." Incidentally, it's not true that Mr. Desbrow paid the fine in cash that day; he had to ask for time to pay the fine -- he paid the fine five days later, and I'm told that he paid it only by taking a collection of the people concerned, but the point I want to make is this, Mr. Chairman -- I'm not excusing Mr. Desbrow, it's true he was fined; he was fined for being in possession of beer. That is a vastly different matter, Mr. Chairman, than the impression which I got and I think other members of the House got -- well, the Minister shakes his head. I wish he would do more than shake his head, and I am through, now, Mr. Chairman, in about one sentence. I wish the Minister would make the statement very plain that whatever Mr. Desbrow did, Mr. Desbrow was not guilty of bootlegging. There's a vast difference between possession of liquor in a car -- and I am not going to discuss that in detail, although I have had a report on what actually happened -- but there's a vast difference between that and bootlegging, and I think most members of the House would certainly agree on that.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, on that particular point, I'm afraid Hansard doesn't do me justice. They forgot to get the long pause between I said, "No evidence of poverty here," and then my statement which went on to say, "on February 2nd," and I think -- when these other people -- I think if my honourable friend reads Hansard closely, he was the one that said he was bootlegging, not I.

MR. ORLIKOW: True, I said it in reply, but I said it on the -- the first I knew, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Desbrow had been in trouble with the law was when the Minister reported so in the House. I assumed that from what -- and I read the text of what the Minister said. I agree that Hansard can't quote the pauses, but I read the text today again of what the Minister said, and I made that assumption. Now I want to tell the Minister, I've checked with half a dozen members of this House, not only from this group; they all had that impression. Now I think that in fairness to the man concerned that the Minister should make it clear that the conviction was not for bootlegging; it was for something else. We don't want to impute things to

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) people of which they are not guilty.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of questions to ask the Minister. First, I would like to say that I think the past three sessions I have always asked that we should have a full-time Minister of Labour and the Honourable Member from St. Boniface mentioned that we are going to have one soon. I don't know where he got his information, I haven't heard anything of it, but with the report that the Minister has just made and all the increased work that there is in the department, I think that we should have a statement from the government, not soon, but now, as to when we can expect a full-time Minister of Labour. Another question that I would like to ask is he mentioned that the department investigates where there's suspected arson. During the strike at Brandon, Brandon Packers, the house of the then President of the Local Union that was on strike, was set on fire and it was suspected that arson took place. I wonder if the Minister could tell us if there was any investigation by his department; if there was, what were the results and so on? Another point I would like to find out -- I note by the Manitoba Gazette shortly after the last session that three members of the Minimum Wage Board were reappointed immediately and the other two were reappointed just in the last issue of the Manitoba Gazette. I would like to know is that because their appointments are staggered or whether we were operating without a Minimum Wage Board for a year? Perhaps it's because they're staggered; I would like to know.

Now going back to the report of the Minimum Wage Board, Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to answer this -- the board, in their recommendations said, "The Board would like to point out the necessity for the Minimum Wage Board convening more regularly to review the operations of the regulations, and in particular any of the new recommendations that have been implemented by the government", and they go on to say that they should meet quarterly. Now I would like the Minister to tell us if they -- my understanding is that there have been no meetings, if there is, I would like to know; I want the Minister to tell us. Have they been meeting and have these suggestions been given any thought to them meeting quarterly or more regularly?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word or two on the Minister's salary. I join with my colleague, the Honourable Member for St. John's in regretting the fact that we haven't had before us, the annual report of the Department of Labour. I appreciate the fact that the Minister did state that there was one copy tabled some month or two ago in the Assembly, and I would suggest to him that after all, we are three months away from the start of the year and if we could not have received a printed copy, surely to goodness there should have been copies made available to the official opposition and ourselves of the content of the report. That has been done in respect of other reports that have been laid before the committee in ample time to peruse the activities of the department before we undertake a consideration of the estimates of the department. I respectfully suggest to my honourable friend that if a similar situation arises next year that sufficient numbers of copies be tabled in order to give each of the caucuses an opportunity of studying the report.

I feel obligated Mr. Chairman, to deviate from the Minister himself for a moment or two and the estimates that we have before us, and say a word or two to my honourable friend the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. I see, unfortunately, that he is not in his seat at the present time. I think I'm quite within my right to speak of this seeing as we're dealing with the question of the estimates of the Department of Labour. I didn't have the opportunity I think, as is well known, of attending the national rally of the Liberal Party. I question somehow though, Mr. Speaker, as to whether the Honourable Member for St. Boniface could have been speaking as to the platform of the Liberal Party. Possibly the Leader of the Official Opposition could set me right on that point. But it does seem to me that this year Mr. Chairman, that organizations who are formed for the purpose of bettering the working conditions that they are acquainted with have come under constant pressure and criticism from the official opposition, the Liberal Party of Manitoba. It seems to me that the utterances of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is a continuation of the attack that was made in this House a week or two ago by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains when he attacked the association of the school teachers here in the Province of Manitoba, because of the fact that they have become organized in order to forward their cause. Are we to gather from this -- and I direct this question to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition -- are we to gather from the attack that was made by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains on our school teachers and

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) the attack which was made this afternoon by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that the Liberal Party of Manitoba are determined to attack the organized bodies of the province who are established under the laws of this province for their own advancement. It does seem to me, as I mentioned Mr. Chairman, that thus far the Liberal Party of Manitoba have indicated that they are in opposition to both of these organizations, labour generally and the teachers also, because of the fact that they have banded themselves together in order that, what in their opinion is justice, may prevail. My honourable friend was very very careful when he was talking on the question of labour to attempt to differentiate between leaders and members of trade union organizations. I want to ask of him, does he consider that within our trade union organizations that those who are leaders are there by virtue of dictatorial methods in order to achieve their positions. I suggest to my honourable friend that if he knows anything about labour organizations, which I question, that the so-called leaders that he referred to in his oration are people, and responsible people too, Mr. Chairman, who have been placed in these positions by will of the individual members of the association, just as we, Mr. Chairman, in this Legislature have been placed here by a vote of the people in our respective constituency. Yes, and in organizations, for the information of my honourable friend the Member for Brandon, in many organizations, the election of officers and leaders are taken by secret ballot. I might say, Mr. Chairman, I readily agree that the machinery of the election is not set up with booths to the degree that it is in a general election, but insofar as my own organization is concerned, the one I'm a member of, that ballots are cast for election to these offices and I'm sure that that is true of many others.

My honourable friend suggests that labour and management should resolve their differences or else they be compelled by an act of the Legislature to settle their differences by compulsory settlements. I might say and interject, the Honourable the Minister of Labour, on the introductory remarks that he made, made reference to the two strikes. He made reference to the strike of the Brandon Packers; he made reference to the strike at Dominion Bridge and some of its subsidiaries in Manitoba. I'm sure he would agree with me that the facts, insofar as the Dominion Steel is concerned, that the organization only struck after six months of continuous effort on their part to bring about a settlement of their differences. So when my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface suggests to us that we should have compulsory settlement of these disputes I would like to ask of him when compulsion of a settlement of a dispute should take place. He suggests that the union should be careful that they work for the members and not just the leaders. I've heard some ridiculous statements before, Mr. Chairman, but I think this one tops them all, because after all why, why are individuals trying to gather in labour organizations or any other type of organization if it is not for mutual benefit to all concerned. My honourable friend says that the worker should not be placed in a position of working for the leaders. I've stated that that is not the case at all. The leaders are working for the membership of the organization and that is their duty, and as the Honourable Member for St. John's has pointed out, that here in the Province of Manitoba -- and I suspect also in the whole of the Dominion of Canada although I haven't that information available at the present time -- that the leaders of labour have acquitted themselves on just as high a plane as any of those who happen to be in public prominence. He also says that the leaders are living on the avails of the members. How ridiculous a statement can a man who supports the old and trusted and true party such as the Liberal Party was, stand up and make such a statement? Of course they're paid by the membership of the organization; just as we are paid here by the people of Manitoba.

Then my honourable friend goes on to suggest that the federal authorities should prevent United States leaders such as Hoffa from entering into Canada. I suggest that if it can be ascertained that any of the laws of Canada are likely to be violated by such an individual coming into Canada that that should be substantiated firstly. I might say, and I say this quite frankly, insofar as what I have been ascertained as to the activities of Mr. Hoffa of the Teamsters' Union there's some aspects of the newspaper reports that I don't agree with, but as my honourable colleague the Member for St. John's pointed out, efforts have been made to substantiate in courts of jurisdiction to the south of us, without avail, of the charges that have been levied at Mr. Hoffa, and I think Mr. Chairman, it would be only proper at this particular time for me who do belong to an international trades union to point out the reasons why we have international trades unions. After all we admit quite frankly from time to time in this Assembly that we're only a young country; that we're progressing. International organizations insofar as the

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) United States are concerned, and their memberships and their branches here in Canada are just a natural growth of the trade union movement. The trade union movement, of course, is not just confined to the international organizations namely as we usually conceive it between the United States and ourselves, but international organizations are affiliated in every democratic country in the whole world to work and to lay plans for the betterment of those who toil. That is why many international organizations have branches here in the Dominion of Canada. I do not recall Mr. Chairman, of any instances that the worker of Canada has been prejudiced because of an association with an American trades union.

My honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface, was attempting to take we of the CCF to task because of the fact that memberships in some of the organizations of labour have under consideration joining with us of the CCF and liberally-minded people, small business people, professional people, in the formation of a new political party here in Canada. I would say to my honourable friend that if he could classify himself as a liberally-minded individual then he would be welcome too. There are no restrictions. He infers that there may be some ulterior motive behind all of this in respect of us in this group, and I suggest that such is not the case. Would he say to me that on no occasions has any group or organizations or industrial organizations never made any contributions to his particular party? Would he suggest that these people who are members of these organizations have no right to associate themselves with a political movement? Would he suggest that they should have no right to affiliate themselves with any other type of activity such as international organizations? But I think Sir, another remark that the member made, which I must take strong exception to was one of his closing sentences when he said that unions should be made clean and kept clean. Certainly Sir, as we analyze those words, it is an indication from my honourable friend that unions are not clean, and I dispute it. Unions are clean. True, there may be individuals, just as there are individuals in any organization, who may not be admired by all, but I say to my honourable friend -- and I appreciate the fact Mr. Chairman, that his lack of knowledge of the trade union movement, he has confessed it time after time -- that through his lack of knowledge of the trade union movement that only these statements would be forthcoming from him. I would like to suggest to him, and I do this in appreciation of the remarks of my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface, that before any further utterances of this nature are made in this committee or this Assembly on behalf of labour, that he should acquaint himself with the method of operation of unions, the purposes of unions; and I'm sure, Sir, that if he took the time and the trouble to speak to those who are in prominence as to the activities of the labour organization, he could not then stand up in this House and say unions should be made clean and kept clean, because he would know that they are.

Now then, Mr. Chairman, I would like to leave my honourable friend for a moment or two and deal with a question that is in my mind at the present time in respect of the remarks of the Honourable the Minister of Labour on his introductory remarks and his winter works program. As you know, Sir, we have a resolution under consideration, twice amended, calling upon the Government of Manitoba in co-operation with the Federal authorities or by itself, to undertake a more vigorous and active role in trying to solve our unemployment situation here in the Province of Manitoba. I, Sir, am not going to repeat the proposals that I laid before the House on the introduction of this motion, but I would point out to the Honourable the Minister that from the figures of comparison that he has given us this afternoon of the provincial participation in winter works programs, that rather than any vigorous action on the part of the Provincial Government of Manitoba in respect of winter works, they're doing even less this year than they did last year. This lesser amount, Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that the unemployment picture here in Manitoba is so much worse, so much more worse than it was last year. He tells us that as far as men at work, if I jotted down his figures correctly, that the comparison insofar as the provincial figures are concerned, was 103 this year as against 101 last year. If my figures again are correct as I listened to the statement of the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that this year 3,204 man hours on winter employment works in the Province of Manitoba as against 4,282 of last year. So I say, Mr. Chairman, and I say to this committee that this Government of Manitoba is not facing up to its responsibilities in respect of unemployment, and the Minister of Labour has proved my contention here this afternoon by giving us the figures that he did. I suggest that there may be reasons why it is that the government is not giving the

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) leadership that it could be giving despite the fact of my honourable friend the Leader of the House, the Premier of this Province, when speaking to the resolution I referred to the other day, indicated to us that there was a limitation on the provincial participation insofar as unemployment and works are concerned. I want to place on the record, Sir, a letter that I received today -- I understand this letter was also sent to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition -- from the Building Trades Council of Winnipeg, which indicates a field in which the Department of Labour and the Government of Manitoba could take a lead in providing employment for more individuals, because this, Sir, is strictly within the premise of the jurisdiction of the Government of Manitoba. Sir, I want to read this letter: "Dear Sir: Re maximum hours at straight time specified for contracts on Grand Rapids Power Development Project. As you are no doubt aware it has been specified in tender called so far issued for the above mentioned project, that the maximum hours to be worked at straight time on this project are 120 hours in a two week period. The Winnipeg and Vicinity Building Trades Council has exerted its best efforts to have the hours substantially reduced in order that a greater number of workmen can be employed on the project and conversely that the number of the unemployed may be reduced. It takes little mathematical ability to deduce that two men working 120 hours in two weeks will have worked enough hours to give three men employment at 40 hours per week. With thousands unemployed a few hundred may appear insignificant to those responsible for policy in this province, but to those who are genuinely concerned with the lot of the unemployed the importance of getting as many workmen as possible fully employed is paramount, whether it be a few hundred more or a few dozen more, or just a few more. If 40 hours per week is the maximum permitted the result will add up to a considerable number additional employed with a corresponding reduction in the unemployed. We do not think anyone will argue that a workman employed for 40 hours a week is not fully employed. We therefore contend that a work week of 40 hours maximum should be established on the Grand Rapids Project. This Council has approached the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board, the Minister of Public Utilities and the Minister of Labour on matters of maximum hours of work and of wage rates on the Grand Rapids Project, and to date the maximum hours of labour at straight time have not been reduced, nor have the minimum rates of wages been increased. Substandard conditions in wages on this project can only lead to discontent and strife until the situation is corrected. This council has therefore decided to bring the matter to your attention with the thought that if this matter be brought to the floor of the Legislature and Members of the Legislative Assembly, the Members of the Legislative Assembly may decide that providing opportunities for employment is more important than problematical reductions in cost." The letter, Sir, is signed by representatives of eight different trade unions or affiliated members of the Building Trades Council of Winnipeg. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the Minister of Labour, that there are things that this government can be doing and should be doing in order to provide more employment and to spread the employment over a greater number. We make reference to the 120 hours as being the maximum in a two week period. Weather conditions can quite conceivably prevail so that in one week they work 30 hours and in the next week 90 hours in order that the aggregate total of 120 hours per two week period is not exceeded. So I suggest to the Honourable the Minister of Labour that he should give this matter his serious consideration and see if he can do something to resolve the situation that is existing at the present time in respect to the Grand Rapids Development.

I also have another matter, Mr. Chairman, that I undertook to bring to the attention of the Minister of Labour, and also to this committee, and it deals with the situation regarding independent truckers in the Province of Manitoba. As far as I'm able to ascertain, Mr. Chairman, there are no regulations in the Province of Manitoba dealing with the independent truckers. It seems to me as though, to a considerable degree, they are at the mercy -- if that word is advisable -- of our large construction corporations, as to their hire or otherwise. There are some jurisdictions, Mr. Chairman, that have regulations dealing with percentages of independent truckers that must be hired on any government contract. I undertook to write a few of the provinces of our Dominion in connection with this and I would like to just make reference to one or two. Correspondence from the office of the Deputy Minister of Labour in the Province of Ontario; "Dear Mr. Pauley: Mr. Daly, who incidentally is the Minister of Labour, has asked me to respond to your letter of February 28th, 1961. I'm not aware that there are

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) any residential qualifications respecting the hiring of truckers on government contracts. Usually the contract let would be for a project and the general contractor would do his own hiring. If a question of wage rates arises it would be referred to me as Fair Wage Officer, and I would require that the contractor pay the going rates for the area on a government contract. We reply on the fair wage scale for the Government of Canada as a basis for determining the going rates for any particular zone. While I have no direct authority for making the statement, I believe the government would only hire individual truckers on small maintenance or repair jobs and I think the preference would be given to the truckers in the area. It would be hardly worthwhile for a person to move trucks from one locality to another for this type of work, so it would seem that a local preference would be obtained." From the Minister of Highways in Alberta: "Dear Mr. Paulley: With reference of your letter of February 28th, addressed to the Honourable R. Ryan" -- he was the Minister of Labour, the reply came from the Minister of Highways -- "I would advise that the Province of Alberta offers a great deal of protection to individual local truckers on all government projects, whether they are carried out by contract or government forces. Truck haul rates are set out by order of the Highway Traffic Board and must be adhered to by contractors on highway jobs. On contract projects the contractor is allowed to engage trucks of his own choosing up to 30 percent of the total truck haulage involved; the remaining 70 percent of the work must be done by independent truckers, preference being given to those who are local."

I might say, Sir, that I also contacted the Province of Saskatchewan and in the Province of Saskatchewan I received a communication from the Director of the Labour Standards Branch and he informs me at the present time in Saskatchewan they have no regulations dealing with this matter at the present time.

I might also say, Sir, that I received a similar communication from the Department of Labour in British Columbia enclosing for my information a copy of Public Works Fair Wages and Conditions of Employment Act which establish minimum wages in the occupations of truck driver, motorcycle operator, swampers and helpers. The point is, and it has been drawn to my attention, Mr. Chairman, and I have received a number of communications and petitions from individuals concerned and who are independent truckers, that more and more they're being squeezed out and are not getting what, in their opinion, is sufficient volume of trucking on an independent basis in the highway construction projects and in particular at Grand Rapids. I am informed by them that there is a great possibility, and I say this subject of course to this just being information revealed to me, Mr. Chairman, and I don't attempt to establish it as being gospel, but I am informed that it appears as though one of the construction companies dealing with the Grand Rapids project, rather than hiring independent truckers, has under consideration or intends to purchase a number of trucks in order to do the job under contract himself. The fear is, Mr. Chairman, that after the project is over in three or four years, the trucks will then be dumped on the market and the contractor just leave them and go out. In the meantime, the independent trucker, who practically his whole investment in his business is in his trucks, is idle because of the fact they're not receiving the work for which they purchased their trucks.

I'd appreciate it very much if the Honourable the Minister of Labour would look into this whole question. As I mentioned, in some jurisdictions there is legislation set up dealing with this. I suggest that these people, these independent truckers, have a considerable investment in their trucks and they should be given as much preference as possible in any government contract in the Province of Manitoba. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is about all I have to say at the present time. There may be a remark or two on some of the other items.

. Continued next page.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell me what legislation we have, if any, in governing the working hours of service stations throughout Manitoba? I know the oil companies, their main concern is selling their products and any person leasing a station from them is now required to stay open at least from 7:00 in the morning until 11:00 at night, and many have to continue on a 24-hour basis. I was wondering what hours also pertain to garages that are handling repairs and general work pertaining to automobiles? Has the Labour Department any control over them?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, if those are the only questions being asked at this time, perhaps I should make an effort to reply to some of them at this time. I'd like to thank the member for St. Boniface for drawing some of the fire of my friends opposite on this occasion. I would also like to say that when a full-time Minister of Labour is appointed, we'll certainly see that he is acquainted with the speech that he made and the recommendations which he has made with respect to trade unions and matters of that kind. The Member for Elmwood is also asking about a full-time Minister of Labour and I must bow to the First Minister in this respect because I am certainly not the man who makes decisions of this kind. In respect to the Olver fire in Brandon, a report was made and the evidence was inconclusive as to who may have set the fire. I think it certainly pointed to arson all right and many people have fairly strong views as to who may have been responsible, but the evidence was inconclusive insofar as a conviction for arson was concerned.

The Minimum Wage Board -- the appointments are staggered and that was the reason for the fairly late appointment of the two members and the Chairman of the Board which went through just recently. The Board does convene at the call of the Minister of Labour. It hasn't been the practice in the past, and indeed the legislation is specific in this regard, it does say that the Board shall meet at the call of the Minister. Presumably, it must have some bearing on the cost of living index because this, of course, is the basis primarily on which the minimum wage is set. It's the cost of necessities for an individual workman, so this is certainly something that we will bear in mind and watch closely Mr. Chairman.

MR. PETERS: Well what I was concerned about was that one part where they recommended that they should meet more often to study some of the recommendations that they have made and the regulations, not so much of the setting up of the minimum wage, but the regulations and the new regulations.

MR. CARROLL: Well we'll certainly keep this matter in mind, Mr. Chairman. The Member for St. John's mentioned the Annual Report and I must regret that it is not available to the members of the House. The Leader of the CCF Party mentioned the same point and I do think that we should be able to provide copies for the two official parties in the House. Had I thought that it would not have been ready, we could have taken some steps to possibly have accommodated you this time. However, we did expect that the report would have been ready a week ago. For some reason it's been delayed because certain things that get priority down there, the Orders of the Day and things of that kind, so that we had certainly hoped that the report would be here and I must apologize for at least not providing the members opposite a minimum number of copies for their own use.

The legislation with respect to the Manitoba Labour Board, this is a question again over which I am afraid I have no immediate control. Instructions have gone forward to the Legislative Council and we are waiting for the legislation so that it can be introduced to the House. However, if my friend would like to know what the amendments are going to be, I would be very pleased to tell him what they are as I recall them at this time. If you would care to ask that question later I would be pleased to accommodate you.

With respect to the transcript of evidence, we have made some attempts since the questions was asked to ascertain what the facts are with respect to the changes in evidence. I have been assured that because they were recording over a machine that there had been fairly substantial number of mistakes in spelling, in punctuation and matters of this kind, but certainly not in the sense of the report. There was one other problem, too. Some of the voices which were coming over the recording equipment were similar and the Counsel for the Commission had to make some changes with respect to the individual who was actually making the statement at the time. I think there's certainly been no attempt to change the evidence. These were merely minor amendments that were required as a result of the method by which they were

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.)....transcribing, taking it down and so on. -- (Interjection)-- I'm afraid I don't know what the usual practice is. We would be pleased though to get any examples of changes if you could draw them to our attention. We're assured that there is no change of any substance.

MR. PAULLEY: The way in which we could do that, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, is if we had one of the original copies and we were assured that it was an original copy.

MR. CARROLL: If it's at all possible to get any original copies, I'd be very pleased to make them available.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to -- it doesn't have to be today, but the Minister has made, I think, a fair offer. I would like to particularly look at the transcript that deals with the questions of Mr. Wilford of the Packinghouse -- Mr. Joe Wilford, the local representative of the Packinghouse Workers Union. That is the section to which some question has been asked. If I could look at that, it would satisfy me.

MR. CARROLL: The evidence that Mr. Wilford presented to the Commission -- right. The question about the employees who are discharged for engaging in union organization activities -- the unfair labour practice part of this legislation is certainly one that is causing us some concern. We are having to look at this legislation to see whether we can't make some amendments which will meet both the criticism of the labour unions and the employer organizations with this respect, because I think the evidence will indicate that there are infractions here on both sides. This is not strictly in connection with the unfair labour practices but with other breaches of contract between the union and the company involved. There have been some evidence of these infractions on both sides and we are having a look at this particular matter now to see whether we might be able to bring in some changes which would make it acceptable and workable. The Minimum Wage Act -- The Fair Wage Act -- there is an attempt, a very genuine attempt on the part of our inspectors in the Department of Labour to seek out, to ferret out any breaches under either of these particular pieces of legislation. When we get up into remote filleting plants, I must confess that we do have some real problems -- to find out where they are to begin with. I suspect that it would not be customary for them to fly around in the north at every small place where there might be people employed, but they do attempt to examine the books of all known employers within fairly easy access to our inspection staff. Now if there are any examples, any complaints received from remote areas, we would be very pleased to go in do what we can to eliminate any breaches of the legislation that may be drawn to our attention, but there is this conscious effort on their part to enforce this legislation. Incidentally, people engaged in the fishing industry, as such, do not come under the terms of the Minimum Wage Act. Fishermen and farmers are excluded by legislation, but this of course I don't believe would apply to a person engaged in a filleting plant. I think he would be within the category that would be inspected and made to comply with the legislation.

The Vacations with Pay Act did provide a great many problems, because in changing the one section of the act from one week to two weeks, we neglected another section of the act which said, "except where union agreements are more favourable." In other words, then you got into a hassle with one week after one year with three weeks after three years, better than two weeks after one, two, three years and so on. That became a real problem for the Labour Board and I must confess it was a long time before they could come to a decision as to what the intent of the legislation was. It was ambiguous, the way the amendments worked out, but the Board has ruled that two weeks shall be paid to all employees, or the agreement, whichever is greater. I think this problem has since been eliminated and I think we'll have no more trouble with this particular piece of legislation. I think we can say it was an error in drafting which we didn't recognize; which members opposite didn't recognize when the legislation was brought in.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I don't like to interrupt, but does the Minister feel that the present provision is satisfactory to everybody? The present provision where some people are still getting less than two weeks?

MR. CARROLL: No. The Board ruling was that everyone shall get two weeks, or the agreement, whichever is better for the employee -- whichever is greater. In other words, it may say that they'll get three weeks after the end of the first year. Would you still want them to get two weeks? They have ruled that it will be two weeks or more, if an agreement says so.

MR. ORLIKOW: Can the Minister tell me when that decision was made, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CARROLL: Well I can't tell you exactly when, but I'm advised that the Board has so ruled. It must have done so, I would say within the last three months because three months ago I know it was still a bit of a problem.

MR. ORLIKOW: One more question. Have these people who asked questions or complained, been informed, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CARROLL: I'll endeavour to find out whether everyone who had a problem there has been so informed.

The Grand Rapids problem, Dallas Construction, I believe, was the name of the firm. This company is sub-contracting under Patricia Transportation. The sub-contract had been let, I think, about the time that Dr. Martin went up, possibly just before he went up, and there have been some difficulties, some complaints with respect to this company. I believe there were some NSF cheques and a few things of that kind. It first came to my attention the day that the telegram arrived here a few days ago. The project manager of the Hydro-Electric Board went to Grand Rapids the next day, together with one of the senior officials for Patricia. Patricia has given an undertaking that no man will be deprived of what is justly due him as the result of this sub-contractor. We understand that meetings have been held and that they're well under way to the settlement of all of the difficulties which were experienced under this particular sub-contract.

With respect to any difficulties which may have arisen before Dr. Martin went up, Drake Construction, insofar as they were concerned, undertook to hear any complaints that any individual might have. Any just complaint would be heard by them and they would settle with the individual. I know of no case where an individual has not been satisfactorily dealt with since these complaints were brought to my attention. Mr. Desbrow, I believe, has been dealt with.

Now the Leader of the CCF party re the winter works program -- I'd like to say that the reason why the Manitoba program has not shown the same response from municipalities this year as it did last, is that the federal program was expanded this year to take into account the municipal building, and I think this was where our particular project gained a great deal of its support last year. We did undertake to provide financial support to municipalities who were employing unemployed workmen in municipal buildings last year. Now with the expansion of the federal program, the need became less for the particular program that we were sponsoring as a province. However, there is still some use for our program in schools and hospitals, I believe, which are still excluded from the federal program. We have had, I think, fairly healthy response in view of the very substantial increase in the federal program and we think that really it's a rather good effort in spite of the fact that it is down somewhat from last year.

Now there's some criticism of why the province limited the provincial program. Now I think that we didn't actually limit the program so much as -- well we actually did -- we have restricted our participation and are contributing to those who are unemployed and are not eligible for unemployment insurance. We're adding 25 percent to the federal program and we're adding another 25 percent, which is 50 percent of the total wage bill for those who have been on social assistance for a period of three months, so we're participating financially to those who need it the most. One of the reasons for this, I must confess, was that there are agreements between trade unions and some of our larger municipalities where the last off work are the first back on, and we felt that really the people who required our assistance most were those who were not getting unemployment insurance or who were on public assistance at the present time. This is where our real responsibility lies and we're providing all the incentives we can to encourage the employment of these people; and certainly I think it really isn't part of our program to subsidize the municipalities with their work. We want to help unemployment. We're not interested primarily in subsidizing municipalities, in aiding them to get their work done more cheaply. This is the program designed to get more people on payrolls rather than save employers' money.

Now the question of straight time, 40 hours a week which has been requested by the Building Trades Council, we have received letters from them asking that the Grand Rapids project be handled on a straight 40 hour week. Our reply to their request, and I think probably

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.)....it might be best if I read onto the record a copy of my reply to Mr. Robbins as a result of either a delegation or an Enquiry that we had last September. That is dated September 20th and is addressed to Mr. Robbins, Secretary of the Building Trades Council. " I would like to say how much we appreciate the concern of your council over the unemployment situation in our province. The view expressed by your council, that the hours of work at Grand Rapids be restricted to 40 hours, is one which seems to follow naturally from your concern for unemployment, but one which would appear to present some problems as well. I'm advised that one of the problems is to attract sufficient men with the necessary skills to this area on the basis of 40 hours per week. Experience in other remote areas would seem to indicate that men who were away from their families and normal recreational facilities prefer to work longer hours. This does not necessarily mean that they would be employed more hours in construction in a construction year. While they would be employed longer hours during the time on the job, I believe that the custom is to take holiday breaks after three to six months from the site. This is the pattern, I'm advised, which is generally followed on a great many remote area jobs."

Another problem would seem to be one of accommodation facilities. While there is no doubt that additional living accommodation could be provided for a larger work force, it could only be done at a substantial increase in cost. I believe it is very important to consider the effect of increased cost and its impact upon the price of electricity to the consumers of the province. It will be recognized that low cost power has been one of the few advantages that we, as a province, have had to offer to encourage industrial development. Furthermore, I believe that there is a danger in establishing a precedent for hours of work which might prejudice future industrial expansion in remote regions. As you may know, the Department of Industry and Commerce has been attempting to attract resources development industry to these remote areas and we are very conscious of the competition for these industries. Operating costs are of considerable importance in the economics of resource development undertaking. This does not mean, of course, that anyone would expect Manitoba labour to subsidize such an undertaking, but I believe that it does require a degree of flexibility in our thinking and adjustment to local conditions."

"Your suggestion of recreation facilities to utilize leisure hours is a very worthy one. If you will recall the Kelsey site, there was a fair variety of organized activity for leisure hours. However, all the recreational facilities in the world will not take the place of a workman's wife, family, his friends, his church, his home, the organizations to which he belongs, and the many other things which cannot be transported with him to a remote site. I am pleased to note that your council is willing to discuss the unemployment situation with the department, and I understand that Mr. Wilson has already written you in this regard suggesting a possible date. I'll be looking forward to a meeting with you at that time."

I think this expresses some of the views which we took into account when we considered working hours in remote areas.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister, did I understand that letter was dated last September?

MR. CARROLL: Yes. September 23rd -- I'm sorry, September 20th.

Independent truckers -- I believe the Leader of the CCF's suggesting here that we should give some kind of a preference, financial preference possibly, to local truckers who are engaged in government contract work. Other things being equal, it goes to Manitoba truckers. I think that's a very good point to keep in mind and I think it's one that could well be considered. If it's a financial preference, of course, we're dealing with something that may be quite different and quite difficult for us to accept in principle.

Now there was a question raised here with respect to working hours in service stations. I understand that these hours quite often are regulated by municipal by-law, but where they aren't, then the law requires that, after 48 hours, overtime shall be paid although there is no restriction on the number of hours which can be worked in a week. I'm also advised that where any person has filed a complaint under The Vacations with Pay Act, that they have been advised by the Board of the latest Board ruling with respect to vacations with pay.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I might ask the Minister -- the letter that I read from the Building Trades Council was dated March 29th of this year. He read on to the record a

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)....reply to a letter which he received last September. Might I ask if any further representation was made to him since September of last year in respect of this, particularly because of the deepening of the unemployment situation from last September to what it has been within this last month or so. And a further question connected with his reply dealing with the independent trucker, has there been any representations made to his department by any individuals or groups on behalf of the independent truckers of Manitoba?

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I've several matters I'd like to raise. First of all, did I understand the Minister to say that those complaints, or those people who still feel aggrieved at Grand Rapids for what they consider to be underpayment before Dr. Martin went up there, that the course for them to follow is to take it up with the individual companies concerned? Now my question is, supposing they don't agree with the interpretation of their case by Drake or Patricia, I would like to know to whom do they go? Do they then go to the Hydro-Electric Board? Do they go to the Department of Labour? Precisely to whom do they go? Because they do not -- (Interjection) -- I'm not saying that they're right at the moment -- but they do not feel that their cases have been disposed of to their satisfaction and I think they're entitled to know to what department of government, if any, they should take their complaint.

The other thing is, Mr. Chairman -- I stepped out for a moment, but I stepped out while the Honourable Leader of the CCF was speaking and I came back while he was still speaking. If the Minister made a clarification with regard to the matter I raised with regard to Mr. Desbrow, I must say I'm at a loss as to when he made that clarification. I still say, Mr. Chairman, that I was under the misapprehension, and Mr. Desbrow is under the misapprehension, if we were, that the Minister suggested -- and I read this part in the Hansard -- that Mr. Desbrow had been convicted of bootlegging. My information is that it's not so and I'm suggesting that the Minister ought to, if my information is correct, that the Minister ought to put into the record what the facts are so there should be no misunderstanding.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I just want to deal very briefly at this time with the matter raised by the Leader of the CCF, the question of the 120 hours in any two-week period, straight time pay at Grand Rapids. I'm not suggesting for a moment, and I think I've been very careful in past years not to suggest that it is practical to have a maximum work week of 40 hours a week on remote projects. I certainly understand the fact that in order to get people to go up to places like Kelsey or Thompson or Grand Rapids, that there needs to be some inducement. But I do, Mr. Chairman, want to suggest to the government that they ought to be having a real serious, and let's put it this way, a non-political, non-partisan look at this. Surely at a time when there are 30,000 unemployed in the Greater Winnipeg area, that it doesn't make much sense to be saying that people shall work 120 hours in any two-week period at straight time. First of all, I think the Minister must agree that this means that less people will work than if the normal hours prevailed. Now possibly the normal hours in the Greater Winnipeg area can't prevail, but surely it's not necessary to have 120 hours in any two-week period. What this means, Mr. Chairman, and I think Members should understand it, it doesn't just mean a 60 hour week at straight time. What it means, and the Minister will remember because I raised this in connection with Kelsey, if, for example, in the month of April there happens to be a week in which the weather is bad in which people work only 30 hours, now obviously they can't be paid for more time than they work and nobody would expect the employer to do that and they don't expect it, but all it means is that the next week instead of 60 hours at straight time, it is possible, and not only is it possible but on other projects it has happened, that they are required to work 90 hours at straight time. Now that cannot be justified on any basis at all; not by reasons of health or anything else. I want to suggest to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that the government take a serious look at not a 40 hour maximum, but a serious look at the extensions to Grand Rapids of The Fair Wage Provisions, if not the Zone A provisions then the Zone B provisions. I can see the point that employees want to work more than 48 hours a week on these remote projects.

I can see the point that the contractor and the Hydro don't want to be putting up expensive accommodation facilities, and the Minister would be right if he said I would be the first one, or one of the first ones to complain if the facilities weren't of a high standard. So I can see all that, but surely the extension of provisions whereby after 48 hours of work in any one week employees would be paid time and a half, surely that is not too much to expect in the year 1961

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.)....with the large scale unemployment which we have. I'm not expecting the Minister to change his mind today because we happen to have spoken on it, but I would urge the Minister and the government to have another look at this provision and to bring it more in line with what is common practice in the rest of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I think I should just answer very briefly about the hours of work -- were there any further representations? I must confess that we have met, I think twice since that time, with Members of the Building Trades Council who have, on each occasion, expressed pretty strong views with respect to a 40 hour week. I don't know of any representations from truckers with respect to preference on government contracts. There may have been, but none have come to me. None have come to my attention. The workers, I would say, should go to their employers if they aren't satisfied with --- this is for the Member from St. John's -- the workers who feel that they still have further wages coming to them. I understand that they mostly are fixed up. At least I was under the impression that they had been fixed up. There may still be some isolated cases. If there are and they can't get satisfaction from the company involved, I would ask them to get in touch with either the Hydro-Electric Board or myself. With respect to Mr. Desbrow, I certainly at no time indicated that he was bootlegging. In fact, I know that he wasn't charged with bootlegging. My information was that he had 17 cases of beer in an unlawful place. Now that certainly doesn't indicate bootlegging. I didn't mean to convey the idea that he was bootlegging because certainly the evidence wasn't conclusive with respect to that particular charge. -- (Interjection) -- He was a good and healthy drinker.

The Fair Wage Act -- I will say this about Grand Rapids. There are implications, I think, that conditions are quite different at Grand Rapids than they were at either Kelsey or Thompson. We fully expect that this job will be an organized job and, in that respect, they will be the hours of work and the wages that are determined from time to time between the employer and his employees. We fully expect it will be organized; we fully expect that the hours will be established to the wishes of the employees involved. I must say that to extend The Fair Wage Act to remote areas is completely unrealistic. In my experience, I have found that people even on 54 hours of work, 54 hour contract, they can be very dissatisfied in remote areas without normal recreational facilities. I think that it would certainly be quite reasonable with respect to any extension in this Act that can be justified, but circumstances certainly must warrant it before we make any changes at all.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has said that there were some proposed changes in The Labour Relations Act and if we asked for them he'd give them to us.

MR. CARROLL: No, Mr. Chairman, I didn't say that there were any proposed changes in The Labour Relations Act.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, it was suggested in the Speech from The Throne. You said you would indicate what they were.

MR. CARROLL: You're asking about The Manitoba Labour Act. Well we were going to add the new Acts that have come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labour. We've changed the definitions of an inspector -- it's been clarified somewhat. We propose to give authority to The Manitoba Labour Board to conduct votes to determine the employees preference. You will recall that there was a case with respect to decertification of Brandon Packers where the courts ruled against the Board and there was some.....

MR. ROBLIN: I'd just like to interrupt, Mr. Chairman, if we're going to have a bill on this, should we not wait until the bill is in the House?

MR. ORLIKOW: He offered to tell us.

MR. ROBLIN: I know he's a co-operative fellow but, on reflection, I think we should wait until the bill is in the House, because otherwise we'll have two debates. We don't want that, do we?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister in answer to a question of mine on the winter works program indicated that the province hadn't done as much this year insofar as the provincial level was concerned as it did the year before. I would like the Minister, if he would be kind enough, to outline the differences insofar as provincial aid this year as to those of last year -- as far as provincial participation in any winter works program is concerned.

MR. CARROLL: Well, very briefly, I think we contributed 50 -- at least 30 percent to

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . all federal projects last year irrespective of the length of time that the people had been unemployed; whether they had unemployment insurance coming to them; or whether or not they were recipients of social welfare. This year we said we will only participate with respect to those employees who are not eligible for unemployment insurance. We'll pay 25 percent with respect to these people; we will pay 50 percent with respect to an individual who has been on social assistance for 90 days. In other words, if the municipality was employing a man who was on social assistance, 100 percent of the wage bill would be paid by the Federal Government and the Provincial Government. If they were employing an individual who was not eligible for unemployment insurance but who is not on social assistance, they would be getting 75 percent of the wage bill paid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 75 passed; Resolution 76 passed; Resolution 77 passed. Item 4 (a) passed, (b) passed, (c) passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, were there any changes in the Apprenticeship Training Program of this year over the previous year?

MR. CARROLL: We're on Employment Standards as I see it here.

MR. PAULLEY: Well the Chairman was going so rapidly I thought he's got down Item 4.

MR. CARROLL: If he could wait till that item, Mr. Chairman, I'll be pleased to

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4 -- passed.

MR. CARROLL: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman, possibly you were on the right one. I may have been behind.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I think I'm still on the right one, Mr. Chairman. If you don't mind-- No. 4. I was asking questions as to the Apprenticeship Program. Are there any changes made? What efforts are being made to accelerate the program? Is it going to tie in with the oft spoken of concentration on retraining of our unemployed? I want to know what the general program is of the department for apprenticeship training

MR. CARROLL: There have been no very substantial changes in the program itself. The only one that might be considered a change, we are co-operating with the other provinces to work out uniformity with respect to our various trades and the standards under which we train them and the standards of proficiency which we demand of them to qualify. We're also co-operating with the department with respect to training under schedule M -- training of the unemployed. I don't think that I can add anything at the moment. There's been no change, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAULLEY: Are there any changes in respect to unemployed young people who are taking apprenticeship training under Schedule M, insofar as board and keep are concerned?

MR. CARROLL: I don't believe there is any contribution by the province with respect to Schedule M.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, just to follow up this conversation, it appears several provinces of Canada have taken advantage of the offer given by the Federal Government in order to give some apprenticeship training to a lot of the unemployed people, particularly the Province of British Columbia who is doing quite a bit in this regard. Now we know that in this province here that any student that wishes to attend a training school, that is the MTI for example here under the sponsorship of this government, has to have a certain standard of qualification; and I think it is either grade IX or X. Now are there any restrictions going to be made to people, of whom there are quite a number of students who probably left school before they completed their Grade VIII standing. Would any of these students, or these people who are in the unemployed group have to conform to the regulations of having the standard education acceptable in the MTI for their apprenticeship training, compared to anyone that's leaving school, say at the age of fifteen or sixteen at the present time, I think this program is in effect in British Columbia because of the assistance they are going to get from the Federal Government.

MR. CARROLL: The only thing I can say with respect to Manitoba's contribution to the training of unemployed, I understand that we have a higher percentage of people taking advantage of this training in Manitoba than any other province, including British Columbia. I don't know what the requirements are for entrance, I think that's in the field of education here, I am told that it becomes very difficult for an individual without a full grade IX, I believe, to be able to have the necessary background in mathematics and other subjects to enable him to

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.)... absorb and to get the most out of this training. Now I don't know what the qualifications are here or whether we have actually lowered them with respect to training under Schedule M.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Would there be an exception to the case after a person who has left school at the age of 16 and has been working for two or three years, his age is probably 19 or 20, would that particular person be penalized now that he's not working, has nothing to fall back on, and couldn't take an apprenticeship training course?

MR. CARROLL: I'm afraid I don't know whether there are any minimum educational requirements as there are under apprenticeship. I'll certainly endeavour to find out and will report back to you later on this particular item, although this is more in the field of education than it is in the field of labour. We co-operate with them but the standards, of course, are something between education and the Federal Department of Labour.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I thought I understood the Minister to say that there was a keen demand for these people that were graduating from the apprenticeship training classes, then later on you said that the number that could be accommodated was limited by the demand. Now are we turning out sufficient apprentices to satisfy industry or not?

MR. CARROLL: Limited by the opportunities that employers open up for apprentices. In other words, there can be a demand for the skilled tradesman that you have at the end of an apprenticeship program -- the journeyman. There can be a demand for those without necessarily an opportunity at the bottom end for him to get into apprenticeship. I think that the only limitation at the moment is with respect to the opportunities of people to get into the apprenticeship program.

MR. WRIGHT: Would it not be a good thing then to increase the opportunities? I don't see anything in the estimates -- I don't see any increased grants here for it.

MR. CARROLL: It isn't a question of grants, it's a question of employers taking in apprentices to train under them. This is my understanding of the situation. We are not moving them up because we don't have sufficient money in our estimates or the Department of Education estimates to train these people. If there's any hold up at all, it's with respect to the opportunities that employers are offering to people to come in and take this kind of training. There may be people who should be taking apprentices in, and giving them this help who are not doing it. They may prefer to work with journeymen only. There are certain contractors possibly who should be co-operating more fully. Now this is the information that comes to me and certainly I think most employers are co-operative. We are endeavouring, of course, to sell this program throughout the province and have been meeting, according to the figures, a high degree of success because the apprenticeship program has been expanding very rapidly in the province.

MR. PETERS: The Minister stated that they're working together with the other provinces to standardize their -- instruction, is it? Would that mean in future that people obtaining Stationary Engineer's tickets and so on and different certificates would be recognized in other provinces because of this standardization that he speaks of?

MR. CARROLL: I would say that that's possibly the hope, although Stationary Engineering doesn't come under The Apprenticeship Act. It comes under Mechanical Engineering and governed by their association. It is the aim to standardize those courses that do come under apprenticeship. At the present time automotive, plumbers and electricians are standardized. There are national qualifications recognized for these trades. Carpentry and sheet metal work is coming under standardization this year.

MR. PETERS: The reason I asked, Mr. Chairman, was this. I had been speaking to somebody and I understand that the department has been thinking of getting people that have boilers and stuff to take in apprentices to take up Stationary Engineering -- to be a Stationary Engineer. That's the reason I asked that.

MR. CARROLL: I think one of the problems there is that there are people in the -- my understanding of the situation is this -- there are people who are training as engineers who are not qualifying for the higher degrees and they are holding up progress. There's a bottleneck there. People aren't going along and getting up into the higher qualifications of engineers and there are some difficulties, there are just not enough openings at the lower levels so that

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.)....good young people can come in and get started and can start up this ladder, because they are held up at the bottom end. But this isn't under apprenticeship.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 78 passed, Item 5 (a) passed.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, would the Minister tell us why he gave assurance to the union, if the strike was settled he would call off the enquiry, particularly in view of the fact he knew what the enquiry might bring out after discussions with Morris Arpin, the Commission Counsel.

MR. CARROLL: If he asked the unions, Mr. Chairman, I think he would find that there were no such assurances given at all. I think you will find out that the unions, who made representation to the government at least, were most adamant in their request that the government call this thing off, and we would give certainly no such assurance at all.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, Norm Riches is quoted in the Brandon paper as saying that the Minister gave them assurance. Mr. Payton has apparently substantiated this remark and there was no denial coming from the Minister after the statement was made.

MR. CARROLL: Well I'm afraid I don't place much faith in what Mr. Norm Riches says -- or Mr. Payton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) passed, (c) --passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Where are we?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on 5 (d).

MR. PAULLEY: I want to ask the Minister in view of the reduction in the conciliation boards and the other boards, the Labour Relations Board, is it because he contemplates less difficulty in the labour field in the -- some people have a fear of in this chamber, particularly my honourable friend for St. Boniface -- does the Minister somewhat agree with some of our contentions that matters within the realm of labour-management relations coupled with governmental assistance is going to be less in the year to come than they were before?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I am not so optimistic as my friend opposite, I do contemplate though a change in The Labour Department Act which might enable us to save a little bit of money on this particular item.

MR. PAULLEY: Conciliation fees?

MR. CARROLL: One of the proposed amendments that we will bring in, if I may just touch on it briefly, is that our Labour Board at the present time is a seven man board. I think we are the only province in Canada with a board composed of seven individuals. These people are all pretty busy people and the work, of course, of the board is growing each year and there's quite a lot of pressure on them for the time that it takes for them to attend these board meetings. We have got an alternative board set up now who meets once a week and the main board meets once a week. We feel that there would be some merit in cutting down the size of the board or enabling the board to meet in panels of possibly three, rather than the full man board of seven. We feel in many cases that a smaller board can perform adequately and relieve the individuals of the demands on their time to attend these regular board meetings.

MR. PAULLEY: This deals, Mr. Chairman, with the board that the Minister told us about that was going to be now headed by Dean Tallin, I understand. When I asked, and I think it's a good departure for the government to take, that the Deputy Minister should not be connected with this board. I understood from the Minister that it was by virtue of the resignation of the Deputy Minister from the Board itself that they decided on some other individual. Is that correct?

MR. CARROLL: Only partly, Mr. Chairman. I think the growing demands on the Department of Labour make it necessary for some sort of a change here as well. The work of the board of course, increasing at the same time, makes this a very desirable change. We're not unmindful of the representations that have been made to us in this respect as well, I might say.

MR. PAULLEY: I am not unmindful of those representations, Mr. Chairman, and I am glad to hear from the Minister of Labour that, due to the growing demands of the department and due to the growing demands on the Deputy Minister of Labour, that changes are being made in the constitution of this particular body. I would suggest to him that he reread Hansard and ask his friend the Leader of the House to re-read it, particularly the aspect dealing with the growing demand, so that before too long that those demands on the department are recognized

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) with the placement of a full-time Minister of Labour.

I think if it's true of the Deputy Minister, it's equally true of the Minister of Labour. Now I'd like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, and of course when saying this I appreciate very much the fact that the choice of the Chairman I believe lies in the hands of the government itself. What were the particular qualifications leading to the choice of Dean Tallin as the Chairman of the Labour Relations Board?

MR. CARROLL: I think, Mr. Chairman, my opening statement in which we read into the record the qualifications of Dean Tallin, the fact that he is well respected on both sides of the question; he has been the unanimous choice of employers and employees for most of 20 conciliation boards that he's sat on; and his broad experience in the field of labour; has led us to ask him to sit as Chairman of the board.

MR. PAULLEY: This then I would take it, Mr. Chairman, because of the position that Dean Tallin, I believe, holds in the academic field, that this will be a part-time appointment. Now is it not going to be rather burdensome, of course I guess that's up to the individual himself to decide before he accepts or on the acceptance of this, the question does arise in my mind whether or not in view of the statements of the Minister of the increasing amount of work, whether or not rather than on a part-time basis that this warrants a person, and I want to assure you, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister and the members of the committee in saying these remarks, I have no personal objection at all to Dean Tallin. I know him to be an honourable and upright individual and I'm not raising these questions because of the individual concerned. I want that to be clearly understood. But in view of the fact of the pressure of business and the increased burden of the Labour Relations Board, whether even a man as capable as Dean Tallin will be able to give sufficient time and energy to this very very responsible position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) (1) passed. . . .

It's 5:30 and I shall leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.