

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.	Virden	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, Thursday, March 23rd, 1961

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.
Reading and Receiving Petitions.
Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.
Notice of Motion.
Introduction of Bills.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 69, An Act to amend the Municipal Board Act.

MR. M.E. McKELLER (Souris-Lansdowne) introduce Bill No. 71, An Act respecting The Municipal Enquiry Commission in Manitoba.

MR. LYON introduced Bill No. 76, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville) introduced Bill No. 23, An Act to amend The Watershed Conservation Districts Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee of the Whole.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the proposed resolutions standing in my name on the order paper.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 1 - Resolve that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act by providing for the making of a levy in each year on municipalities, no part of which is in Metropolitan Winnipeg, the proceeds of which is to be paid over as directed by the executive committees of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and Manitoba Urban Association, the levy to be of such amount as stated in a joint request made in respect of that year by those two organizations.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I think the wording of the resolution itself is pretty well self-explanatory. This is a request that has been made of the government by the Union of Municipalities and the Urban Association of Manitoba whereby on their request to the Minister, he may make a levy pursuant to provisions of Section 9 of the Department of Municipal Affairs Act for any purpose that they may wish. I can advise the committee however that the prime purpose at the present time for this request, initially at least, will be for the raising of money to support the Municipal Inquiry Commission. I think the amount that they will probably require will be in the area of \$10,000, which will require a levy of some fraction of one mill over all municipalities in Manitoba outside of the Metro area.

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I don't know if this is the proper place to bring it up, but I was wondering whether it would not be possible to tell us specifically the purposes for which the money could be requested, because it seems to me it's pretty wide.

MR. LYON: I think that was in the minds of the Urban Association and the Union as well, Mr. Chairman. They asked for the power in general form because they have one or two other projects which while not current will be coming up in the future, which will probably require a very minimal assessment for their support. I think one thing they are thinking of, and I wouldn't want, of course, to bind those two organizations by anything that I say, but I think one thing they are thinking of in the future perhaps might be a course for Secretary-Treasurers in Manitoba which they might wish to support, and they would use this medium for that purpose; but I know I raised that specific question myself as to whether or not it should be limited to a definite purpose. You will note however when you see the legislation that it is only done at their joint request and for an amount as stipulated by the two organizations.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister if the vote was passed unanimously at the meeting of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities or if there were some opposing such a move; and also whether the government could not see fit to contribute enough money so that this investigation could be carried on without having to levy on the municipalities? We have had the experience in the past of municipalities asking for levies like on cancer, on soldiers' taxation relief and then coming to the government and asking that they be relieved of these levies. So I think if it were possible that the government should help to finance this commission, this enquiry, so that the principle should not be established of levying on the municipalities for this purpose.

MR. RUSSELL (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I was almost going to say what the Honourable Member for Carillon said in reference to this resolution. It seems to me that the municipalities in the past have impressed upon the administration and eventually have been generally successful in having levies on the municipalities gradually abolished and done away with. I know that the Provincial Municipal Committee that was set up back in -- reported in 1952 or '53 as I recall, convinced the government in respect of the municipal commissioner's levy -- if I recall correctly -- the cancer levy as reported by my honourable friend; the T.B. levy; the soldiers' taxation and one or two others. (Interjection) Yes, as a matter of fact it was amazing to me the generosity of my honourable friends at that time, I don't know whether there was an election coming up or not. But apart from that the principle was established at that time. Now then while it might be true that this request is made in respect of the Municipal Inquiry Commission, and I join with the Member for Carillon when he suggests that the payment for this, it's a very vital and necessary commission -- as a matter of fact I would go further and suggest -- almost brought in a resolution this year for the establishment of another committee, a joint committee, between the province and the municipalities to investigate all aspects of municipal government including the financing of the municipalities, the division of responsibilities, and the re-assessment of a base structure for financing of the municipality. I said that I had that in mind, I may do it yet. I want to find out more about this Municipal Inquiry Commission before going further in that regard; but I do suggest that this is a request that appears to me from the brief statement that the Minister gave of the municipalities desiring to have sufficient monies to foster and promote this enquiry commission; surely to goodness the government -- if it is the amount of approximately \$10,000 or \$20,000 that is the request at the present time -- surely to goodness the government of the Province of Manitoba out of its huge budget, without placing a levy on the municipalities could find sufficient monies to give to the two respective organizations in order that they might carry out this particular survey.

Now also the point touched on by my honourable friend the Member for Carillon, I think is a very, very valid one. Was this unanimous in both of these conventions that they would accept a levy on their respective municipalities or towns for this purpose; because if it was not, then I think that we're not being fair with our municipalities. I think that the municipalities, if it was by unanimous consent, could have among themselves agreed that each and every municipality or town or city outside the metropolitan orbit could have made a contribution on a basis mutually agreed upon to raise this \$10,000. I think, Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness that this, with all due deference to the men and women who make up the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Urban Association, this is a departure from a practice that I think has been established and established properly after thorough investigation in years back, and I would suggest to these two organizations that they reconsider this matter before going back into the hodgepodge of levies for specific purposes of this, that and the other, because while this is starting out just for one purpose as intimated by the Honourable the Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs, heaven knows where it might end up in the future. It may go back to the old hodgepodge that we had before. I respectfully suggest that serious consideration be given to this; I respectfully suggest to the government that if it is a question of \$10,000 or so, that rather than go through this procedure to put a levy, even though requested by the municipalities, on the municipalities for this purpose, that there is within the budget and in the coffers of the Province of Manitoba sufficient monies to take care of this without a levy on our municipalities.

MR. E.I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, I think that possibly I can speak for the municipalities in regards to this. I am surprised at the comments made by the Leader of

(Mr. Dow, cont'd.) the CCF Party, because this is one opportunity that the two organizations felt that they could stand on their own feet. It was their desire and their attitude to conditions throughout the province that they instigated this inquiry and they wanted to do it in such a manner that they were independent of any government subsidization. They felt that this was an opportunity of which rather than coming to the government and even agreeing that they could get a sum of money to do it, they thought it would have more impact and would serve the purpose of which they're trying to achieve much better by doing it themselves. Therefore I hope that this House will agree with their ideas that this is one time they wish to stand on their own feet.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I can only re-echo the words of the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain whom I believe was present at the meeting of the union and indeed at the meeting of the urban association when this joint resolution, I think it was worded in the same terms, was presented to both meetings. He has hit the nail on the head exactly when he says that this is a project which the union and which the urban association have taken unto themselves. They want to finance this themselves; the government has already given them an initial grant I think of either \$1,500 or \$2,000, the exact amount escapes me, as an establishment grant to get this Inquiry Commission going. It was at their request that we acceded of the suggestion that the levy be put on, and while I don't recall the exact vote, and I couldn't say categorically that it was unanimous, I think if not unanimous, nearly unanimous in practically both meetings. Now I stand to be corrected on that and certainly the representatives of the urban and the union can tell us when we get this bill into committee stage.

The other point I would like to respond to is that made by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party when he talks about the need for such an inquiry commission. I think we're all well aware of it and I have nothing but the highest of praise for the Union and Urban Association for their taking of the initiative in this project and deciding without prodding by the government or anybody else to do this themselves, and this I think is the nub of the point. They're undertaking through this Inquiry Commission one of the most fundamental searches of municipal government in Manitoba that perhaps has ever been undertaken. The Chairman, as we all know is Dr. Murray Fisher, the former Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs for many years, and he has on the Inquiry Commission with him selected representatives from both the urban and the union. The Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne introduced a bill in the House today, a private members' bill, which will give legislative status to this Inquiry Commission, because it's not something that's going to last for just a month or two or perhaps a year or two; it may go on longer than that. I can only say that this is a very fundamental search into the vitals, the very vitals, of municipal government in Manitoba. One which the municipal organizations are undertaking at their own behalf; one in which I think they want to see the government stand apart from, because this is something that they realize has to be done and they want to present us with their story of what they think should be done to municipal government in Manitoba. So while there may be some merit as applied to other situations in the suggestion that has been raised by the Honourable Member for Carillon and from the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party, I think this is one instance where the mode of procedure that has been sought by the Urban Association and the Union is certainly justified, and I know that they will both be ready to appear at the Municipal Affairs Committee or Law Amendments wherever this bill appears after second reading in committee and give the full story to the members of those committees so that you can hear it from their own lips. I can only say now that I would ask the committee to approve this resolution in its present form; we hope that we can give any further detail, answer any further questions when the bill reaches the committee stage.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I have the same information as the Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain, and like him and other members of the House I've a very high regard for the executives and the membership of both of the municipal associations that have been mentioned; but I still have the feeling that the municipal men are perhaps being a bit optimistic when they ask for levies to be put on themselves, because we have the history of the past years to go by in seeing that these inquiries are likely to last longer than are expected at the time that the proposal is made for them, and I can't help but think of the levy that the municipalities used to carry. As a matter of fact when I first came to this House something in the neighbourhood of 20 to 25 percent of the total revenues of the province were direct levy on the municipalities. The program had been started as a

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) patriotic levy it was called at the time of World War I, then it gradually got more and more things added to it to the extent that when the revenues of the province in total were below \$11 million, that direct levy by the provincial government on the municipalities was something like \$2,200,000. It was because of that levy of that day that the equalized assessment was first entered into because up to that time it hadn't mattered so much what the original program of any municipality was, whether they had a low assessment and a high mill rate -- they just had their own money to raise anyway -- but when the province started putting levies on them it was recognized that there had to be some basis of equalization as between the two. Well now we've gone around to where all these levies have been wiped off and instead huge grants in the form of the unconditional grants and assistance to schools, health services and so many others; roads are now being given back to the municipalities, and I think there is a danger of the municipal people themselves creating a bad precedent by asking the government to put levies upon them. On the other hand I recognize their spirit of independence when they want to feel responsible by themselves rather than having the government do something of this kind. I'm wondering if the work that they're attempting couldn't be completed in a comparatively short time; the Minister said it may go on for a couple of years or longer. Personally I don't see any need of it taking that length of time. I have very high regard for the members who have been put on that Inquiry Commission and I think they should be able to wind up their inquiry in a short time. However, I suppose the thing for us to do is agree that the bill should be introduced; we can discuss it further on second reading and then, most important of all I suppose, hear from the municipal representatives themselves. I would like to ask this question of the Minister responsible though, Mr. Chairman, and that is, according to the resolution will this idea be carried forward into the bill that this joint request is to be made every year by the two organizations? Are they to determine the amount of money every year?

MR. LYON: Actually, Mr. Chairman, it will be a joint request for a fixed amount, if any. Actually the legislation will read that way.

MR. CAMPBELL: Every year?

MR. LYON: No, not every year. Just as and when requested. If they want to raise a certain flat amount for a specified purpose that may run for two or three years they would, I presume, raise that amount in the first year or they could choose to raise it by whatever means they wanted. But the levy would only be raised upon the joint request of the two organizations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Carried. Resolution No. 2. Resolved it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Expropriation Act by providing among other matters that where title to land or an interest therein has become vested in Her Majesty under expropriation proceedings, on application by the owner and on request of the Minister concerned, the Provincial Treasurer may pay to the owner up to seventy-five percentum of the estimated value of the property expropriated.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, just a word of explanation about this section which was I think, forecast by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture when he was dealing with expropriations in connection with the floodway. This is a section that would specifically give the Minister power to make settlement -- not to make settlement, I want to avoid that word -- to pay a landowner whose land has been expropriated, 75 percent in cash of an estimated value which the Minister would set without doing any prejudice at all to any agreements that the owner may be making with the Minister or without doing prejudice at all to the principle that he can go on to arbitration. This is merely a device whereby money, cash money, can be put into the hands of the expropriated landowner to enable him to resettle or to look for a new site after his land has been expropriated. (Interjection) My honourable friend has raised a point which might well occur. The government may well be assisting the expropriated landowner to pay lawyer's fees to fight the settlement. That is certainly conceivably possible. But this is as I've mentioned, that is the prime purpose, a new device under the Act to permit money to get over to the landowner faster without abridging or prejudicing in any way any settlement that he may want to make, or any agreement that he may want to make, or prejudicing in any way his full rights of arbitration under the Act. It merely ensures that he can get some money up to 75 percent of the fixed value right off the bat. "On his request," I should mention -- where he requests it.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster):the Minister of Agriculture to make the 100 percent assessment of which you will pay 75 percent. In other words you stated that the

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) Minister of Agriculture will put 100 percent assessment then you ask for authority to pay 75 percent. What would be the authority or the basis on which the Minister of Agriculture will put his 100 percent assessment?

MR. LYON: He would give that assessment, I would presume, on the advice of assessment officers on his own staff, and of course the figure that ultimately would be arrived at, I would imagine in most cases would be above, probably above that figure or around it. But the 75 percent is inserted to make sure that the man is not paid more in the original instance than he would end up receiving finally after the thing was all completed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Honourable the Attorney-General if, after this legislation is passed, is it the intention of the Minister of Agriculture or whoever is the responsible party for expropriation, transmitting at the time of notice of expropriation, the amount of money that he is prepared to offer for the property?

MR. LYON: I'd have to ask the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman. I'm bringing in the bill as a legal matter; I don't know what the administrative practice will be. All I know is that this is devised entirely to give a better deal in terms of quicker payment over to the person who loses his land.

MR. PAULLEY: My point, Mr. Chairman, is not the question of quicker payment, it's the question of quicker information to the parties concerned as to what their offer will be. Now my honourable friend the Attorney-General said that this is a legal matter. We have raised the question of the legal matter, particularly in reference to Section 13, of the Expropriation Act, I'm not going to suggest that we should go over all the agreements again. But, again I want to try and draw from the legal mind of the government, and in all deference to the rest of the law fraternity on that side, I mean by this the Attorney-General, as to whether or not the Expropriation Act itself will be adhered to after this practice has been established, of where there will be an assessment made, an offer made albeit 75 percent at the time -- or at least, allowable 75 percent in cash. The point that I'm, of course, obviously getting at is will there be after the passage of this legislation more conformity to the law of Manitoba as we see it on this side of the House?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I can only assure my honourable friend that the law of Manitoba will be observed just as strictly after the passing of this Act as it has been up to the present. And while that may not satisfy my honourable friend, I know that it will satisfy all reasonable thinking people in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, satisfies the people whose properties are being expropriated. And while I don't mind the Honourable the Attorney-General referring to me by implication as not being a reasonable person, I would suggest that all of those people who are under expropriation are reasonable people.

MR. LYON: we're trying to help the reasonable people by this amendment.

MR. GRAY: Is it the opinion of the Attorney-General that the Minister of Agriculture has such a physical and big heart; we can depend on him that he will treat everyone alike, because his heart physically and otherwise stretches out so wide that probably he could make a mistake in certain constituencies.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, it's my remembrance of the Act regarding expropriation that the Highways Department already has this authority. Is that correct?

MR. LYON: Not specifically, Mr. Chairman, the practice that is adopted in the Department of Public Works is somewhat akin to this but there is no specific legislative authority for it because it deals with part payment on lands for which agreements have been made prior to the filing of the expropriation plan. It is rather an ad hoc arrangement that was made I think, oh, about 4 years ago where they started getting agreements for sale which they registered by way of caveat and then on the basis of this agreement for sale and caveat, which represented a final settlement by the way, they then paid out I think it was four-fifths of the amount agreed. This is akin to that procedure but different, because here payment's to be made out after the filing of the expropriation plan on the basis of 75 percent of an estimated value only, which is not agreed between the parties, and which will not prejudice agreement between the parties of perhaps a larger amount.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, is the Honourable the Attorney-General sure that even though the Expropriation Act itself has not been changed that there was not a change in the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) Public Works Act which gave this same authority? I seem to recall that there was.

MR. LYON: I am not; I couldn't speak categorically on that at all. I know what the practice is and I don't know myself though of any legislative change that was brought in but I'll certainly check on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted. Passed. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole 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 Winnipeg Centre the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. LYON introduced Bill No. 70, An Act to Amend the Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

MR. LYON introduced Bill No. 73, An Act to Amend the Expropriation Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer but I cannot state the question unless I get one or two words why I'm asking it. That's in connection with the Provincial Savings Bonds. I understand that this has a limited time for people to subscribe to it. I find also that it's very popular, and I'm glad of it. I suggested that years ago but it's still popular and the money's coming in. Why should the Provincial Treasurer limit the time knowing that the province has to borrow money all the time, and as long as the people in the province are willing to subscribe to it --and which is a very wonderful thing to invest money in their own province on the security of the people of the province -- why limit the time of doing it? There was criticism that we had to pay, or the province had to pay one percent to the seller. But that one percent covers ten years of bonds, which means a tenth of one percent. So there's no expense to it. The province gets money for five percent where they had to go and stand on their knees occasionally to the American investors and Canadian investors to get a loan. Why not continue this all year round, and have the the money invested in the province on the security of the people of the province.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, that's one of the most interesting questions I've heard for a long time. The short answer, Sir, is that we only can use so much money within a certain period of time. Therefore there's not much advantage to us in obtaining more than we require at one particular period. That means that our best interests are served by going to the market at intervals, depending upon our need for money. I'm glad to be able to say that the bond issue does appear to be going well, and I may make a further statement on it this afternoon before we rise.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health & Public Welfare) (Gimli): Before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House the three copies of the Manitoba Hospital Survey Board Report dealing with hospital facilities. When these are laid on the table, at this time I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the second and final report of the Willard Survey or the Manitoba Hospital Survey Board Report dealing with personnel will be filed as soon as it is completed. The completion of this report has taken much longer than was anticipated, mainly because of the complexity of the study once we got into it, or the Board did. Secondly, members of the board have had an unexpectedly heavy load placed upon them during the course of the study. Dr. Willard during this period was named Deputy Minister of National Welfare by the Prime Minister in the summer of 1960, and shortly thereafter, Mr. McNabb was appointed Deputy Director of the Hospital Services Plan of Ontario. Because of this delay and because of the widespread interest in the report, it is being tabled immediately upon receipt and before it has been printed. I have asked that copies of this report in stencil form be prepared for distribution to the Members of the Legislature and to all hospitals in the province. These reports will be laid on members' desks today. By distribution of the preliminary report or the completed report in this form to all hospitals in the province will give them an opportunity to study the report while it is being studied simultaneously by the government. The copies of the report which members and hospitals will receive contain certain slight misspellings, certain errors and omissions in punctuation and minor variations from the three edited copies

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) which I am tabling. None of these changes really affect the intent of the recommendations contained in the report. I have also, Mr. Speaker, ordered printing of the report from a copy identical to the reports tabled. Immediately the printed copies are available they will replace the advance copies which are now being made available. It is obvious that this is a very lengthy detailed study and report. I believe it will prove to be the most comprehensive study of hospital needs completed in Canada. It will take the government I'm sure months to study and report and determine the portions thereof that can be adopted and endorsed as a matter of government policy in its program for the expansion of hospital services and facilities.

I must point out Mr. Speaker, I'm most grateful to the National Minister of Health, the Honourable J. Waldo Monteith for asking Dr. Willard, for making him rather, available to us as a private consultant for this study, and for his continued services after appointment to his very heavy post. I would also express my thanks to the General Hospital of Port Arthur and the Ontario Hospital Commission for permitting Mr. McNabb to participate. Dr. J.D. Adamson, the third member of the team has, of course, made an immense contribution to our province over the years and we are most grateful for this his latest contribution. I would like to express to all members of the Survey Board and the Secretary Mr. Holland and the Manitoba Hospital Services Council, who acted as an advisory committee to the Board, and to other members of our staff involved in this report, the government's deepest appreciation.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, can we get a week off to read the report? The question is directed to the Leader of the House.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think that's an excellent suggestion and I'm personally going to take a week off to read it just as soon as the House rises.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Education, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Four portable schoolrooms have just arrived in Manitoba for use in Northern Manitoba. Were these schoolrooms which were built in Alberta, were tenders called at the government's request?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that as notice because I really have no idea as to whether they were purchased by the Government of Manitoba or not. I expect that if they were, the tenders were called, because that is our practice, but that fact can be ascertained.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Utilities. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, this bill is one which I have given a great deal of thought and a great deal of research and a great deal of soul-searching since I first learned that it was the intention to combine these two great utilities. I wanted to satisfy myself that we were doing the right thing. Yesterday I hadn't looked at my copy of the order paper and this matter came up for debate. Quite frankly Mr. Speaker, I had some reservations about the necessity of combining these two utilities and as a result of the questions that arose in my mind some time ago when this matter was being discussed, I made some enquiries of the Minister; I made some enquiries from other jurisdictions, other provinces in Canada and from some of the people that would be affected by this move. As of yesterday when this matter came up for debate I had not received the answers to all of my queries, and in view of the fact that I was lacking this information yesterday, I adjourned the debate on second reading of this bill. Since adjourning the debate yesterday I have received most of the information which I sought and as a result this has removed from my mind any objections that I might have to passing on the principle of this bill on second reading. I think that the bill should certainly go to committee and no doubt at the committee the officials of the two utilities would be there to answer any questions of a technical nature which I might want to raise and which any member of the committee might want to raise at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak on

MR. CAMPBELL: Before closing the debate I wish to make a few remarks on this bill Mr. Speaker. I have no objection at all to anyone proceeding with it today. It's my intention move the adjournment however.

MR. SPEAKER: Anyone else wish to speak now?

MR. CAMPBELL: If no one wishes to proceed today, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Carillon that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 50. The Honourable the Minister of Utilities.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the leave of the House to let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Second reading of Bill No. 51. The Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge) presented Bill No. 51, an Act to amend The Civil Service Act for second reading.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker the bill is concerned with a number of typographical corrections, a number of technical adjustments in the Act; there is no matter of fundamental principle. I think it might be suitable if we discussed it at the committee stage rather than at second reading.

MR. CAMPBELL: The Honourable the Minister says that there is no matter of fundamental principle involved. I thought perhaps there was one that could qualify for that description because it seemed to me that this bill widens the sphere of authority of the Civil Service Commission to make reclassifications without the necessity of it going to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. It seems to me that that is quite a change in principle and while I think, not necessarily objectionable, is something that we should pay some attention to here and it was that point that I thought perhaps the Minister would wish to cover.

MR. EVANS: I should be very glad to discuss that principle before closing the debate. Are there further question anyone would care to ask?

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker for the last 20 years I've seen hundreds of bills presented here amending typographical errors. Couldn't we get someone who knows English to prepare the bills and avoid the typographical errors?

MR. EVANS: If there are no further questions then Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the point raised by my honourable friend. I might do so without discussing in detail the particular section in question and will try to do that. At the present time the Civil Service Commission can promote, transfer and appoint to positions below a certain grade, but reclassification to a lower maximum salary was inadvertently omitted, that is to say the principle now established in this bill is that it had been intended to place in the Act in the first place the power to reclassify a position to a lower maximum salary; it was omitted at the time the bill was passed in the first place; it's intended now to include this power, and that was the sense in which I meant that it was a technical adjustment. (Interjection) Just about.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and this House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department X - Public Utilities.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, maybe I should say a word at this time about some of the questions which have been raised by the honourable members opposite with respect to the Minister's salary. I am afraid I don't find any of the members in their seats who have raised questions here. Oh yes, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead has now arrived. The Honourable Member from Brokenhead raised some rather interesting questions regarding: (1) wondering why the rate differential with respect to Power Commission rates in parts of his constituency, parts that were on one side or the other of a particular highway. I think it's recognized that the cost of distribution in rural Manitoba is considerably higher than the cost of distribution in the more densely populated areas, built-up areas, and therefore there is a point at which we must have a differential in rate -- there must be a boundary some place -- and in the particular case

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) that was drawn to the attention of the House yesterday, we have the anomaly where there is no apparent difference between people on one side of the line and people on the other and yet it is part of a boundary that was established years ago and has been accepted for some time. It appears that the boundaries of the municipalities of East and West Kildonan, they have been considered the boundaries for beginning of rural rates for a good many years and I am advised that representations dated March 16th of this year were received from one of the municipalities and the Power Commission now has this particular question under consideration and they're studying the matter to determine whether or not the boundaries of Metropolitan Winnipeg might be considered as the boundaries for urban rates rather than the present boundaries that are in existence.

Now with respect to the Manitoba Telephone System service to that portion of the member's constituency adjacent to No. 59 highway. Transcona multi-party area is comprised of portions of North Kildonan, Springfield, East Kildonan, including the Village of Bird's Hill. In July, 1959, we completed an estimate of upgrading in that particular area from eight to nine subscribers to five to six subscribers per line. This work was carried out at a cost to the MTS of \$33,000. Now the growth during the past year and a half has been a total of 91 subscribers. At the present time we have 51 multi-party lines providing service to 384 subscribers at an average of 7.5 subscribers per line. Project No. 6621 included in our 1961-'62 budget -- incidentally we have plans that we will be laying before the House for an upgrading of service in that area if approved by the House would enable us to upgrade service in that particular section of your constituency to give you 4.7 subscribers to the line as compared to the present 7.5 and the estimated cost of this particular work is \$100,000. You see the extremely large capital sums involved in upgrading service of this kind. Now in respect to the Henderson Highway portion, there was a work order in -- the estimate was completed in the latter part of '57 for the upgrading of multi-party subscribers for the above area from nine per line to 5.4 per line. This work was carried out at a cost of \$32,300. To date there has been a growth of 51 subscribers, making a total now of 6.6 subscribers per line on a total of 42 multi-party lines with 276 subscribers. The municipality of East St. Paul contains 26 multi-party lines and 159 subscribers for an average of 6.1 per line. There are three multi-party lines in the Narol area with ten subscribers per line and an arrangement has been underway to reduce these lines to about six, and this work will be done by mid-summer. The average for the whole of your constituency would appear to be in the neighborhood for about 7 subscribers per line; there are only three with ten; all the rest have fewer than 10 subscribers per line.

MR. E.R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, is the Minister referring only to the East St. Paul area? What about the Narol area, just north of that?

MR. CARROLL: No, I'm afraid I -- this is the municipality of East St. Paul. Did you say the Narol area? Well the Narol area -- yes, is included in this. Arrangements have been underway to reduce this in the Narol area from ten to six. The work is -- I mean it's in the program and will likely be done by midsummer of this year.

There were some rather interesting questions on whether consulting services are included as part of the rate base or whether they shouldn't be, and I think it's very difficult for the board either to accept or reject the expenditures for consulting workers on the ground that they're consulting services alone. I mean there must be some other reasons, and I think the final test is whether the expenditure has been prudent or whether it hasn't. For instance it might be possible that certain consulting services might be included in part of a rate base providing it was done as part of the work and part of the capital program of initial construction. Then again part of it might conceivably be part of the expenses of the utility for the year. But it's pretty hard to say that they should or they should not be included. This is a question of judgment on the part of the board and that's something which they alone can determine on the basis of the facts and the studies which they undertake.

The question of plans for expansion to new communities: I'm afraid this is something about which we have no special knowledge at this time and therefore cannot provide any special information. The question was asked as to who our expert consultants were with respect to the Brandon rate hearing. We had four consultants on that hearing: Eric N. Wright, Dr. Gordon Blake, Carson Templeton and George Davis. In connection with the Portage hearing Eric Wright was the only consultant on that particular occasion. This was an interim application

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) and was not an application for a rate base and therefore did not require the services of our engineering consultant.

Oh yes, another interesting question with respect to the Portage rates. Well in the order which established the Portage rates, they had a specific rate included which was to decrease automatically as soon as a certain customer build-up had been reached. This customer build-up was reached apparently or we were approaching that particular customer build-up sometime last September. The company wrote to the board advising that they were approaching this particular point and would the board waive the reduction in rates -- which was really not a big reduction, I think it was something like five cents -- would they waive that particular reduction in view of the fact that they would be up for hearing in the near future for a rate hearing. Somehow or other this arrived at a rather bad time with respect to the board. As you know we had a change in board personnel about that time. One of our members died and the chairman himself left the board. The third member of the board had no knowledge of this particular letter. As soon as it was discovered they brought it to the attention of the board and they ruled against the company, and the company are putting all of those funds in a special trust account and they will be returned in the future. Now I think that's pretty well all of those questions which were raised by the Member for Brokenhead, as I recall them.

The Member for Emerson was inquiring about telephone service in the Carrick and Badger districts in his constituency. I'm pleased to advise that surveys have been undertaken. We do have that area in mind; the surveys were completed I believe, last fall. We can offer no immediate promise of service in that area but it will be part of our long-term plan of telephone expansion and I expect that sometime in the future we will be able to give service to the people in that particular area. The member raised the rather pathetic point that somebody had to walk eight miles for help because there was no telephone service available. Well I appreciate the difficulty that his constituents undergo and I'm quite in sympathy with him and with his constituents. But I will say this for the telephone system, they are conscientious people and they will do everything they can to give service throughout the province. They have one real problem; the cost of extending these services is fantastic, and if they were to give service to every area now which doesn't receive it, without regard to the cost, then I'm afraid that we would have a good, at least a comprehensive telephone service in the province, but certainly one that the average telephone subscriber might have difficulty in paying for. I think we must be conscious of the cost to our telephone subscribers at the same time and give as reasonable service as we can within certain bounds, and I think we can say that the MTS have always co-operated and have accepted their responsibility with respect to the interests of the province and the telephone subscribers in the province. He raised an interesting question with respect to rates on farm trucks, suggesting that some trucks should possibly be registered at a very low rate because they're used in only certain seasons and because of their age and so on. Well I'm afraid I can't give any undertaking at the moment but I will say that we will consider your request sometime in the future. We do from time to time consider the basis on which we charge our licence fees on various types of vehicles; this is certainly an interesting suggestion which I understand has been made before and which we will certainly take into consideration.

With respect to the parking facilities around the Legislative Buildings I would refer you to the Minister of Public Works when he has occasion to be before the House on his estimates. (Interjection) Oh yes, well that's a good question. I'd certainly love to be able to do something down there because I drive by there every day and I know the kind of a problem I have. That's one of the real bottlenecks on the way down town, but I don't know what we can do unless we buy St. James park there -- whatever they call that. I don't know that it's for sale and I don't know that -- (Interjection) It's not for sale. I don't know, maybe we could demolish the church next door or something if we had the finances -- it is a real problem and I'm in sympathy with anybody that has to stop there for licences. But I do offer this consolation that those who want to take advantage of our mail order service can avoid this kind of delay, parking and so on. If any of you fellows are caught disobeying the law I'm afraid you've got to go down there anyway because we're going to haul you in and make you pass a test and things of that kind. We do offer a measure of relief to those who want to take advantage of this mail order service.

I don't know whether the Member for La Verendrye is going to be with us this afternoon or not, but I feel that maybe I should answer his interesting question at this time. The question

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) of inspection of motor vehicles, the compulsory inspection of automobiles. I think this is certainly an interesting point that he has raised and I think that there is a great deal of merit in the suggestion that vehicles should be checked periodically. We should be sure that our vehicles are in good working order. In fact the National Safety Council that's quoted in the brief presented to the government by the Automotive Trades Association does mention that this is a factor, and I'd like to read what they have said about compulsory check of automobiles. "National Safety Council of the United States which after making a thorough survey arrived at the following conclusion" -- there appears to be a misprint or something left out of my brief, but I presume it says: "No one should establish an inspection system until there has been successfully developed an adequate over-all accident prevention program". In other words you develop your accident prevention program and then you get into the testing of vehicles. "This includes such essentials as standard driving, licencing examination, accident reporting and a program of highway construction improvement, competent traffic engineering and education, all backed up by official enforcement. Having once provided these basic requirements however, full realization of the objectives of accident prevention cannot be obtained without the inclusion of a periodic motor vehicle inspection as an essential part of the program." In other words the last thing we do is to attack the motor vehicle and make sure that it's in good working order. Now I think that there may be a few other items there that could be added as essentials which may or may not have priority. Such things as research and statistics into accidents and things of that kind and these of course are points which we would want to take into consideration as well. And then they go on to say that the best way for this to be done would be to be established as a municipally operated vehicle inspection station. Well now I think that we accept these things; we think that there are more important things in order of priority that should be done before we get into the compulsory inspection of vehicles. With respect to cost I believe that -- there were some suggestions at one time in the brief that they should be inspected twice a year at a cost of \$2.00 per vehicle. This would amount to \$1,200,000 as an additional burden if we required every motor vehicle in the province to be inspected twice a year. I think that the House can see, that the committee can see that if the amount of money were spent on driver education, driver training, driver control, on research and engineering traffic study, that we would have possibly better results than could be obtained from a motor vehicle inspection service and this appears to be borne out by the National Safety Council of the United States, which is I believe an authority on highway safety. I think those are the major items that were raised yesterday and if there are any further questions I would be pleased to

MR. GRAY: I appreciate very much the problem which the Minister of Public Utilities has to try and solve every problem that is brought to his attention. I believe he's doing a good job and anything that he failed on my colleagues have covered yesterday. So what I'm going to do is just make one brief comment and ask one or two questions. I realize that telephone service now is an essential, it's no longer a luxury. I remember about 40 years ago my good wife was sick so I put a telephone in the house. At that time it was only \$3.00 a month. Then some charitable institution came to me and wanted a donation. Well I gave it to them. They said: "That's not enough, if you can afford a telephone, you could afford to give more for charity". That was 40 years ago. Today a telephone is absolutely an essential thing and no one can get along without it. So I don't think it's a true statement that the people or the subscribers of telephones are objecting to the rate. I think it's wrong in my opinion. Nowadays the people want service and they're not complaining about the cost, at least very few. The question is, give the people the service and I don't think you'll have any trouble in collecting your bills.

My first question is, can we possibly eliminate the party line? It creates a hazard, I know from personal experience. I know where one subscriber of the telephone happened to find out who the party line is and he sent over somebody and he says "Please get off this telephone I have a very important call to make," and the other one refused. Telephones are not now only for gossip -- although quite a bit of time is taken up by the social elites of gossiping for hours over the telephone -- but sometimes it is an emergency, there is a fire, there is sickness, they have to call a doctor and the party line is holding it up. And I think something should be done. People are willing to pay to do away with the party lines, which creates a great hazard in the city and I speak from personal experience.

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) The next complaint, which is not serious, but it is serious in a way; the telephone directories for last year at least, all pages almost have fallen out — the binding was poor. I suspect, although I am not making a definite statement, that this is because the contract is given to the same firm every day because their estimates are lower than the others for one reason. Once they've had it one year they could avoid at least 90 percent of retype of the names -- they have it on their plates. Naturally they could avoid paying money for retyping the same names again. So they assume that they could get the contract anyway because they could always underestimate the others. Now I'm speaking also from personal experience. I had to go down to the telephone office and change the telephone directory five times, or five directories, because the pages had just fallen out and couldn't be kept. The binding is poor. It's a small thing, but when pages fall out and we've got to get a number to those who need the name and need to find the telephone number, it's a very serious situation. So I say this is only small in the criticism over the Minister -- others have been made.

My last question is a very serious one. What are the possibilities and the preparations and the program and anticipated need for more power? In other words, can we one day accidentally find that we turn the switch in the morning to have a cup of coffee, there will be no power? This question is quite serious to me because in view of the increase of power use and the slowness of developing more power, I'm afraid that we may be caught in a position that we cannot carry on, not only our utilities but our home life.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a point regarding the quality of the provincial telephone book and to concur in what the Honourable Member for Inkster has just said. The provincial telephone book, you can't keep the pages together and particularly when you're using the pages in connection with one particular town all the time, you keep turning it over and the first thing you know the pages separate, they break down and it is very poor quality. I wish you'd try and do something about it. Another point that I'd like to raise is the question of Winnipeg Directory insofar as the Manitoba Government Section is concerned. Now the only names that appear under the Manitoba Government are the names of the Ministers and all the other officials are designated by their official title. Now previously we used to have the names of the individuals and in my opinion I think, speaking as a member, and I think most members feel the same as I do, that when you're looking up for a certain telephone number in the book under the Manitoba Government, you may not know the man's official title but you do know his name, and you would save a great deal of time if you put the names in there as well.

There's another point that I would like to raise Mr. Chairman, is this. I raised it last year. And that is in connection with an appeal from a conviction, say, under Section 221 or 222 of the Criminal Code for either drunken driving or impaired driving. That appeal does not operate as a stay of proceedings against the suspension made by the Registrar, and I think that the Minister should take into consideration a stay of proceedings in respect of that suspension while the appeal is pending. I would not suggest that it be for any great length of time because if you did it might cause delays in prosecuting the appeal; but I would suggest though that you take that matter under consideration. There is another matter that I would like to mention, Mr. Chairman, and it has to deal with Section 115, (1) of the Highway Traffic Act. Now I always thought that that section was quite clear but it's like every other bit of legislation, you think you're covering all conceivable cases and then finally you bump into something which is just a little off track. Now this section provides that the licence and the right to have a licence of a person who was convicted under Section 222 or 223 of the Criminal Code, that is for driving a motor vehicle while impaired or while intoxicated, or while under the influence of drugs, is hereby suspended: (a) in the case of a first conviction for a period of six months, except where injury to or the death of any person, or damages to property exceeding \$100.00. Now here are the words that: "occurred in connection with the offence in which case the period of suspension is one year". Now it's the words "occurred in connection with the offence" that are giving a little trouble. The matter to which I specifically wish to refer is this. In the case of an individual who was convicted of impaired driving. Now his vehicle took fire; it was not involved in an accident. There was no connection as far as I could see between the fire and the offence. But the damage that was done to his vehicle exceeded \$100 and the poor fellow now finds that in addition to being convicted his licence is suspended for a year instead of six

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.) months. Now it's perfectly evident to me that the words "occurred in connection with the offence" there is a direct connection between the impaired driving and the drunken driving and the damages. In other words, the damages were as a result of the offence for which the man was convicted. But here you have a case where actually there was no connection between the offence and the damage, yet, and I suppose it's due to the fact that the type of police report we use, or the form that is used, the damages to the car exceeded \$100 and this fellow finds now that he is faced with a year's suspension. I haven't taken it up with the Registrar yet. I think when I do take it up with him that he'll straighten it out. But at the same time I think that a little change in the wording there might clarify the situation so that that wouldn't result again.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, while we're not too far from the Manitoba Telephone System, there is a matter that I would like to discuss with the Honourable Minister. I must say that probably we should start by congratulating him for the workings of that department. It is a very active and progressive department, and we certainly give them credit for that. But there is a certain matter that I would like to discuss with my honourable friend. Many of my constituents, in fact, many of the people of Manitoba are slightly annoyed because of the lack of bilingual operators, that is telephone operators. Now, mind you Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting that there aren't any bilingual operators at all or that every single operator should be bilingual. But it seems to me that it wouldn't be asking too much if on every shift, at least here in the City of Winnipeg, on every shift there would be somebody that could take those calls; that could speak French. It's certainly something that has been discussed -- it's been a problem for a few years now. It's something that would render not only the French speaking people of Manitoba, but all the citizens of Manitoba a service. And we want to be practical; it would be ridiculous to say that every operator should be bilingual. But on every shift it seems to me that it wouldn't be asking too much if we had at least one person that could take those calls or could be called to take those calls. A lot of these calls are going into the eastern provinces where many of the firms and companies or private individuals are French and have a little harder time with the English language. Now that could also extend in the rural points where I would say all the operators, there's just a question of one or two operators in the rural points where probably 80 percent or 90 percent of the people speak French. I wonder if the Minister thinks that this is practical; that it's not asking a little too much; and if he feels he can do something about it in the not too distant future.

While I'm speaking on this question of telephone, there is something that I have missed and many businessmen of Greater Winnipeg it seems have missed also, it is this book that we used to have -- this book I think you called it, "Who Called Me". Now a year and a half ago the Honourable Minister told me that they had stopped putting out that book because it was a little too costly. Since then I have heard a lot of people say that it was too bad they were ready to -- they thought it was well worth the money -- they were ready if it had to cost more, they were ready to pay their share and they felt that more people would take advantage of this book if they knew about it. I wonder if the department has ever thought that this book should come back?

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the last speaker on the book "Who is Who". I think the business people, the merchants are getting so many telephone calls, and it would be worth a lot of time at the switchboard with the easing of their work if that book were to be published again and charge those who are using the book high rates that we're very willing to pay for it.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister for the information which he gave in reply to my questions of yesterday and I rise only to attempt to clear up by way of further questioning certain things which are left untouched that I am interested in.

Now did I understand the Minister correctly with regard to the investigation of the power rate differential -- is there some thought of looking at this or has it already been looked at and dismissed as being beyond action? (Interjection) Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I'll leave that to the Minister for later. There were other points too. I realize that yesterday one of the questions which I put to him was really a question which he could not answer and that had to do with my asking the Minister whether or not he can cite any examples of the Public Utility Board turning down any applications or turning down any investments because it wasn't prudently

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) acquired because -- and I cited the example of Greater Winnipeg Gas and G. M. Gest -- but I realize that no rate base hearings have been held as yet here and so that question can't be answered. It's really my fault. I would like to ask the Minister though and he made no mention of it either yesterday or today -- on the Brandon hearings -- I saw no news releases. What was the increase in the rates? I think that we should know. I was disappointed to hear the Minister say that the board nor he did not have any idea as to the extent of expansion of natural gas distribution in the province for this year or next. I suppose it's because this being a matter of policy of a private company the board isn't expected to know. That would probably be the Minister's opinion. I would like to ask the Minister just where do you draw the line? After all the board is supposed to be looking after the interests of the consumer -- I suppose in a sense also, it's supposed to look after the interests of the public of this province -- and I think we should know what plans for expansion the utilities have in mind. I'd like to ask the Minister if the board does receive into it's possession knowledge as to what the various bids were by the different companies that were bidding on certain construction projects. For example on the Order for Return which I received some time ago I see that Greater Winnipeg Gas awarded contracts to companies like G. M. Gest, Mannix, Harris Construction and so on. Tenders were called; what were the bids? I asked for the bids by way of Order for Return and I was turned down. Well all I am asking is does the board know what the bids were? Perhaps it's too confidential a nature for me to know, but certainly the board should and I would like to hear the Minister say whether or not this is the case. Further to that Mr. Chairman does the Public Utility Board have any substantial proof that the utility does call for tenders in all cases?

Now the Minister will recall that I submitted several Orders for Return about a month ago; two of which I received in fairly good time; one of which the Minister rejected in part at the time of moving of it, but accepted in part, and I have received no return on it. It's about a month now and that particular Order for Return asked these questions. I won't read them all, just the ones that were rejected: What were the prices contained in these tenders? -- that was rejected. Which firms were awarded contracts in each case? -- that was rejected. Then I asked for copies of the contracts; well that was rejected and I can appreciate that. It would be rather costly to reproduce these contracts and make them available, but certainly I don't think that I as a member of this Assembly should be denied information as to the bids tendered by the various firms competing for contracts from the utility. In connection with that Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Minister that in 24 of 48 States in the Union, all material and documents, and possessions of a Public Utility Board are available for public scrutiny -- for anybody, that's right. They could be put in the Legislative Library. Now it could be that at some specific time it might be prejudicial or detrimental to the public interest to have certain information made public, because of the time of the submitting of the bids and so on, but for example in the State of Wisconsin there's a 90 day time limit, after which time all, as I said, all material, documents in the possession of the board are put on file in the Legislative Library. I would ask the Minister why he would object to following such a practice here?

One last question, Mr. Chairman, I didn't mention this yesterday. We have now as of January 1st, a requisite in this province for a standard system of accounting for the utilities, so I assume the purpose of this is to make it easier for the Utility Board to regulate, to function and so on. By what authority was this set up? Was it by an order of the Utility Board or was it by an Order-in-Council? I know it wasn't by the Public Utilities Board Act; it wasn't by statute, so it must have been either by the Utility Board order or by an Order-in-Council and I would like to know which it was? And if it was thought desirable by the Cabinet to issue an Order-in-Council to have this mandatory for the utilities, why wasn't it put in the Act? I would like to ask the Minister. I would assume although I would like to have this clarified for definite -- is this uniform system of accounting a requisite only for the gas utilities or is this also going to be a requisite for the publicly-owned utilities?

MR. P. WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Chairman, I have only two questions to ask. I just wonder if the Minister thinks of shortening a route in rural area on telephones or if he still intends to follow up the mile apart. Now for a moment if the farmer is not living within a mile's reach of the telephone he is not entitled to get a phone unless he pays out of his own pocket for each pole and particularly in a sparsely settled area like ours, sometimes it's pretty difficult

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) to have the money to pay for the poles. However, it has been brought to my attention that even -- I know there is a place pretty well that is within a mile but somehow the Engineering Department feels that it is a little over than a mile and the man is deprived of a telephone -- so I would call upon the Minister not to be so closely figuring or so tight, in my language of speaking, that if it's a hundred yards over a mile or 200 yards or so that the man should be deprived of a telephone, and I wonder if the Minister is thinking of extending the length of over a mile.

The next question, the Minister will recall since 1958 I have been hammering and pleading on behalf of the people in the Interlake area that they would get a better reception on television. However, last year the Minister sympathized with me and he asked my patience for a short period and it shall come about. Now I believe it's one year past already and my patience has been exhausted and I would like to hear the Minister say something on the television reception in the northern part of the Interlake area -- we don't need a station, not in my opinion -- we need only a satellite. However I read here in our paper clipping of March 17th, 1961 that's from Ottawa, that there is applications for new CBC television stations at Flin Flon and The Pas, Manitoba are among 14 listed today by the Board of Broadcast Governors for public hearing in Ottawa starting April 11th. Well I don't deprive these people whatsoever, I'm not greedy and I'm not selfish, but at the same time I believe a station costs a lot more money than a satellite station and I believe that the Interlake area people would appreciate very much if we could have a booster to a TV that we could get a better reception. However I must admit Channel 7 is a little bit of an improvement, but it's not desirable, it does not bring in -- the point that I'm trying to say -- it interjects sometimes -- oh I would say the reception is good three days and four days it's no good or four days it's good and three days it's no good. I would urge the Minister to look into this matter and satisfy the Interlake area and I would rather have the satellite than sympathy.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Chairman I think that the answer which the Minister gave me yesterday and the attitude which he displayed requires me to say something more on the question which I raised yesterday. I don't mind Mr. Chairman, the fact that Minister was very critical of me. When a man runs for public office he can expect to be treated in a rough and rugged manner; and I don't mind it all -- I enjoy it. I don't mind admitting in this House that I'm a biased person. I like to work extra hard for people who are underdogs whether they be workers or farmers or Indians or ex-prisoners or people who have mental illness, anybody who is an underdog will have a ready hearing from me; and sometimes I am prone to be partisan, so I don't mind if the Minister criticizes me. But Mr. Chairman, when the Minister tries to create the impression that the things which I say are being said by me and that they have very little validity and that they have very little support and that there's really nothing much to it, then I have to take objection. Now Mr. Chairman, this government is very good and I must compliment them on their public relations ability. They are able on nearly every question to create a good impression that they're doing a good job; that they're moving quickly; that they're handling the things which need to be handled. I find it very strange therefore, Mr. Chairman if everything is as good at Grand Rapids as the Minister tries to suggest, that a meeting convened by the Welfare Council to discuss the problems of Indian and Metis held just several weeks ago -- they passed a resolution on Grand Rapids -- and I'm going to read that resolution in a moment Mr. Chairman. But I want to point out to this House and to the Minister some of the people who headed up that conference. The co-chairman of the conference was Mrs. Bastin. I think members will recognize the name. She has been very active in Conservative politics. Certainly she's not a partisan of mine. The other co-chairman was Reverend Ted Scott, the head of the Social Department of the Anglican Church in this diocese. One of the leading people in the conference was Father Raynaud who I understand is the top expert of the Roman Catholic Church in all Canada who deals with the problem of Indians and Eskimos. I relate this Mr. Chairman, only so as members will understand that if they pass a resolution it may have some value. Now the conference was attended by a large number of Indian people, by social workers, by Ministers, by government officials and I want to tell the members of some of the people that I saw there. Mr. Darwin Chase, the head of the Co-operative Services Division was there. Mr. John Lagasse the head of the Community Development organization was there. Mr. Wickford the community development officer at Grand Rapids was there. Dr. Lommerce, I think that is his name, the

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) Health Officer in charge of Northern Regions was there. Now they were there, Mr. Chairman, and if they were -- I wasn't at the discussion where this resolution was drafted -- but if they didn't like it, if they thought that this was being too unfair to the government I'm amazed that they didn't voice their objection, and here is the resolution which they passed and I'll read this, the resolved part, and I quote: "That this Seventh Indian and Metis conference urge the Government of Manitoba (1) to enact legislation requiring all contractors taking contracts for bush clearing in the Province of Manitoba to make available to all workmen, piece workers and hourly workers alike, adequate board and housing; and (2) until such legislation is enacted to insist that all those tendering of such contracts for government projects be required to include in their tenders, provision for such services.

Well Mr. Chairman, if everything is as beautiful as the Honourable Minister said yesterday, why this resolution? I suggest the reason for the resolution is that everything is not as the Minister suggested. Now Mr. Chairman, I never said yesterday or have I ever said that there weren't some people making money, that there weren't some people who had had experience who know how to live well in the north country. But I made very specific charges yesterday, and I note with interest and I think that there's a moral to be drawn from it that the Minister didn't reply to a single one of the specific charges with regard to wages that were paid and so on. And why didn't he? I think the answer is obvious. Every charge which I made in this House yesterday was made, where? Was made before Dr. Martin who was appointed by this government to hold an enquiry. It was taken down I assume in the transcript and the companies concerned and the Hydro had the opportunity at that time to make a reply, to point out that these charges were incorrect. I assume they didn't because if they had I'm quite certain the Minister would have been here yesterday with excerpts from the transcript which he has, but I haven't telling us that I was wrong. Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I'm amazed to say the least that we have not yet received the report from Dr. Martin. (Interjection) Yes, the Minister says "in due course". I'm sure "in due course" means sometime after this House has finished its business. In view of the controversy I would have thought that the Minister would have taken steps to urge Dr. Martin to get on with the job and get the report in; unless he doesn't want the report for reasons of his own.

So I say Mr. Chairman, that the Minister did not reply to one single charge which I made with regard to the wages. Now I said yesterday that I'm satisfied that now the wages which are being paid are the \$1.35, but I think it's important to get at the heart of whether the charges which were made and the fact that there was a strike, whether there was any validity to look at all the charges, and the wage charges were an important part of the whole case. So I say the Minister didn't reply because he didn't have an answer. Now Mr. Chairman, what about the other answers which we got from the Minister. The Minister implies that I don't know much about the situation up there and that may be so, and the Minister said some unkind things about Reverend Harvey. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, but that's between the Minister and Reverend Harvey, if the Minister told Reverend Harvey what he thought of his views when Reverend Harvey came to see the Minister. But that's not my affair. That's between the Minister and Reverend Harvey.

MR. CARROLL: Just for the record, I don't believe I said any unkind things about Reverend Harvey. I said I respected his sincerity and his appraisal of the situation. I said I did think that his report was somewhat misleading and wasn't maybe a correct representation of the facts as I saw them.

MR. ORLIKOW: Well I think the Minister just said again exactly what I thought he said about Reverend Harvey's report, but that's between him and Reverend Harvey.

Now Mr. Chairman, the reply which the Minister made yesterday could have come from only one source. It could have come from only the information which he got from the Hydro-Electric officials. I want to suggest Mr. Chairman, that fortunately or unfortunately for the Minister, there are other government employees who have been at Grand Rapids and who are at Grand Rapids. The Northern Health Officer is there. Certain health officials were there and are there. The Community Development Officer is there. Now I assume Mr. Chairman, that they all on one occasion or another made reports to the Minister or to their own Ministers. We asked Mr. Chairman, that the reports made by these officials be tabled in the House so that we could look at them and we could find out actually what has happened, and this government

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) decided in its wisdom that these reports could not be tabled.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the government made no such decision in its wisdom at all. The rules of the House, the rules of procedure from Beauchesne, from the Mother of Parliament from London has decided this as my honourable friend well knows, and he ought to know better than to stand up in this House and say or imply that the government is keeping information from the House because it wants to. This is information that is kept from any House in any British constitutional set-up and he well knows it, and he knows better than to make that type of allegation here.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Minister were not so quick to interject, if he had waited one second more, I would have said what I said before that the government was within its rights and it is standard practice. I want to suggest however, Mr. Chairman, that if -- I want to suggest to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that if in all these reports which the Minister has received which he, I assume has read, although I have not, that if in all these reports there would be a statement, one sentence, from any of these people which would say in plain language that the conditions in Grand Rapids are adequate, that the Minister would have brought that sentence in and reported it and read it into the records of the House. Why doesn't he do it? Because I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that these people have reported to the government and that the reports they made bear out what I say. Now the Honourable Minister says that they're within their rights not to table these reports. Of course they are. I want to challenge the government to call a meeting of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities. Let's have these people in and let them make their report and give us a chance to ask questions and let's see what they say.

Mr. Chairman, I don't like to do what the Honourable Minister did yesterday -- and I will come to something which he did which I think is completely inexcusable in a moment -- but I happened to be in Grand Rapids during the strike and I attended a public meeting and I wouldn't report on this if it weren't a public meeting. A public meeting which was open to all the strikers and all the residents and to which a representative of the Hydro-Electric Board was present, and so I assume that he must have reported and therefore I have no hesitation in reporting on a statement which was made. And the Health Officer, not the doctor but the Health Officer -- I'm not going to mention his name -- but I can give it to the Minister -- I think the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare knows who he is and here are the notes I made of what he said, Mr. Chairman, and I quote, and I made them as he spoke: "Living conditions in Grand Rapids are the worst I have ever seen in Canada". He then went on to explain and I quote again: "The law requires that men working by the hour are entitled to decent living quarters, to satisfactory eating quarters, to clean bunkhouses, but people who are sub-contractors and therefore self-employed are the responsibility of nobody". Now I happened to be there and this is what the Health Officer said, and so when members opposite say, Mr. Chairman, that I don't know what I'm talking about I think they'd better get the records and see what the facts are. Now Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister said he was there. He was at Grand Rapids. I was also there. I wonder who he saw? I wonder who he discussed it with besides officials of the Hydro and the contractor. Did he meet with any of the people who are on strike? Did he talk to the people in the Anglican Mission? I did. Did he talk to the Roman Catholic priest who was up there? I didn't see him but I'm told by people who are there that he agrees with reports which I got from the people in the Anglican Mission. The Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare also talked to them. I wonder what he has to say about this. So when the Honourable Minister tries to create the impression that I'm all alone I think he should give it a second thought. CJAY sent up a two-man team, a reporter and a camera-man, and newspaper people are by and large pretty -- they've seen and heard everything. Has he talked to them about what they saw? They put on a half-hour program. They started it off with a statement by the Honourable the First Minister. Did he ask them what they thought? Did he watch the program? Did he see the remarks of, they say I haven't been up there, but they did have Mr. Valentine McKay, I think his name is, who's 75 years old and who has lived up there all his life. He had some very uncomplimentary things to say. (Interjection) Well I haven't got the transcript here but you can get it. I did make some notes. They interviewed two -- and I incidentally didn't conduct them on this tour, I hardly saw them -- they interviewed two engineers who were working for the bridge company, a Mr. Al Smith and a Mr. Clem Harrington. And what did they say?

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) They said that they'd been there for some time, that the people in the bush were being discriminated against and that the conditions were a disgrace. That's what they said. So everybody, Mr. Chairman, is out of step but the Minister and the Hydro-Electric Board.

Mr. Chairman, I'm finished except for one last point. The Minister did something yesterday which I think he must regret today. If he doesn't, he should. I think it was inexcusable. In trying to discredit what I said, in trying to discredit what others have said, he took the opportunity to do something which I think is inexcusable. He took the fact that a man who had been a strike leader and what he did as a strike leader needs to be analyzed and considered on its merits, whether it has any or not, and he took the fact that this man got into difficulty some time later, that this man was arrested for selling liquor illegally and paid a fine, and I certainly don't excuse that. But this is not very uncommon on construction projects as the Minister well knows. He took that fact and tried to draw a red herring over the issue. He mentioned this man by name, mentioned the fact that this man had been arrested, mentioned the fact that he had paid a fine. Now the Minister is not a lawyer but we have members in the legal profession here. I wonder what their attitude is; I wonder what the Courts say about this business. I talked to a number of lawyers since last night and they've all agreed that the courts take a pretty dim view on this, and that a judge will not consider what a man may have done in other cases in dealing with what the man has done with regard to a particular case. (Interjection) I beg pardon?

MR. LYON: is the accused or a witness. You tell us

MR. ORLIKOW: Accused is what I've been told by lawyers and I think I could bring the legal text to prove that what I say is true. And so I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister had no excuse to do this. I'm not defending that man for what he did there, nor am I particularly defending him for what he did in relation to the strike. That is a separate matter. But for the Minister to do that, I think, Mr. Chairman, was an inexcusable act and I think it's an offence to the dignity of this House.

. Continued next page.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should reply at this time to the remarks that have been made by the last speaker. I hope you'll excuse me if I reply to some of the other remarks at a little later date. We appreciate that the member is a man who works for the under-dog, and I think for that we give him all credit. I think if any criticism can be attributed to our Member for St. John's, it's the fact that in some occasions it appears at least that he's trying to make some political capital out of the kind of things that he happens to be digging up. Now he says we've never, we didn't do anything about the direct charges which he made. Now, what were some of the charges that he made yesterday? I've had a chance to have a look at them very briefly, and I'd just like to comment about one or two of the things that he has said in his report. He refers here first of all to -- excuse me I'll just back up here -- to John Martinuik, page 1139, bottom of the page, second last line, John Martinuik who lives at Gonar, or near Gonar, worked on Grand Rapids project for seven days before Christmas. They worked eight hours a day, seven time eight, 56 hours. The report which I have before me at the moment indicates that three men contracted work with Drake Construction, contracted on dates December the 13th to December 19th. They contracted to cut five acres at \$75.00 per acre on December 13th. On December 19th all three men came to the office and requested an advance of \$40.00, which they were given, and they have never returned to work. During this period they worked for five days at seven hours a day, a total of 35 hours.

MR. ORLIKOW: May I ask the Minister a question? What system of records did the company at that time have to know how many hours any man works?

MR. CARROLL: Well, we'll just carry on here for a moment. As they did not return to work a cheque was sent to them on January 25th for \$7.25 each, this being the balance owing at the rate of \$1.35 an hour. Now anyone in the House will recall that during the month of December they were credited with working here December 13th to December 19th, the hours of daylight, are at best in that degree of latitude seven hours a day, and I suspect probably somewhat less than that. I'd like to point out that -- now this is a report that I have here -- I'd like to point out that at this time these men cleared just over an acre and a half, working alongside a crew who were clearing three acres. It is suggested here that they may be experienced industrial workers, but he also would like to emphasize that they're danged poor bush workers and I'll spell that, d a n g e d, danged poor bush workers. That was the report on this one group, and I think is the factual information which my honourable friend didn't get last night.

Now the next man, Haleyko I believe it is, yes Lawrence Haleyko. What do we have to say here now? He told me that he had been working from November 14th till the time we saw him; that he'd averaged 12 hours of work a day, and the pay which he'd received was \$6.00 a day, or an average hourly rate of 50 cents. Now the figures that we have here -- our record here shows that he worked from November 14th to December 19th, gross earnings \$375.00, less gas and oil \$15.91, net earnings of \$359.09. This man worked from daylight to dark, only during this period which was no more than seven hours daily. Assume that he worked 44 hours for four and a third weeks, assume 200 hours, and I understand that they've been generous in their consideration of this man's Assume 200 hours, which is high, he received \$1.88 an hour. One dollar eighty-eight an hour. A suggestion here, that we can substantiate our figures; we would like Mr. Haleyko to come to us and present his claim if he feels there is anything further coming to him. This man returned to Drake on the 10th of January and was paid a straight hourly rate of \$1.35 but he could not keep up the pace with the others and could not make a go of it as a piece worker. Presumably he left the job at that time. Now we have a very interesting suggestion here. A Mr. William Lathlin of my constituency who was on the job -- before we go to that one -- (Interjection) -- There is one other here that deals with wages, a Mr. Angus Martin. He worked for Patricia Transport three weeks, for somebody, oh yes, I think it's Legall and Wright for three weeks, and for Drake Construction, a total of seven weeks, during which time he made gross earnings of \$302.21. The Member from St. John's wasn't interested in getting the rest of the facts. Oh there he is, oh yes. I want to keep an eye on you there. I can never trust you when I can't see you. I like knowing where you are. -- (Interjection) -- \$302.21. These were the facts, of course, as they were presented from across the way. Now the figures that we have here. Mr. Angus Martin worked for one week with Patricia; three weeks for Legall and Wright; three weeks for Drake, a total of seven weeks, during which time -- I'm sorry, this is just repeating your statement, I'm sorry.

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) Legall and Wright from November 1st to November 19th. Sixteen days, or 128 hours at \$1.35, \$172.80, less groceries and clothing of \$49.17, with a net of \$123.63. Now at Drake Construction from November 20th to December 20th, 21 days, and he worked intermittently here. He wasn't working every day -- he liked to have time off, I take it; \$187.50 was what he got in gross receipts, less groceries of \$47.94, making a net of \$139.56. The gross pay for the 37 days in all, and part of this time he wasn't working, was \$360.30, which is somewhat different from the figures that were presented to us. We also have a breakdown of his diet here. Six tins of fruit cocktail, 15 tins of peaches, pears, pineapple, six tins of plums, a gallon of apples -- boy! -- 24 dozen eggs. Obviously some people found a way of eating eggs even though they may have been frozen. Seven pounds of bacon, 69 lbs. of beef, 21 1/2 lbs. of prok, 5 lbs. of hamburger, 32 lbs. of sausage, 10 lbs. of spareribs, and 46 chocolate bars, plus cigarettes. -- (Interjection) -- No, no jam.

And now, there were some general complaints apparently from Mr. William Lathlin, although we don't really know what Mr. William Lathlin was complaining about, I take it, from the remarks that were made. But I have his wage figures here. From January 10th, '61, to January 23rd -- these excluded certain days in which he didn't work because they were on strike. They take Saturday afternoons off. They work three hours Saturday. During this period of time, his average wages were \$1.48 an hour. Now obviously Mr. Lathlin wasn't complaining about the wages on the job, and yet three other men in his party, Leslie Cook, William George Lathlin, Sr., and Moses Lathlin, all received, during that period of time, \$1.48 an hour. We have here some of the commissary slips which these fellows were getting. If anybody is interested we can tell you what these fellows are eating. January 9th, four axes and a file; January 9th, leather mitts, two pairs of leather mitts, two pairs of wool mitts. We have on January 9th also, a pound of tea, ten loaves of bread, five pounds of lard, three pounds of butter, ten pounds of sugar, six pounds of hamburger, four -- (Interjection) -- No. They only eat butter on that job; they don't eat margarine, I'd like you to know that. Four pounds of bacon, two milk - powdered milk -, five tins of peaches, ten pounds of bologna, a carton of cigarettes. Now incidentally, these fellows don't roll their own. The rollings are there, but these fellows smoke nothing but carton cigarettes. And this repeats itself pretty regularly through this item if the members want to hear -- ten candles, three matches, three spaghetti and meat balls, six Klik, eight and a half pounds of bully beef, three dozen eggs -- there's another fellow who thinks you can eat eggs up there on that job. -- (Interjection) -- This is for January 9th. Three dozen eggs, three tins of tomatoes, three packages of macaroni; this was on the 9th. On the 9th again they get leather mitts, wool mitts, leather boots, insoles.

MR. WAGNER: Would the Minister be kind enough to say how much they have to pay for those mitts and

MR. CARROLL: Oh sure, I would be glad to let you know. Leather mitts are \$2.40, wool mitts are \$1.15. There are leather top rubber boots, you know the kind you can wear in construction, \$11.50. I don't know -- that sounds like a reasonable price, and I used to have something to do with these kind of boots. Insoles are 45 cents. -- (Interjection) -- Too much for insoles, eh? Must be a special kind. An ax-handle and while on the -- there's a bad word here, but it's a file -- you fellows from the hardware business probably understand it. On the 11th they bought some more food, more bully beef, peaches -- four peaches, water pail, milk, pork and beans, another ten loaves of bread. I don't think you want to go through all these items, but sufficient to say that William Lathlin appears to have been eating fairly well, and he appears to have been earning better than the minimum -- (Interjection) -- Well that's a very good question; I would like the honourable member to tell us if he knows.

MR. ORLIKOW: I was not there until after this strike started.

MR. CARROLL: I just asked you if you knew. I don't.

MR. ORLIKOW: I don't.

MR. CARROLL: Now the Welfare Resolutions; now this is very interesting, and I know that the people on this Council are people of integrity and of the very highest motives, and people whose only intention is to help others, but I just want to tell you really what kind of a problem we can get into here. Now on -- was it a Labour Religion Conference they had here, or was this a special labour meeting where Mr. Goorevitch -- an article was attributed to Mr. Goorevitch in the paper saying that conditions were really pretty bad at Grand Rapids. We tried to trace this

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) down because we were interested in that --

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, didn't try very hard, and I'll give the Minister the information.

MR. CARROLL: All right. I'll tell you how hard we tried. This is a letter -- a memorandum that has been passed to me. "Further to my letter to Mr. Sol Goorevitch of December 16th and further to my memorandum that followed December 23rd, I succeeded this morning in reaching Mr. Frazer Earle" -- Oh, I'm sorry, I'm reading the wrong letter first. -- (Interjection) -- I am going to read it. I want to read that letter. Now, this is a memorandum of December 23rd -- Don Stevens. "Mr. Sol Goorevitch called at 12:30 p. m. to date, further to my letter of December 16th. Mr. Goorevitch stated -- started out by stating that he had my letter, that he could quite understand my anxiety to obtain a specific information, that he was sorry he had no knowledge whatever with respect to the Grand Rapids job, going on to state that he had no more knowledge of what was going on on Grand Rapids that he had of what was going on on the moon, that he had attended a particular conference, that he had reported to the press and had heard certain statements made about the Grand Rapids job, that he was called upon to sum up the discussions within a particular sub-committee of the conference, and that when doing so he had made reference to Grand Rapids, but in his judgment, the newspaper reports magnified his remarks with respect to Grand Rapids beyond what he considered was appropriate, out of regard for other things that he had had to say, and that so far as he could recall, the only reference other than his to the Grand Rapids project had been made by Frazer Earle, the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, and that he doubted very much as to whether Mr. Earle had any first-hand information with respect to the Grand Rapids project. And yet these people are passing resolutions without really too much information, from what I can gather here. Mr. Goorevitch went on to state that since receiving my letter he had attempted on several occasions to contact Mr. Earle in order that the latter might be put in direct contact with me. Mr. Goorevitch stated that he had been able to reach Mr. Earle and suggested that I might telephone him at such and such a number. I mentioned to Mr. Goorevitch that we had enquired into certain earlier vague reports that we had received about low pay and living conditions in connection with the clearing contracts, but had found most of these heretofore to have been without foundation. Mr. Goorevitch went on to state that he realized that there would be a lot of rumours and that he would not be surprised if most of these were without foundation. I have since attempted to reach Mr. Earle by telephone but so far have been unable to do so." We were trying to trace these things, now, Mr. Chairman, because there were very serious criticisms at the Grand Rapids project.

And now we go back to this other letter. "Mr. Frazer Earle appeared to be better informed on the subject than anyone else in the Human Rights Committee. I thereupon asked Mr. Earle if he would be kind enough to supply me with any information which he had with respect to conditions of employment at Grand Rapids, such as, in his opinion, should be enquired into by the Board. Mr. Earle stated in effect that he had no personal knowledge whatever of the conditions at Grand Rapids, that he had heard some comment upon these conditions from two sources, Mr. David Orlikow had made some general remarks on the subject; he had had several discussions with Mr. Lagasse of the Provincial Welfare Department." He goes on to state -- "Mr. Earle stated that the reports which he had had from Mr. Lagasse were mainly of a statistical nature, having to do with the local number of Indians and Metis employed upon the project and that the numbers, in his opinion, had been surprisingly large. Mr. Earle also stated that the general impression which he had formed from his discussions with Mr. Lagasse had been to the effect that the Indians and Metis were generally integrating very well on the project. When questioned as to whether Mr. Orlikow had supplied any information on the subject of employment conditions at Grand Rapids, Mr. Earle stated that he did not recall any specific information on the subject having been attributed to Mr. Orlikow. When questioned further as to whether Mr. Lagasse's favourable reports appeared to him to be well-founded or whether from information which he had received from others, he would be inclined to question Mr. Lagasse's report, Mr. Earle stated that insofar as knowledge of working conditions at Grand Rapids was concerned he would defer completely to Mr. Lagasse."

Well it appears, Mr. Chairman, that we have people passing resolutions which come to the attention of the public, which tend to discredit the good efforts of many people in that area, to do

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) a good job on behalf of the people who are working in that area, and I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that the resolutions that may have been passed by the Welfare Council may have been based on the same kind of inadequate information that these newspaper reports here were based upon. Well now, he wonders why the specific charges haven't been answered. I think I have answered some of them here -- I may have missed a few and if I

MR. ORLIKOW: repayment to Moose Lake people.

MR. CARROLL: Yes, well, my understanding is that any, and this as I recall it, goes back to the sub-contracts under Drake, I understand that repayments have either been made or certainly will be made. I rather suspect they have been made some time ago.

MR. ORLIKOW: under-paid in the first place?

MR. CARROLL: Well, what about Dr. Martin's report? Here is the interesting question. I'm not standing up for this contractor -- I give credit to the prime contractors on this job, the prime bush contractors. As soon as they found out there was something wrong, they got rid of that contractor, and that took them about three weeks to do, and that happened -- and they were finished and out of there -- as I recall, early December. Now nobody is making any excuses for these people at all. Nobody intends to. Well what about Dr. Martin's report? Well, I'll say this. Dr. Martin went up to Grand Rapids. He got certain evidence. My understanding of the situation was that the transcript of evidence was only available to him about a week ago, and incidentally one other thing, he did suggest in his report that he would be returning to the job about a month later. As it happened, Drake Construction closed down about February 24th. They do have a very small amount of work to do, but there appears to be no point in Dr. Martin going back with respect to the workers that had been on that particular job. But the transcript of evidence was only available about a week ago, and I understand that some of the contractors were not present when part of the evidence was being given, and he had undertaken to give them an opportunity to read the transcript of evidence and make any rebuttal that they might choose to do. We're not in any way endeavouring to withhold this information from the House or to delay the tabling of this report, or the receiving of this report. Well, there is some suggestion of why we don't table the reports. Well, I don't know that I need to add anything to what the First Minister said on this subject, except to say that some civil servants on occasions will make statements in their reports which certainly were not intended ever to become public. One of these reports that I recall having read, I would say, were libel in the fact that they made certain accusations which I doubt could be proved, but opinions, feelings -- these are the kind of things that are expressed in reports because this is the way people think and act. They express these things in reports that certainly could never be made public. They may be criticisms of other departments and so on.

Well now, reports of Health Officials, and so on. I think that the gentleman referred to at that meeting -- I think his immediate superior was up there and did report that conditions were not a hazard to health, and not -- (Interjection) -- not a hazard to public health. Yes, I'm glad that you corrected me because, there could be a hazard to personal health. Any person can infect himself if he wants to be dirty, but I think the responsibility of the Department of Health is to protect public health. Now there is a report saying that there was no hazard to public health with respect to this particular job, and insofar as regulations are concerned, we have ascertained that the regulations that are pertaining to camps were designed for semi-permanent camps, not camps that move from day to day, and that really the provisions in the Health Regulations as they relate to camps, bush camps of that kind, the regulations were not intended to apply to camps that are mobile and moving from time to time.

With respect to this TV broadcast I certainly don't want to say too much on this particular thing. I note that many of the people that were speaking on that particular show were not, in my opinion, the best qualified people to speak on the subjects that they were discussing. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Valentine McKay, as I recall, said that there was no discrimination on his -- I don't think he said anything about the living conditions of the men on the job, as I recall -- but who are the authorities on men working in the bush there? There was a storekeeper; he was running -- what do they call it -- the outpost? How long has he been in Grand Rapids? Here's a man who's been there a month. Where did he get his experience in living and working in the bush. He's had one month's experience out there. Talking about an engineer -- there was an engineer on that job, out from England how long? Three months, maybe a little bit more, but

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) certainly not much more. These are the authorities that are being quoted on living conditions in that area, besides, of course, my honourable friend and some of the members of his committee. Now my remarks the other day were certainly not intended to discredit Mr. Desbrow. I merely pointed out to the House for their information that this is the man who is looked upon as the Labour Religion Committee who attended that area, as their guide, as their interpreter. The man who told them where to go and who to see. In fact, I'm told that he steered clear of some fellows purposely. Now I don't know whether there's any validity to this or not, but this is what I'm told, and I'm just telling you that really the kind of advice upon which all of these remarks have been based is probably not the best advice that's available. That's all I wish to say at this time, Mr. Chairman. I will speak to the other questions when I get up again.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I'm just going to be a couple of minutes with this famous newspaper thing. The Minister says that they tried very hard to find out where that resolution came. Well, they didn't try very hard. They called this man, Mr. Goorevitch whom the Minister referred to, who happens to have acted as the secretary of that group. He referred them to Mr. Earle. Mr. Earle told them to get in touch with me, which they didn't try to do, although I was not out of the city. I can tell the Minister that that resolution -- that I wasn't in that particular section of the conference, but that resolution arose, Mr. Chairman, out of the impressions which these people got as a result of a report which was given to them by who? By Mr. John Lagasse. Mr. John Lagasse was invited to appear at that conference. Mr. John Lagasse made a report. I was not present at the time, but the resolution arose out of the report which Mr. Lagasse made. Now I'm not suggesting that they may not have -- I don't know, I wasn't there. They may have put emphasis on things which they shouldn't have done, but I think that the conference got the best possible person to report on conditions, and he wasn't asked to report on Grand Rapids per se. He was asked to discuss the work which is being done about Indians. This is part of the discussion which arose. I don't think that they could have had a better person to report on. He must be good; he was appointed by the former government under the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and he was re-confirmed in his job by this government, so I think the conference did the best job they could to get the man best qualified to report. They got it and that's where the report came from. Now, whether Mr. Stevens talked to Mr. Lagasse, that of course is between the two Ministers. I can't speak about that.

MR. CARROLL: particular point. I wish that Mr. Orlikow would tell Mr. Frazer Earle where he gets his information, because he tells us that he gets his information of a statistical nature largely from Mr. Lagasse. He was surprised at the number of people that were employed on the job, but he got the rest of his information, according to him, from Mr. Orlikow. Now I just refer to this letter and that's the only thing I can say.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, a couple of sessions ago members on this side of the House were told by the then Minister of Labour, that the difficulties experienced by the union organizers at Kelsey and Thompson who wanted to visit the workers on the project in their bunkhouses to discuss organization with the workers, would not be repeated at Grand Rapids. We were told for security reasons they might police the project and bunkhouses, but that there would be no difficulty to arrange for union organizers to have easy access to the men in their bunkhouses to discuss organization with them. To date, we understand the Hydro policy is only permitting the organizers access three days a month. This is not living up to the promise made by the House former Minister. It's unnecessary and it's unfair.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in reference to my friend, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. He had mentioned that he was in favour of the government setting up a Motor Vehicle Inspection Board. I'm in full agreement with it. I think it should be done.

And now, Mr. Speaker, we'll get back to this Grand Rapids hassle that we've been having here for two days. There have been many words that have been introduced into this Legislature -- one by the Honourable Member from Swan River, "inference"; my friend from Kildonan, of "window dressing"; I shouldn't say my honourable friend from Kildonan. I think it was the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that introduced that word. Now I would like to introduce a word, "whitewashing", and I think that's what the government is doing with this Grand Rapids situation. They're trying to whitewash this thing. If they weren't, they would set all these

(Mr. Peters, cont'd.) reports that they have on the table of this Legislature. Let's look at them; let's not do a whitewashing job.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, my name was mentioned and I wish to offer an apology to the Honourable Member for St. John's. I made an intimation yesterday that possibly the Indians might have had some jam in there, but from the Minister of Labour's remarks they didn't have jam, but all they had was canned fruit and canned cocktails. I'm very sorry that I made the about jam.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, while still on the 1 (a), Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some questions of the Minister as well on the matter of Grand Rapids. Now the human factors were covered I think very well, by the Member for St. John's, and while I'm very much interested in those, I think they have been covered and I don't propose to go over those any further. But I have some questions on the business aspect of this situation. Now in the invitation to tender that was put out by the Hydro-Electric Board on September 6, 1960, on page four it listed very clearly the instructions to the tenderers. Subsection 18 says as follows: "In connection with hours worked and wages paid to employees, the terms and conditions of employment shall be such as of from time to time negotiated and agreed between the contractor and the workmen employed by the contractor, but notwithstanding, it shall be a condition of the contract that - (a) employees of the contractor actually engaged on the work shall not be required to work in excess of 120 hours at straight time rates in any two-week period; (b) the basic hourly wage rates paid by the contractor to employees in the following classifications of employment, and who are actually engaged on the work, shall not be less than the rate stated below, namely, labourers \$1.35 an hour; truck drivers \$1.40 an hour, concrete finishers \$1.50 an hour; scraper and bulldozer operators \$1.50 an hour; dragline, shovel and crane operators \$1.70 an hour; carpenters, other journeymen tradesmen \$2.15 an hour. Now my questions to the Minister are these: What check was conducted by the government or the Hydro-Electric Board to see to it that these conditions were lived up to? What controls were established to ensure that the contractors who did get the successful tender actually followed these conditions, because quite obviously unless there is a proper check set up then the successful contractor can proceed, subsequent to his receiving the contract, not to follow these conditions, and if this is not controlled, is unfair to any other contractors who may be interested in bidding, because a legitimate, honest contractor who would bid under these conditions and intended to follow these rates, would be unable to compete with one who had no intention of following them, and it therefore is most important from the standpoint of good business, that the government controls this. If it isn't done, then the whole process of bids falls down.

Another question is - Was there any contractor given permission to go below these rates? Did the government agree that they could pay less than this subsequent to the contract being given? As a result of the difficulties that arose, another question comes up - Was the government involved in any extra expense because of this situation? For example, in the case of the Dr. Martin inquiry. What were the expenses of this inquiry? Did the government pay for it, or did the contractor if he was at fault, was this charged back to him, if it was the result of his not following the terms of tender, that the costs were developed.

Now those, I think, are points that I would like some clarification on from the Minister, because this is very important on this whole question of tendering on government jobs.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, first of all, I'd like to commend the government for giving the Greta people an automatic exchange for the telephones. Thus far they were always connected to the Altona exchange, and this definitely is a big improvement, but at the same time I would like to know just what kind of procedure is followed in giving automatic or dial exchanges to the various localities, because I know that in the neighbouring town of Morden, they're getting a new exchange being built, and whereas in my constituency we have exchanges such as Altona that has 1,187 subscribers, it's more than the one that Morden has, and I would like to know just what procedure is being followed and how these new exchanges are being awarded. Plum Coulee has roughly 400 subscribers and Winkler has over 1,000 too. Personally I'm on the Winkler exchange and we have many party lines. I'm on a party line myself with more than 10 subscribers on my local line, and I'm sure that people in my constituency would appreciate if something was being done to get better service, and I'm sure that more calls would be placed, and especially long distance calls, which would provide further revenue to the

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) Manitoba Telephone System. Also, I'd like to know whether any benefits will come to the neighbouring exchanges close to Morden because of this new exchange office being built in Morden. Probably the Minister could tell us something on that, and also tell us on what basis the new automatic exchanges are being installed in various offices throughout the province.

MR. GUTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I presume television and telephones should be brought up on the Minister's salary because I don't see any other item for it. Is that correct? Mr. Chairman, like I have in the past, I once again want to urge the Minister to reconsider the policy of the Telephone System whereby they only allow one mile of road allowance construction for each subscriber. If a subscriber living beyond the one mile limit desires telephone service they must pay \$450 to the Manitoba Telephone System, and for the majority of the people this is just too much money. They just can't afford it. And these are the people who really need the service. I sincerely urge the Minister to change this policy so that more people in the Province of Manitoba can benefit from the telephone. I know all throughout my constituency there are people who are frequently seeking telephone service and because of the policy they just are excluded. We have at the present time, that I know of, two applications in from two areas, one from Harperville District and another from the area east of Eriksdale, where they have enough subscribers to fall within the policy and telephone officials indicate that they may not be able to get service this year even though they do fall within the policy. I would think that these people certainly should receive consideration when they have enough subscribers to fall within the policy. At the same time I would urge the Minister to change the policy so that those persons who don't fall within the policy can get the service, because these are the people who live furthest away from the town and in the case of illness, or any such other emergency that may arise, they need the telephone service very badly, and I would ask that the Minister give this immediate consideration.

On the matter of television, I'd like to ask the Minister whether the Provincial Government is considering giving the Town of Flin Flon financial assistance to bring in television to that northern area? The reason for my question is a news story in last night's paper which reads, "Although Flin Flon is expecting the CBC to provide Kinescope TV by next fall, a letter received by the Town Council has left some hope that live network might still be provided. Apparently it all depends on whether or not the Provincial Government is willing to help. Alphonse Ouimet, CBC President, has written to Councillor Harry Easton, who heads the local TV committee, stating that because of the high cost involved of supplying a live network to Flin Flon, the CBC has decided to proceed on the basis of using television recordings, unless, he states, some arrangement can be worked out with the provincial authorities to share part of the cost of live network service." Could the Minister indicate when he goes to Stanton again whether they're going to get assistance?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) passed.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I'm just wondering if I should answer in reply to some of these questions that have been raised. I hate to delay my estimates but The Honourable Member from Inkster raised the point about elimination of party lines, and as he may recall, last year we launched a program of upgrading telephone service in the Greater Winnipeg area. This is a five-year program in which we felt we could eliminate all or the majority of two-party lines in this area, providing the people, of course, wanted to be upgraded to one-party service. During my opening remarks we did announce that 9,626 two-party subscribers had been upgraded to one-party service. We had offered it to 16,552, with 42 percent turning it down.

I think that the next question having to do with telephone directories -- I've since had a piece of paper forwarded to me here which appears to cover this particular point. Winnipeg and Provincial directories are published annually. We are under contract to a very responsible Winnipeg printing house. The contract contains provision for a perfect, fine type of production that is very much the same as all large telephone directories published in other parts of the country and necessary to this large type of book. We have had some difficulties on account of the loose pages in the last two years of the book, and this is being remedied by changes in printers' techniques. And the last book is a decided improvement over the previous one. We are confidently expecting better performance in future issues by reason of the demand upon the supplier. Now I don't know what the Honourable Member from Inkster does with his book. He had to change

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) five last year. I just hope he isn't beating anybody over the head with it or anything.

MR. GRAY:

MR. CARROLL: No, if I had been it might have been different. I've been using one all year and I've had no trouble with mine, and we've had no trouble with the one at home.

MR. GRAY: the official at a telephone office. I brought them the book and I got another one on several occasions. And they gave me a new one.

MR. CARROLL: Yes, I don't doubt it. If they drop, it could conceivably happen, you break the binding, and so on.

Now the need for more power, I think that really this is the responsibility of the Hydro-Electric Board. I rely on their good judgment. We have inter-connections now with Saskatchewan and Ontario which should give us better reliability than we have had in past. We have the additions of coal steam generating capacity, so that we're not so reliant on the Winnipeg River supply as we were at one time. And I think that the indications are that we have an adequate reserve to tide us over the future growth in the system until such time as Grand Rapids comes into operation.

The question of the Member from Selkirk. The Manitoba Government listings. This is really a very important item, and one that has been giving us really a great deal of concern. The experts in the field tell us that it's best to just list the senior people and to outline the departments below or the functions of the department. Now I admit that all the members in this House are pretty familiar with the personnel who are engaged in the workings in these departments, but they tell me that the average member of the public who is trying to get, say, Game Branch, he doesn't know who the Director of Game is but he knows he wants the Game Branch so he looks to Mines and Resources, he sees the Game Branch and goes directly to that number. Now I don't know; I know there are weaknesses in this. I'm not at all happy with the complications that we've had in our past directories, but I want to assure you that we are trying to work on a system which will be clearer and much easier for the public. And when we make changes we'll invite the comments of any members of the House with respect to the changes.

On the question of appeal from conviction under 222. I don't know; I don't have a full appreciation of the legal aspects of the complaint that you're making. I do suspect that if a person can have his licence reinstated until such time as an appeal is lodged that we will be getting a lot of people driving who perhaps should be suspended, but then again maybe that's a small inconvenience to pay for a person who legitimately has a complaint and who should not have been suspended. I think that a step in the right direction was made when we set up our Appeal Board, because there is an easy recourse for a person in such a position, but I must confess that we will have a look at this other and see if there is anything that can be done. With respect to your Section 151, I would suggest that you take that up with the Registrar and I hope that you'll be able to work out a practical solution to this particular problem.

Now the question of the book "Who Called Me". I believe this question was asked last year as well. This is the Honourable Member from St. Boniface. And this was discontinued due to the very expensive production of the document, and in attempting to determine whether or not this was really a valuable service to the public they advised all of the System's customers who were taking advantage of this service, they advised them that they were planning to discontinue and they had a very, very small number of letters in reply criticizing the discontinuance of the service. Now it was, as I say, a very costly book to produce, and it was felt by the System that it didn't warrant the expenditure in view of the small number of requests for this particular service. I have asked for information with respect to bilingual operators. I am advised that there has been no real problem in the City of Winnipeg in this respect. We would be pleased to investigate further and advise the House if we can give any further information on it.

The Member from Brokenhead was interested in his power rates and I would like to say that there has been no decision made as yet with respect to including his area within a Metropolitan district, which would get the same rates as the other suburbs.

The question of the Board having knowledge of the bids, the Public Utilities Board having knowledge of various bids which come in on various contractors' work, I think the Act is very specific that really the only time the Board becomes really interested, where they're directed to determine the amount of the contract, is in the case where there is an interlocking directorate.

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) And here I think it's specific that the Board must determine the price of the contract and examine the contract before it can be let.

Now with respect to other expenditures, the Board has a responsibility to determine whether or not the expenditures were prudent. And I think that this is the limit to which the Board can reasonably be expected to go. Now I would like to say this, though, for the benefit of the Honourable Member from Brokenhead and for any others who may be interested in getting further particulars, we did make an offer in this House some three weeks ago, or whenever it was, that we'd be very pleased to go to the gas company, arrange to have you or any group go down to the gas company, and get further particulars with respect to their contracts, and the gas company offered to co-operate with us, and we've had no offers from anybody on the other side of the House to take advantage of this very kind offer, I think, on the part of the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company.

Now the uniform system of accounts has been established by Board order with the authority of the Act. The Board has the authority to establish uniform systems of accounts and it applies at the present time to gas utilities only, although I know the telephone system have a uniform system of accounts, and I'm not quite sure about the power utilities whether they're uniform or not.

There were one or two inquiries about the one mile limit. The Member from Fisher, I believe, was the first one to raise it in respect to the one mile limit, one mile per farmer. And I think that really if anyone only has 100 yards to go, or 200 yards to go, I have found that the MTS are pretty reasonable sort of people. They aren't out there to overcharge or anything else. But I think at the same time they have an obligation to keep the cost of the extension of telephones down as low as possible. Otherwise it would be beyond the reach of the average citizen to enjoy telephone service. Now I think with respect to extensions beyond the one mile limit, normally you pay for labour only. Now I could be wrong, but I think the charges certainly aren't the full capital cost of the extension of that line. It's a small portion of the total cost of extending the line.

About television, I regret that I'm not in a position to give you any assurance of television this year in your particular area. But I will give you all my sympathies with respect to ultimately obtaining a good television service.

The Member from Elmwood has raised the question -- these fellows are all out of the House when I get to their questions here. However, I guess it doesn't matter too much. He was concerned about union people not getting into Kelsey and Thompson and we did say that we would make reasonable provision so that union people would have an opportunity, a reasonable opportunity, to get into the job site and be able to talk to the men that they're interested in organizing or whose contracts they have to serve. Well now I think three days a month is probably a pretty reasonable gesture on the part of the Hydro-Electric Board. After all, they have no obligation to provide free board and room to these fellows, and incidentally, they don't even keep them out. Your men up there, one of your guides up there, he goes all over Hydro-Electric Board property without getting authority. I have heard of no case in which people have been kept out, but I do think that there is a reasonable limit beyond which you can't go in having union organizers running around the camps, so I think that the three-day provision is pretty reasonable. You will recall that conditions are altogether different here from conditions at Kelsey. People can come in and live in Grand Rapids, live within a mile or two of the camp, and there is free movement of personnel back and forth. There is no real difficulty here. No legitimate complaint as far as I can see to the movement and to the legitimate business of trade union people.

Now the Member for Rhineland raised the question about procedures for establishing where automatic exchanges shall be put and so on. I think that we rely pretty well upon the technical advisors of the Manitoba Telephone System and they determine, in their opinion, where the growth is and what equipment is ready to be changed, and they're expanding in an orderly and progressive manner, ultimately to have automatic dial equipment throughout the province. Last year I believe our report said it was expanded to eight rural locations, community dial offices in eight locations in the province, and this is done on an orderly and a progressive basis. Now there is no reason to go in and take out perfectly good manually-operated switchboards if they are functioning properly, people are giving good service, just for the sake of taking it out and replacing it with automatic, until such time as the other places who get no service at all are served, or

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) until the old magneto-type systems are out. I think that there's a pretty logical sequence of expansion, and I have great faith in these people, in determining where these new systems should go and the manner in which they're extended.

Now the party lines, I think our ultimate goal is to reduce all party lines to below ten subscribers to a party line, and this is being expanded just as quickly as our financial resources will allow us.

With respect to extended boundaries beyond the rate base area. Of course we have this kind of complaint quite often. People who are in one rate base area, friends may live in an adjoining rate base area, and there is a pretty arbitrary line in between there sometimes, and the individual says, "Well, golly, you only have to hook me up this other way, it's only a mile, or a mile this way", but somebody has to make the decision as to where that line should go and we can't possibly please everybody in the province. Somebody has to be unhappy, but always we do the best we can to give people the kind of service that they should have, providing it can be done economically. The same question was asked by the Member for St. George. He has two applications from two areas who apparently meet the present policy of the Board, and some suggestion that they are not able to get extensions in the immediate future. Well, that may be possible, and I think one of the difficulties here is that a telephone system must plan well in advance the work, and it must proceed -- some of our equipment has to be ordered two years ahead, and we have a schedule that they are working to, and they are always working two years or more ahead, and they are limited too by the construction crews and the engineering forces that they've got. They can't expand beyond a certain limit each year, because physically they are not geared to expand more quickly, and there are, of course, some financial restrictions upon them. They are restricted by the amount of money that we vote each year to them, and I think they've voted certainly sufficient money to handle the work that they are equipped to do, physically equipped to do.

With respect to a contribution by the province to Fln Flon, the Member from St. George asking about a contribution to Fln Flon for assistance in financing television, all I can say is that there is nothing in my budget for this particular item and I have no knowledge of any special consideration being considered at the present time.

Now the Member from Ste. Rose has mentioned an invitation to tender which specifies certain minimum wage rates and certain maximum hours of work and these were put in not only to protect our Indian and Metis people in that area, but they were put in there as a result of some of the complaints that we received at Kelsey. We know that some of the hours that were worked were exceedingly long. They could possibly have been justified by virtue of the fact that they had long concrete pours and this was a continuous operation that they had to proceed with. But I think that we can say this, that this is a reasonable maximum number of hours and a reasonable minimum levy. We expect, of course -- and we aren't trying to set wages; we say that the wages shall be such as are negotiated from time to time between the contractor and his employees.

Now what controls are followed with respect to see whether or not these monies are actually paid to the employees? Well now I'm afraid that I can't really answer that question just at the moment, but I do know this, that before a contractor is relieved he must sign an affidavit saying that all of his obligations under the contract document have been fulfilled. So here is a legal control. A company must sign by affidavit that he has lived up to the terms of the contract. Secondly, I would say this, that the contractor will follow up any legitimate complaints that they may get with respect to wages. If anybody comes along, if anybody had come along before Dr. Martin, and documented even one case of where an individual had not received the proper wages for the hours that he worked, if one case had been documented, then the Hydro-Electric Board would have had something to take to the contractor and say: "Give us an answer". But there were nothing but vague allegations that people were working fantastic numbers of hours per week, when we know that the hours were pretty well limited to daylight hours, and you don't get 12 hours of daylight at Grand Rapids in December and January. We know that. So these, I think, are some kind of legitimate controls. Now, I know of no expenses, additional expenses which have been involved as a result of any breach in this contract, and Dr. Martin, of course, was sent up under the authority of the government to go in and conduct certain investigations. We have no idea at the present time how much this will be, and when it comes in of course, the government will be prepared to consider who should pay this bill, if we are.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister a question? I

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) have the progress report for the Telephone System for 1960 here, and the last part of the second paragraph it tells a total number of telephones showing it as 281,537, and ends a sentence, "and the demand for service is still substantial." Then taking the Annual Report it says, "In Greater Winnipeg over 6,000 residents' services were upgraded from two-party to individual lines and unfilled orders were reduced to a level where they might be considered as non-existent." I take from that that the country is giving the trouble in regard to new telephones, but what is their level of non-existence? Would it be Would the Minister have the figure?

MR. CARROLL: again please?

MR. WRIGHT: "Unfilled orders were reduced to a level where they might be considered as non-existent", and I take it this is for Greater Winnipeg. Have you the figures handy?

MR. CARROLL: In Greater Winnipeg there were no held orders at the end of December. Incidentally what I thought you were getting at was we increased by 14,455, or something, telephones. There was also an upgrading in Winnipeg that provided some further 9,500 but these weren't new telephone services, these were just people who were upgraded. The same number of telephone subscribers, but just upgraded service. Now the demand for new telephones -- what is the demand for new telephones? I think we determine the demand by the amount of new construction. How many new building projects are going up? How many new apartment blocks? How many new businesses; new industries? This is where we say that the demand continues at a high rate. Construction continues at a high rate. In the country, I believe, there were 89 held orders as of the end of the year. Now I don't know how they define "held order". I suspect it's something held over a three-day period or something like that.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, we hear of people who have been on the waiting list for the upgrading of service for five or six years. Are these people located in areas where it's impossible to upgrade the service?

MR. CARROLL: Oh yes, I would say that there's nobody delayed. Where we have the facilities to upgrade them, they're upgraded. Now we have really quite a problem in some Winnipeg areas, and I think we mentioned the talk last year of upgrading Greater Winnipeg services. I think something like \$5 million, but I could be way wrong there, but it's certainly a pretty fantastic sum of money and we're doing it as quickly as we can. We're embarked upon a five-year program, and we certainly hope to be able to meet our goal.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, does the Honourable Minister mean to tell me that they employed the services of Dr. Stewart Martin on this survey without having any arrangements with him whatever as to what the survey was to cost? Do you mean to tell me that they had no negotiations with him that he'd either be on a per diem or an hourly or some rate? Is that how the government conducts the business of the province, that they proceed to employ someone like Dr. Stewart Martin on no arrangements, and he gets up here in the House and tells us that when the bill comes in he'll simply pay it and that's it?

MR. CARROLL: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's a pretty ridiculous kind of a comment because nobody employs anybody on a commission of this kind, or anything else, without having some kind of arrangements made. But how do we know today whether he's going to spend three days on this investigation, three weeks, or six weeks? We don't know what it's going to cost him for secretarial services. They're going to obviously take down evidence; somebody has to transcribe it. What's that going to cost? Are they going to have a thousand words given in evidence or ten thousand words, or are we going to have a document like we had with respect to Brandon Packers that took some 2,200 and some pages. I think these are the things that we don't know, but certainly the arrangements that were made with Stewart Martin, they weren't made by me, but they were made by our department, and I suspect that they were made in the way that we normally make these things, on a per diem basis with legitimate expenses being allowed to the commissioner, and these will all be accounted for at the time when he files his report and submits his bill.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to have this clarification.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could make a further announcement on the progress respecting Manitoba Savings Bonds. The total received as at the close of business today is \$14,272,300, and the progress of this undertaking is such that I think I should also tell the committee that we intend to exercise our rights under the arrangement to give notice that

(Mr. Robln, cont'd.) subscriptions -- that applications for these bonds will cease at the close of business on March 27th, 1961, and written instructions will go out to agents giving the details of this particular decision on the part of the Treasury to close the subscription lists at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 p.m.