

DAILY INDEX

Thursday, March 24, 1960, 2:30 P.M.

<u>Introduction of Bills</u> : No. 137, re Shop Regulations (Mr. Smellie)	1895
<u>Bill 138</u> , re Loan Act (Mr. Roblin)	1895
<u>Third Readings</u> : Bills 43, 108, 118, 116	1897
<u>Bill 119</u> , re Hospital Loans (Mr. Roblin)	1898

Thursday, March 24, 1960, 8:00 P.M.

<u>Bill 119</u> , re Hospital Debentures: Mr. Campbell, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Paulley	1899
<u>Second Readings</u> : Bill 107 (Mr. Witney); Bill 114 (Mr. Lyon)	1899
<u>Bill 120</u> , re Public Schools Act (Mr. McLean)	1901
<u>Bill 123</u> , (Mr. Witney), <u>Bill 124</u> (Mr. Hutton), <u>Bill 126</u> , re Traffic (Mr. Carroll) ..	1903
Mr. Tanchak, Mr. Molgat, Mr. Paulley	1904
Mr. Hillhouse, Mr. Carroll	1905
<u>Bill 129</u> , re Treasury Act (Mr. Roblin)	1905
<u>Bill 132</u> (Mr. Johnson), <u>Bill 134</u> (Mr. Carroll), <u>Bill 119</u> (Mr. McKellar)	
<u>Bill 125</u> (Mr. Scarth), <u>Bill 131</u> (Mr. Shewman), <u>Bill 136</u> (Mr. Lissaman)....	1906

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, March 24th, 1960

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
Orders of the Day

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct your attention and the attention of members of the House to the Gallery to your left Sir, to a group of girls from the St. Vital Y.M.C.A. who accompanied by their leaders, Mr. and Mrs. Rothwell and Mr. McRae. In case you're wondering why they're girls from the Y.M.C.A. I might explain that the St. Vital Y.M.C.A. is a family Y.M.C.A. and has programs for both boys and girls. We welcome them, Mr. Speaker, tonight and we hope that they'll enjoy their stay with us.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. In view of his trip to Ottawa, I wonder if he's in a better position to tell me when I can get my correspondence.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to tell my honourable friend that I think I'm going to have it for him tomorrow, but my trip to Ottawa had nothing to do with that particular matter. I know what the next question's going to be.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I may surprise you. I'd like to know when I can get the correspondence pertaining to the roads for northern development.

MR. ROBLIN: I have every hope that that will be ready tomorrow, too, Mr. Speaker. I'll make a special effort to speed it up.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.
Committee of the Whole House.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee to consider of Bill No. 119.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House. Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 119, Sections 1 to 16 read and passed. Section 17....

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, is finally disposed of, I just wanted to check a couple of matters with the Honourable the First Minister. I have no wish to delay the passage of the bill, but I assume that the government has already had requests for the assistance in providing this money to these hospitals. I know that they, along with other hospitals, get the customary grant, but these are separate and apart and in addition to, if the occasion so arises, I assume. And while I'm asking the question, is it correct to assume that, circumstances being somewhat similar, that practically every hospital that applied in Manitoba would get similar treatment?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is correct in his first point that he raised. In respect of the second one I may say that this question was asked of me at second reading, and I explained at that time that this matter is all bound up with the review of hospital requirements as being made now and undoubtedly we'll have to come to grips with the financial problems involved in that. But we are withholding our consideration of the matter until we have the full picture in front of us. These hospitals were in the mill before the survey began and have been given general approval by the survey and we think we are not justified in holding them back.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, might I ask further to that of the First Minister, that in the event of the Advisory Board making its report, and construction may be started or at least desirable in respect of other hospitals, will it be necessary to obtain the consent of the Legislature for the government to treat them the same

(Mr. Paulley, con'td.)...as these hospitals are being treated in this Bill?

MR. ROBLIN: I believe it will be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) passed. Preamble passed. Title passed. Bill be reported.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take advantage of the fact that we're in committee just to advise the House of the proposal I made in Committee at 5:30, that I would ask the House to consider whether or not they would be prepared to go ahead with second reading of the bills that are listed here. I may be unduly optimistic, but I think that most of these bills are of a generally routine nature and are not liable to provoke much discussion, although I may be quite wrong, but I would suggest that if members are agreeable, that we should go ahead with second reading by leave, because I think that we should wait until tomorrow morning if it were to be done in the regular way, but it seemed to me as reasonable to suggest that we get on with that particular matter tonight and we adjourn and go back to the committee.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I should say that as far as we're concerned, we're quite willing for these to be proceeded with. I think it might be possible that we would adjourn the debate on one or two -- for instance, even though I took the Honourable the First Minister's advice and picked up the bills to look them over, I simply didn't have the time, because of other commitments, to examine a couple of them as carefully as I would wish to do. The one would be the Public Schools Act; the other, as you would expect, the Treasury Act. But depending on the explanation that's given - no, I don't think I should put it that way either, because quite likely we would ask for them to be adjourned in any case. I have great confidence in my honourable friend, the Minister of Education in explaining his bill, but even so we might ask for those two to stand. I think as far as we're concerned, or as far as I know, it's certainly okay to proceed with them all and we might adjourn the debate on that pair.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, as far as we're concerned, leave will be granted, I'm sure everybody in the House appreciates the fact that due to the busy tempo of the House, that we haven't had the opportunity of really studying these bills and, as I say though, we will not impede the progress of the House on second reading on the bills, as I can see at the present time it may be that pertinent points in connection with them may be discussed in Committee of the Whole on third reading rather than on second reading at the present time, but I want to assure the First Minister that as far as we're concerned, in our group, we will go along and give leave to the second reading of these bills.

MR. ROBLIN: Thank you Mr. Chairman. That sounds perfectly reasonable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. The Committee of the Whole House has considered Bill No. 119 and directed me to report the same without amendment and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

Bill No. 119 was read a third time and passed.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources)(Flin Flon) presented Bill No. 107, an Act respecting Provincial Parks and Provincial Recreation Areas for Second Reading.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) presented Bill No. 114, an Act to amend the Dower Act, for Second Reading.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, just brings into force, for the benefit of the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains, who is looking at me in a querulous way, brings into force one of the recommendations of the Norton Commission on Mineral Transactions providing that mineral interests -- the dower consent on mineral interests must be taken before a notary public or a barrister. There will be an added amendment to be brought up to that bill in committee which will provide that if these documents, or if these consents or affidavits are taken out of the Province of Manitoba --without of the province, that they can be taken before a properly qualified notary in the extra-judicial province or the province in which the affidavit is taken.

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

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin) presented Bill No. 120, an Act to amend the Public Schools Act 3, for Second Reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of provisions in this Bill of what I would call an administrative nature. They do not develop any particularly new policy with the exception of one or two that I shall mention in some detail. I think, however, that most of these items which are of an administrative nature, we will be able to discuss in detail in Committee, although I shall be very glad to answer any questions and provide any other information that may be required at this time. Dealing with some of the matters which are provided by the Bill, I should point out that there is a provision respecting fees to be paid by trustees with respect to trustee conventions. This is an item that has been requested by the trustees in convention themselves. There are two sections making certain amendments respecting the advertisements for teachers and the legislation here in the proposed bill has been approved by the Teachers' Society and the two trustee organizations and the Department of Education. We met and formed a committee and agreed that this legislation was proper and advisable. It will save a considerable amount of money with respect to advertisements for teachers. It will be administratively somewhat easier than the sections which exist at the present time.

There is provision for the appointment of auditors, a requirement for the appointment of auditors to audit financial statements of school districts. The persons who may be appointed is quite wide and we feel that it is essential, particularly in view of the rather larger number of grants. By that I mean the different types of grants that we now have under our grant system and the necessity of properly audited accounts that this should be done. I would just say, because I am certain that some of the members of the House may be wondering about the matter of the costs of such an audit. They will not be large, but it will be remembered that under our grant system we do provide for a grant towards administration expenses and of course the cost of an audit would be an administrative expense.

An administrative matter is one provision in the bill providing that for the deduction from the equalized assessment of the municipality of that part of the municipality's assessment which is based on the assessment of a military establishment which comprises a school district. This is a matter that should have been put into the legislation when we brought in our legislation concerning school divisions, and we now bring it up to date. It is necessary because otherwise it works a hardship upon a municipality that may have a military establishment which in itself is a school district and which provides school facilities and therefore makes no contribution to the levies of the municipality itself.

Provisions respecting the termination of teacher contracts and the committee of investigation that may follow, the essential part of this legislation provides certain time limits which have not been in the legislation prior to this time. Again, this provision has been agreed upon by the Trustee Associations and the Manitoba Teachers' Society, with the Department of Education and comes here with the agreement of all concerned.

There is a provision that schools -- school districts, where the school or all of the schools in the district have been closed for 10 or more years the school district under certain conditions that are laid down in the bill may be dissolved and their land transferred to an adjoining school district or adjoining school districts. We feel that this is necessary. There are a number of school districts in Manitoba which have been closed for many years and it is felt advisable that this procedure should be followed in order that their lands be attached to an active and operating school district.

There is a provision for the making of an electors' list in a school division every three years, and the procedure is laid down in the Act with respect to it. We felt that it was necessary to have a fairly well-defined procedure for the preparation and keeping up to date of electors' lists in each school division.

Perhaps the matter of the greatest change is that respecting the grants for construction of high schools in school division. And I should just like to sketch in the background of this and to make certain points quite clear because I think we don't wish to be under any misunderstanding about the effect of these amendments. I would remind the members of the House that under the school division legislation we provided for grants toward the construction of new high schools in school divisions on a sliding scale beginning with 40% in the case of a four-room high school and going up to 75% for a twelve-room high school or more and with intermediate steps between those figures. At that time it was our policy and is still our policy that it is the decision of the school division board with respect to any individual school or schools, they

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.)...decide where they want the schools and the size of the schools. There is no requirement that they must construct a school of a particular size. They make that decision subject, of course, to the rules and regulations that apply to school construction, and then the grant payable to them is according to the legislation that was enacted at that time. And I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that that situation continues. This provision makes absolutely no change in that situation. That is the law and it has not been changed and is not changed by this provision. However, there were requests and discussions and resolutions in this House that some consideration should be given to taking care of cases of hardship where because of some feature, geography, population or some other feature it was not practical to take advantage of the larger grant and as a result of a resolution or as requested by a resolution passed in the House at our last session I was asked to study the matter, the problem and to bring to the House some recommendations with respect to it. Now, Mr. Speaker, my study indicated that there are some problems. The problems, however, are in many respects related to the matter of location insofar as the desires of people in local communities are concerned. In other words, it isn't altogether a question of distance or geography or pupil distribution as much as it is the very natural and proper interest of people in communities within a school division to have a high school located at their particular place of residence or their particular centre. So I want to emphasize that while I am aware, indeed very aware, of the differences of opinion that do exist in parts of the province, with respect to high schools it isn't-- it's a problem of, shall we say, of divergent local interests as to where these schools should be located. However, that is not to say that there are not cases where it is not practical to build larger high schools to take advantage of the, perhaps the grants that would otherwise be payable if a larger high school were a feasible proposition. And so we have brought in this amendment, or an addition really, to the grant scale or grant provisions providing that the Minister of Education at his discretion, may pay grants not exceeding 75%, and I think it should be emphasized that it's clear that this may be at any figure, any intermediate figure up to 75% for a high school which has less than 12 rooms if certain conditions are satisfied. Briefly, these conditions are related to the, the geography of the division, the population of the division and its distribution, road and travel conditions, the cost of providing transportation to students in the division. That, in my opinion, is an important aspect because obviously there will be occasions when it would be cheaper to build a smaller school than to undergo the expense of transporting pupils an excessive distance to a school and the general economic circumstances within the division. These conditions are conditions precedent to this larger or additional grant being available. The grant is limited, where it meets the conditions, it is limited to not more than two high schools in any school division. In assessing and in studying the problem, it appears to us that there are a number of school divisions which would not normally qualify as far as we could tell, and that by limiting it to two we would take care of all the situations where this situation might normally arise.

We have placed a further condition in the bill, that it must be shown that the high school enrollment in the proposed school will be sufficient to warrant a separate room for each of the secondary grades. In other words this is limited to those cases where it will be possible to have a separate room for each of the secondary grades and that it will be a school of sufficient size to earn a grant for each teacher that is employed, and that the board of the school division has unanimously requested that this be done. And finally, that a board of reference has recommended that the request be granted.

With respect to, and I want to acknowledge, the contribution that has been made by the members opposite, the matter of the board of the division, making a request, it came to us from the members of the CCF Party in the House and was originally made, I believe, last year by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and while we haven't put it in exactly as he had suggested, certainly he must have the credit for having suggested it, and given the idea that is contained here. And then of course, the provision with respect to the Board of Reference has been stolen holus bolus from the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. These, and I'm quite prepared to acknowledge the fact that both of these ideas have found their way into this legislation as a result of their contributions to the various debates that have taken place and the suggestions that they have made. Now Mr. Speaker, I must warn the House that this plan may be considered by some to be not sufficient and certainly will be considered by others as going much

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.)...too far. Let no one be under any misunderstanding that I think that will be accepted as completely perfect because I'm quite certain it won't. However I do say to the members of the House that it represents my best judgment on what should be done to meet the special circumstances that have been mentioned in the various discussions in this House and to meet the circumstances which I know do exist in certain parts of the province, and I think that it can be made to alleviate those problems and be of very considerable assistance in cases which otherwise might be cases of hardship. I perhaps should also mention that this provision is retroactive to April 1st, 1959 and therefore is considered for all purposes to have been in force during the time that the division plan has been in effect.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, this is one of the bills in respect to which my leader made certain reservations but rather than hold up the second reading we'll agree to the second reading on the understanding that we reserve the right in Law Amendments to make whatever changes might be deemed advisable to us.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading of Bill No. 123. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. WITNEY presented for second reading Bill No. 123, an Act to amend the Mines Act.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading of Bill No. 124. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON presented for second reading Bill No. 124, an Act to amend the Veterinary Services Act.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading of Bill No. 126. The Honourable Minister of Public Utilities.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities) (The Pas) presented for second reading Bill No. 126, an Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act. (2)

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if the Minister would give us an explanation and I might say while I'm on my feet, among the explanations possibly he could tell us why these matters were not dealt with at the time we were giving the big revisions to the Highway Traffic Act.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, the main reason why this wasn't dealt with at the time of the other Act is that there was so much work involved in the first Act we didn't have time really to have the rest of this legislation prepared to proceed at the same time. Most of these are routine matters, some of them will, we hope, assist in a better enforcement, more efficient enforcement, solving some of the problems that have been encountered in this respect. We're adding some features here which we think will contribute to safety on our highways and a few other odds and ends that have been put in. I can give the House some examples of the things that we're talking about with respect to safety. We find that when drivers are ordered to stop on the orders of a peace officer to check the vehicle for safety features which are required such as brakes and lighting that there's nothing in the act which requires the driver to co-operate and to do certain things and we're spelling out in the Act that the driver will render such reasonable assistance as may be required by the peace officers. We can rule out mechanically unfit vehicles, there's apparently no authority in the Act to take vehicles off the highway which may cause injury to persons or property; such things as torn fenders or bumpers which may be protruding at an angle which could be dangerous, and things of that kind. Requiring that loads be secured in such a manner so that they will not be dangerous; we're requiring an additional connection between a trailer and the vehicle that will be towing it; adding certain prohibitions for persons driving on a highway. We say it must be equipped and constructed as required by the act, it is to be mechanically fit to be driven on the highway, it is not otherwise in a condition as likely to cause injury to persons or property, it is loaded in such a way that it is not likely to cause injury to persons on a highway. These are some of the things which we hope will contribute to highway safety. Some of those things, of course, which contribute to enforcement we find that a few years ago when T-licence trucks were allowed to travel beyond the 15-mile limits so that a man could take his family to the beach on a Sunday, we find that the

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.)...amendment was a little too broad and we have people who are using it in their business beyond the 15-mile limit, we're now tightening it up to ensure that only household goods are carried beyond the 15-mile limit. I believe it read before "own goods" which could be the product of a man in business who is delivering it beyond the 15-mile limit, tools of his trade in service calls, also beyond the 15-mile limit and so on. We find that there's some difficulty in enforcement where the registered owner is part of the charge which is laid, so for the purposes of enforcement and for the purposes of registration we say that title passes when the vehicle - when possession of the vehicle passes. This is only for the purposes of registration and it will assist the police in the enforcement of the Act. With respect to highway traffic we're providing some increase in fines for people who violate the provisions of their franchise under the Motor Carrier Board. The only thing that they can do in enforcing the provisions of the franchise is to suspend the franchise, which is a fairly drastic course of action to take and which could put the trucker actually right out of business. This provides for a maximum fine of \$2,000 which is fairly common I believe, in many jurisdictions, particularly in the States. A peace officer may inspect the load in a truck. This has not been possible in the past. We're now putting it into legislation. We're spelling out the definition of the width of a tire for a motor vehicle; we're designating all highways in the Greater Winnipeg area as designated Class A Highways, but that of course is subject to a municipal by-law which can thereafter restrict transports from certain streets. We find this has been too restrictive with respect to the movement of trucks in the Greater Winnipeg area. We're making some changes, too, with respect to the size of trucks and trailers to bring it in line and in conformity with the practice in many other jurisdictions. I think there are a great many other small amendments which I think can best be discussed when we have our technical committee at Law Amendments - incidentally this act, this bill has been approved by the technical committee which worked on this the same as the bill which was before the House previously.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, if I may, I didn't want to interrupt the Minister before. I'm not too clear on the words where it says sub-section (1) used to have "the goods of the owner" only; the "goods of the owner"; and now it's changed to the "household goods of the owner". What does that - I would like clarification on that. Say for instance if a farmer bought some grain over 15 miles and he is taking it home -- would that be considered household goods, or for instance repairs -- 20 miles or 25 miles out, would that be considered household goods? In atruck, yes.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Minister closes the debate on this, I'd just like to say that here again it's a little difficult to discuss the principle on this sort of a bill - there being many principles involved. We do not propose at this time to oppose the second reading of the bill but we do want to reserve the privilege in Law Amendments of making any comments and changes that we see fit. The bill has just come to us. It's a fairly large one, we haven't had a chance to examine it completely and we just want to establish that, while voting for second reading.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one or two comments on it, and I'm in the same position as the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities in his presentation mentioned that there were other parts of the bill of a relatively minor nature. To me they seem to be of a rather major nature, in all due respect, in that I note that there is going to be an increase in the amount of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund namely, as I read the bill from \$300,000 to \$500,000, and as I've pointed out before in the House, Mr. Speaker, that this is a surcharge to a considerable degree on the owners of motor vehicles who have automobile insurance, that in addition to all of that they have to pay the amount into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund; whereas previously it was \$300,000 for increasing that by an additional \$200,000 which, in all likelihood, may mean additional assessments in respect of these people. I also note in the bill there, that there are provisions for gain, and this is a favorite method of my honourable friends opposite, another increase in the amount of fees payable in respect of legislation in the province. I note that it raises one of them three times to what it is at the present time in respect of examination in the improvement areas for the obtaining of a licence. We will -- as my honourable friend for Ste. Rose said, I'm not going to delay the passage of the second reading -- the Minister has told us that the technical staff haven't had much of an opportunity to get together with the Minister to discuss

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . all of these matters and most likely at that particular time will have some comments to make. The only one I wish to make in respect of that at the present time. It seems to me that even at the present service charge that is being made in respect of examination repeats at \$1.00, it seems to me that there is a tendency to drive into our Driver Training Schools, which would appear to me to be more or less unrestricted at the present time, which are rather costly insofar as the people who are desirous of obtaining a licence. I think that it may be driving still more into their arms at the fee rates suggested in this Bill and it might be that the technical advisors of the Department will be able to expand on that aspect of the Bill when we get into second reading.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I'd only like to make one comment and that is on the comment made by the Leader of the CCF regarding the surcharge on the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. I would sooner pay the surcharge on the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund than pay the extra premium that we would have to pay if we had compulsory automobile insurance in Manitoba.

MR. CARROLL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I must apologize for having said that there were a few other minor amendments. The reason I didn't mention the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and the other fee change was because it was mentioned in the House the other day in the resolution which introduced the Bill. However, I must confess that these are not minor changes, these are major changes and I will comment on them very briefly.

The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, as you know, when the Fund reaches a \$300,000 limit then by the Statute we must cease to collect the .50¢ surcharge for the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. This provides that the Fund may now reach a maximum \$500,000. The reason we're doing this is in anticipation of raising the limits which will be paid out with respect to any one accident and we feel that it's a good precaution to make this raise in advance of the change actually in the legislation itself which would provide for the additional limits.

With respect to the Driver Testing fee. This change merely pays for the cost of the service which is being performed in providing this service to the public. I think it's one of the finest tests and does more for highway safety in this province than probably anything else that we do. We think it's so important that we're expanding the area of coverage and we want to be sure that we have sufficient revenues from this service to pay for the program and the service that's being provided.

With respect to the T-licences. This will not affect the farm truck licences at all but only applies to T-licences which at the present time are limited to 15 miles -- a change was made in the Act a few years ago to allow people with 1/2-ton trucks to take their families beyond the 15-mile limit on weekends to the lakes and so on, and they felt at that time that it was reasonable that they should be able to take the groceries with them and maybe a few household appliances and so on that they might need during their stay at the lake. We have found that certain abuses have crept in, and we propose to eliminate that by limiting it to household goods only and not goods that they might use in their trade and so on. So we feel that this will tighten up the Act sufficiently to prevent the abuse that has crept in.

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

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 129, an Act to amend the Treasury Act for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, there are three matters in this Bill that I should explain to the House. The first one has to do with that same matter of foreign exchange that we discussed previously on the four other Bills that went through. This is a companion measure. The second matter in here has to do with the depreciation accounts which up to now have been run on automobiles and heavy equipment. This gives power to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to do away with that. Now, I should explain to the House that our intention is to do away with it in respect of automobiles, but not with respect to heavy machinery and equipment. The reason for that is that automobiles, the way the turnover of cars is a very short period in the government service, they turn over very quickly because we find that pays us -- there isn't the same real reason for a depreciation account as we formerly had in cars; it's a lot of book-keeping; it doesn't seem to add up to worth the trouble that it takes; we expect to find the money out of current revenue, rather than out of depreciation accounts, so we intend to do that and this part of the Bill gives us power to do that. The third thing that is in the Bill is to do with

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . the issuing of cheques. At the present time, under the regulations, we couldn't use mechanical cheque writing equipment to issue cheques because they're not under the control of the Comptroller-General; they're in the Treasury Department and there's some little legal aspect of that matter which seems in need of being cleared up. So the last part of this Bill makes it clear that while they're under the direction and control of the Comptroller-General, they can be done in other places.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I want only to say that as far as our group is concerned we're prepared to vote for this Bill going to committee with the same reservations as with the other two.

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

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health & Public Welfare) (Gimli) presented Bill No. 132, an Act to amend the Child Welfare Act for second reading.

MR. CARROLL presented Bill No. 134, an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act for second reading.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) presented Bill No. 119, an Act to amend the Manitoba School Trustees' Association Act for second reading.

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q.C. (River Heights) presented Bill No. 125, an Act to amend the Ophthalmic Dispensers Act for second reading.

MR. H. P. SHEWMAN (Morris) presented Bill No. 131, an Act to authorize the transfer of land by the Rural Municipality of Fort Garry, for second reading.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) presented Bill No. 136, an Act to amend an Act to Incorporate Brandon College Incorporated, for second reading.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that the House do now adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Friday morning.