

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8 p.m., Tuesday, March 23, 1976

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed this evening I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members of the gallery on my left where we have 26 members of the Third Transcona Rama Pack Cubs under the direction of Cub Leaders Mr. Stellar, Proskie, Lapuk and Kanski. This Cub Pack comes from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Transcona, the Honourable Minister of Labour.

On behalf of the members I bid you welcome this evening.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. PAULLEY: The member for Transcona quite frequently needs a cheering section, and I do want to say there are no greater cheerers for the Minister of Labour than the Scouts and Guides and Cubs and Brownies of Transcona.

I am not sure whether among them may be grandchildren so I had better be very careful of what I say this evening less a report goes back. But I join your welcome . . . and from Transcona.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has twenty-five minutes.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the Honourable the Member for Fort Garry is not in his seat. He went on quite a rampage just before the end of the committee meeting this afternoon about mobile homes, the regulations, etc., pertaining to the same. I did have about five minutes just before the Committee adjourned to indicate that in our opinion and in the opinion of most of the builders of mobile homes, and those engaged in the industry, that when the Act was first introduced in 1974 it was acclaimed as a great step forward in the protection of the owners, buyers, particularly the buyers and consumers of mobile homes. At that time, I indicated it took a little while before precise regulations were forwarded to me for my approval as Minister, and then subsequently the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I indicated then, and I repeat that in formulating the regulations we had the full co-operation of the industry as a whole.

The Honourable the Member for Fort Garry raised the question as to whether or not there was an adequacy of staff within the department to inspect and approve of all of the mobile homes before April 1st, or whether we had the capability of carrying through the inspection and the certification within a reasonably short period of time. I think my honourable friend is flying a kite in the wind without a real knowledgeability of what the situation is, and what the deadline of April 1st, really means.--(Interjection)--I will tell you; I hope you listen, and of course if you do you may be out of context with your normal approach.

The April 1st deadline deals not with the possession of a trailer, not that it has to be inspected, unless it is going to be sold and doesn't have a sticker, that is the deadline. There is no deadline that says that everyone who owns a trailer must have a sticker by April the 1st; it is on the sale of the home. The complaint that I am sure that my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry - and I'm glad he is here now - that has been drawn to his attention by distributors is that they may get a trailer turned in on a Thursday that is not approved and they can't sell that trailer to another consumer unless there is a sticker on it, and I would suggest to my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry that his complainant is the same complainant with whom I have been in touch, and is domiciled in my own constituency, and that is what the fear is. Now my honourable friend went out on a long tirade, and I've complimented him on a number of occasions; he should have been a Ronald Reagan and had a prior involvement in theatrics before becoming a politician. My honourable friend, I say this in all love and affection to him, is attempting it in reverse, being the politician and then turning around and attempting to emulate the theatrical capabilities of a Ronald Reagan, but he is not being quite successful.--(Interjection)--Very well.

In answer to some of the points raised by the Member for Fort Garry, and I am

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) sure that he would agree that in our normal usual competent manner that over the dinner hour we took into consideration some of his points. I want to say as far as the time element is concerned, Mr. Chairman, advertisements respecting the new regulations first appeared in the media on February 7th of this year, almost two months prior to the April 1st deadline, and these advertisements have appeared since on a weekly basis. An information booth was also operated at the Recreational Vehicle Show in the Convention Centre during the period February 4th to the 8th. Aware of the fact that regulations were to come into effect on April 1st, approximately 15 dealers from among the 25 or so operating in the city, and one or two dealers from outside Winnipeg, met with the department on the 27th February, at which time they were fully informed of the application of the regulations. As a result of that meeting the department arranged to issue selling permits prior to April the 1st, despite the fact that dealers were not required to have such permits until the date of April the 1st, which is not here as yet.

I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that as of yesterday, March 22nd, 492 units within the City of Winnipeg and 89 outside the city were fully approved and permitted for sale, and I want to emphasize permitted for sale, so here we have almost 580 units. It is interesting to note that 57 units examined were not approved, 30 having minor deficiencies, the others major safety hazards, such as broken electrical outlet boxes, and bare and exposed electrical wiring. This is what we're endeavouring to do by this legislation and these regulations, to prevent the sale after April 1st of mobile homes that have these deficiencies in order to protect the travelling public and the consumer. In my opinion there is no evidence that the regulations themselves have seriously interfered with the sale of mobile homes or travel trailers in the province. There is evidence that regulations are achieving their primary purpose, the protection of the consumer and the protection of the dealer against unfair competition. From my knowledge the dealers who are willing to co-operate with the department have no legitimate complaints, and I said that before we adjourned at 4:30.

When I arrived back from the dinner hour I had on my desk, in my mailbox, a letter from a party who has a trailer in the constituency, I believe, of my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry. I would just like to refer to that letter because there's a misconception in the minds of some people and certainly there is a misunderstanding or a misconception of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

A MEMBER: No way, good Lord.

MR. PAULLEY: Here's the letter and I ask, Mr. Chairman . . . I'm prepared to give the information but I have a request of the party for non-revealing of the name. I would give it privately if that is agreeable. If I don't have that assurance I will not read it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister can make reference but if he makes a direct quotation then it's a different matter.

MR. PAULLEY: Okay, that's my honourable friend. I admire his fairness. I admire his fairness, I will not refer to the letter because I know what it contains, but I did want precise quotations of how the honourable member, and that honourable member has no conception of the problems with which we are engaged at the present time. So in fairness I will not quote from the letter lest my honourable friend the Member for Birtle-Russell attempts to have me do something other than the request that I have received from a person who has a misunderstanding of the regulations.

Here is a person 74 years of age, or an elderly citizen, who has had a trailer since '74; it has a Department of Labour mechanical and engineering certificate on it, which denotes that the equipment is in a satisfactory condition. The party is worried because it is felt by the party concerned that they have to have that mobile home inspected and approved by the 1st of April of this year. That is totally erroneous. Totally erroneous. The only requirement insofar as April 1st is concerned, that where a person sells a trailer, or a trailer changes hands from one person to another, that it must have the seal of approval as to the safety of the unit. This unit being in a trailer camp does not require a certificate or a permit to stay there. And in this particular case because

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) the trailer has the stamp of approval that on sale, if it is to be a sale, from the present owner to a future owner, there is a transfer permit fee of \$2.00 so that there is the continuing registration in respect to the motor vehicle. Now is that unfair, Mr. Chairman, I ask you?

There is such a widespread misconception of what is going on.--(Interjection)-- That's right. My honourable friend from Roblin says that's right. I say to my honourable friend that he should start at home with his colleague immediately behind him. We're not attempting in any way, shape or form, to impose conditions on people who have trailers but only to assure that where there is a transfer of ownership that the new owner is not getting rooked by buying equipment that is not safe on the road or safe to live in. Now is there anything wrong with that, Mr. Chairman? I ask the Member for Birtle-Russell, would he not agree that this is a reasonable step forward?

My honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry raised the question of the input of the sales tax because the financial department or the treasury will be deprived of receiving revenues from the sales tax on the transfer or sale of equipment. It's a bunch of rubbish. It is rubbish on the part of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry because if the equipment has the approved sticker there's no prohibition, and my honourable friend, if I recall what he said correctly . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a point of order?

MR. GRAHAM: No the Minister asked me a question . . .

MR. PAULLEY: No I didn't ask you a thing, sit down. Sit down. Lord I've been around here long enough that I'm not gullible enough to ask you any questions.

My honourable friend mentions the question to the effect of the sales tax and he implied, if I heard him correctly, and I'm referring to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, of the loss of revenue because of the lack of sales, because of the threat, or whatever the dickens it was he said, of this imposition as of the 1st of April so there would be no sales in March. I would suggest that if the attitude and approach of the Member for Fort Garry was right, there should have been overwhelming sales before April the 1st because if they have ill-equipped equipment in mobile trailers on their lots, I would suggest that they'd be most anxious to get rid of them before the requirement of safety in the mobile homes as we're going to require on April the 1st. So I take it as utter nonsense and poppycock the approach of my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry insofar as the application of the sales tax.

We will assure the distributors that where they have units that are ready for sale, on application for priority that those applications for priority will be given every consideration.

The Member for Fort Garry intimated before the dinner hour that the department only worked five days a week, so here we have the weekend without anybody around capable or competent to make an assessment as to the safety factor of a trailer. I say to him and I say to the people of Manitoba that this is utter nonsense and ridiculous because the Department of Labour in this field as in other fields as well realize their responsibility and if it is necessary, Mr. Chairman, in order to accommodate the continuing sale of mobile homes that are safe for the travelling public, we will engage sufficient staff so that that can be accomplished be it over the weekend or otherwise. So I reject, I reject the contention of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

Yes, I know. He indicated, Mr. Chairman, that if it hadn't been considered under the Estimates of the Department of Labour they were going to bring it in as a grievance. I think that if there is any grievance at all to be raised it is a grievance by those who may be purchasers of equipment that is unsafe and may be death traps to the purchasers. That is why we're doing our job. That is why this Mobile Act was approved by this House and as I said before supper hour, with the approval of the Honourable the Member for Fort Garry. Now we're attempting to bring it in and to make it effective, his hands go up in holy terror and said: "What doest thou to the distributors?"

I say we are doing the distributors a favour. I say, Mr. Chairman, that we are doing the manufacturers of mobile homes in the Province of Manitoba a favour. No longer will it be possible as it has been possible over the years for cheaply made, unsafe

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) equipment, manufactured outside of the Province of Manitoba to come into this province and be sold. No longer will it be possible in the Province of Manitoba for fly-by-night constructors of mobile homes to sell, to possibly gullible purchasers, unsafe equipment.

I'm hopeful that as time goes on with the completeness of our inspection program that we will not see, as many of us have seen I am sure from time to time, trailers on the edge of our highways burned to a crisp because of ineffective operation of propane gas equipment, electrical apparatus and the like. That's the objective. We have to start somewhere and we decided back in December after the regulations had been formulated as I say by joint co-operation between the industry and the department; the order-in-council, as my honourable friend from Sturgeon Creek says, was approved on January I believe, the 16th; April 1st is not here as yet; nearly 600 units have been inspected for the purpose of sale. Those units that are not being sold and being retained by the owners are not subject until there is a desire to sell or to transfer to somebody else.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask you, I ask the members of this committee in all reasonableness, is not this fair? It isn't as though the regulation or the idea came into being within the last two or three weeks or so. I would say, I would say were that the case then there is justification for the fervour created by the Member for Fort Garry.

The Act was passed 1974, nearly two years ago. With the co-operation of the industry the regulations were formulated and passed by Order-in-Council and filed on the 16th of January of this year. The department in the meantime through advertisements in the media, participation in the Convention Centre with the display, has tried its utmost to make sure the message go . . .

Now, only recently within the last two or three weeks has there really been any uproar by some distributors of mobile homes, and I suggest in all due respect to them that that they should have known - there is that saying I understand in law, and of course I'm no lawyer - I understand in law there is that saying, "That ignorance is no excuse." In this case widespread advertisements have been carried on, and I would suggest that while my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry may love to rant and rave and flamboyantly plead for the distributors of mobile homes, our concern is for the users and the purchasers of the home as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While it's been very interesting to listen to the Minister about this particular subject, and certainly when the Act was passed this side of the House recognized the safety factor and the work that was being done on behalf of the purchaser, but the Minister has been speaking most of the time tonight about dealers and distributors and manufacturers, and let me just refresh his memory. The Act which is in front of us here, which I have in front of me, the definition of a mobile home under Section 8, means, "a portable dwelling unit (1) is capable of being transported on its own chassis and running gear by towing or other means; or (2) is placed on a chassis or body of a motor vehicle; or (3) forms part of the motor vehicle and is designed to be used as living quarters or as accommodation for travel, recreation or vacation purposes."

Now, Mr. Chairman, that takes in just about a covered wagon at the present time if you want to sell it. That takes in any type of vacation sleeping accommodation. It takes in the whole gamut whether there's a stove or propane gas equipment in it or not. There are many trailers and pieces of living accommodation on the road today for vacations that don't have anything in it, not one thing, such as a tent trailer as a matter of fact, as far as electrical, gas, or anything else in it. Yet this bill states the definition of a mobile home and it takes in everything from a covered wagon on up. So the Minister has to remember very clearly that this piece of legislation is not just referring to electrical or anything of that nature.

Mr. Chairman, in the beginning of the regulations it says the Act being The Building and Mobile Homes Act, and I refer to Section 3 of the regulations, "No person shall lease." No person, that's everybody, that's not dealers, manufacturers, that's you and me, that's everybody that happens to own a trailer that doesn't have electrical or

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) anything in it, that's everybody that has had a trailer for a long time that wants to sell it. Now we agree with the Minister that it doesn't have to have a label by April 1st, but what we are saying is when you want to sell your trailer, this is the process that you will probably have to go through.

Take Section 3, "No persons shall lease or offer for sale or lease a mobile home without a permit for the purpose issued by the Minister under this Act."

Let's take a look at Section 5, this is a confusing section of the regulations, "Where an inspector of a mobile home under sub-section 1 shows that the mobile home (a) bears a label," you know, bears a label. (b) "Has no apparent safety hazard." Has no apparent safety hazard. "The Minister or person acting under his authority shall issue the required permit."

But then you look at 6(1) and 6(1) says, "Where an inspector of a mobile home under Section 5 shows that the mobile home bears a label." Bears a label, "but has an apparent safety hazard, the Minister or person acting under his authority shall not issue the required permit." Now how does a person know? It says in Section 5 if it's got a label, you've got to issue a permit; then it says if it's got a label and it's got an obvious safety hazard that you won't get a permit. So a person can't take a chance, whether he has got a label or whether he hasn't got a label, he has got to make application. This is just another way of collecting money; it's one of those hidden taxes of this government; so he has got to go from there.

And then you get into the area of Section 7 "Where inspection of a mobile home under Section 5 shows that the mobile home does not have an apparent safety hazard." Does not have an apparent safety hazard," and does not bear a label, the Minister shall not issue the required permit but shall require the applicant for the permit to apply for a standards inspection to show that the mobile home complies with the standards and the form supplied by the Minister." And have you taken a look at the price of the standards inspections in the back. You know, it starts to get pretty expensive if somebody happens to own a mobile home that they want to sell, it doesn't happen to have a label and they're going to apply, and it hasn't got a label on it, so therefore they've got to have Standards Inspection, and the mobile home may have been in use for a long time.

Let me tell the Honourable Minister something about CSA. They approve a unit. I could have a unit and put a larger fridge and stove in it that has a CSA approval on that fridge and stove, but because it isn't the same model that was originally approved with the unit, my unit wouldn't have a label on it, and I'm wondering if the Minister has thought of these types of things.

Look in the paper tonight, Mr. Chairman, there's all kinds of people, you know, ordinary people, that have got their mobile homes for sale. They've got to apply now and have an inspection if they don't have a label. Mr. Chairman, these regulations have obviously been made up in such a way that they're almost impossible to enforce. You know, it's like the seat belt legislation in Ontario, you can't enforce it. You've got something here that's an impossible situation, which is control anybody that owns a covered wagon or better, and that's really what it says. If you go back to the bill and you read it, it says, "Quarters as/or as a combination for travel, recreation or vacation purposes." Now that's not just talking about electrical. You know, this really means that every trailer sold in this province which could be slept in, could be slept in or have a cup of coffee in, is going to have to have an inspection, a costly inspection very likely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concern of my honourable friend, but how realistic is he being when we're talking about the covered wagon. Maybe --(Interjection)--No, I'm speaking, and I have the right to speak. Yes, he sat down and he was finished. Do you mind? All right then. Hold your tongue. My honourable friend mentions about the covered wagon and boy-oh-boy I think that's typical of the type of criticism that we're getting from the other side of the House. Because after having supported the legislation unanimously and realizing that the purpose was safety in the legislation, my honourable friend the Member for Sturgeon Creek is now - is criticizing us because it could conceivably apply to a covered wagon. Well, I say, Mr. Chairman,

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) I say to my honourable friend that if it does apply to a covered wagon, and if by way of interpretation the covered wagon is included in a requirement for safety, is it wrong? Is it really wrong? I can't see any logic in his argument at all. He's not considering--(Interjection)--Oh, you'll have your opportunity if you want it in a moment. Because it was your local area there that were the greatest supporters of this legislation, and I'd be glad to hear from you in a moment.

The fact of the matter is that there's no question or doubt that there may be some trailers that might not have propane gas; they may not have certain facilities in them that would require inspection, or come under the broad term of the inspection. There's no desire on our part, there's no desire on our part to impose conditions on the owner of a Red River Cart apparently, as my honourable friend was referring to, but how would we know. How do we know in the Department of Labour, that is charged with the responsibility of the safety, know whether it was a covered wagon or not until we took a look at it. And the permit requirement for sale after April the 1st is so that the department has an opportunity of inspection. Now, I'm sure that the officials of the department, the inspectors, when they come upon the Red River Cart, referred to by my honourable friend the Member for Sturgeon Creek, would not soak them for inspecting gas tanks if they weren't there, propane heaters if they weren't there, and other pieces of equipment if they were not there. What a ridiculous argument. Surely--(Interjection)--well whether it's got a label on it or not, if after the inspection the inspector puts on a label certified for use and there's no equipment in the thing, what harm has been done, even if it is the inspection of a Red River Cart. So I reject the contribution of my honourable friend from Sturgeon Creek, and I'm sure were he here and I there, he would reject as I do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Well, Mr. Chairman, it's very interesting to listen to this Minister in the debates of trying to solve the transit strike. We in the opposition day after day offered him our services to helpfully get the transit workers back on the job, and he rejected us day after day after day. Here we have another classic example of the opposition trying to help the Minister clean up some poor regulations, poorly drafted and meaningless regulations. It's an unsurmountable task to get across to this government that they don't know all of the answers, and they haven't got the ability to solve the problems of the people of this province. And certainly, Mr. Chairman, we in the opposition supported the legislation when it was brought in in '75, and we support the concept of the need of safety regulations with trailers, but somehow, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's got hung up on this thing. The difference between a mobile home and a little trailer that you pull behind your car, it's as different as day is from night, and this is the problem with these regulations. You've thrown them all into one grab bag, and it's absolutely impossible to regulate a mobile home on the one hand, and a little trailer that a man's pulling behind his car on the other hand. And I've got many questions to ask the Honourable Minister just how he's going to manage this.

First of all, how many trailers are involved in this province? There must be 6,000 or 7,000. They're going to have to be inspected, and should be inspected real quick, and you haven't got enough staff. Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Leave that to us.

MR. MCKENZIE: I know, but when I get through speaking I think we'll prove to you that there is an easier and a better way of doing it than we've got before us on these regulations that we're dealing with tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I've been in touch with some of the groups in this city that sell what's known as the little trailers, the recreational type, and they are known as the recreational vehicle dealers. They tell me that they went down to the Minister's office many times - but he was so tied up with the transit strike he had no time to deal with them, and so they were turned aside - trying to find out what these regulations are all about and how they were going to become involved. I said that some of the recreational vehicle dealers in the city were at your office when the transit strike was on. I don't know who they were but some of them have met with me and complained that they were not able to see the Minister because he was so busy trying to resolve the transit strike,

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) and in the meantime they're hung up with these regulations and trying to - and this is the recreational type of trailer group, not the mobile home group, I'm talking about the recreational people. I contacted them again during the supper hour and they spelt out again they were not consulted with the regulations, and they had some suggestions for the Honourable Minister to deal with.

But, Mr. Chairman, first of all I'd like to ask the Minister how many units is he looking at in this province that he is going to now either provide a permit for them or put a sticker on them.

MR. PAULLEY: I don't know how many are up for sale.

MR. McKENZIE: He hasn't got a clue. Well some tell me that there's 5,000, 6,000 that change hands in a year. So he has five on his staff, and two work in the office, to do this tremendous amount of work. The other thing: I am told that now if you go over and try and buy a licence for your trailer from your Autopac Dealer, you can't get a licence plate unless you have this sticker, this so-called sticker. Well, I hope the Minister clears that up, because there has been problems.

MR. PAULLEY: April the 1st isn't here.

MR. McKENZIE: I hope the Minister clears that up, because there has been problems--(Interjection)--I know, but there has been problems already with this where people with trailers have gone to Autopac Dealers and they've said, we would like to put the licence on our trailer. They have been denied the licence until they have the sticker. Well, I hope the Minister--(Interjection)--Well, now let me ask the Minister the other thing. In these so-called recreational types of trailers, and you're talking about the broken-down electrical connections, are you going to check the car that's going to pull that trailer? Are you going to check the hitch that's on that car that's pulling that trailer? No, you're not. And this is the problem. Whereas the mobile home is certainly a unit in itself, the recreational type of trailer is one that you pull behind a car, and it's a different ball game, a different ball park altogether.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister has . . . many things that have been overlooked in these regulations. Is there a possibility that the recreational type of vehicles could be put off and regulated separately from the mobile home? And that's a concern, and one I think that the Minister should take a look at and maybe it will solve this problem. The other one that keeps coming across my desk all the time, would it not be better to licence these dealers? The dealers that have a sales type tax licence that are in the business of selling trailers, let them inspect the trailers and notify you within an hour or two hours the trailer has been inspected, and if they don't abide by your rules and regulations their sales tax licence will be cancelled. No, the Minister he wants to build up a tremendous bureaucracy, and at the same time tell us that he's going to follow the guidelines and follow this restraint program that the Premier is laying on the line. I suggest this is a simple way. These dealers are already in operation. They hold a sales tax licence, you can bond them, and let them do the inspections of these trailers, fill out the forms and send them back to the Minister's office. Very simple. They're in the business. They'll do the safety checks, and I'm sure that they'll do them as well as your staff and they're in the business, they know what it's all about. --(Interjection)--Well, whatever the case may be.

But, Mr. Chairman, who are these inspectors that the Minister's got to go around checking these trailers? They're electrical inspectors and gas inspectors. Now what knowledge have they of brakes? Like a safety on a trailer is a braking system. Have they any knowledge of a braking system on a trailer? I suspect they don't, Mr. Chairman, and this is what the trailer people are telling us.

The other thing, Mr. Chairman, is, if a unit has been inspected, that hasn't been inspected now that the period - has he, the dealer got to take that off his lot? Can he leave that on his lot for sale when it hasn't got the sticker on it?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, as long as he doesn't sell it.

MR. McKENZIE: I wonder would the Minister give me some idea what's the life expectancy of the mobile home unit and the type of trailer that you pull behind a car. Is it two to three, four, five, ten years, or are we talking about annual inspections on these

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd) trailers so that stickers are renewed every year? Or are we talking about twice a year? Because if you're going to go into the inspection business for safety reasons we'd better have it annually or bi-annually and much different than I see in the regulations.

Another question was asked me by the trailer - what happens when a guy's got a bunch of trailers in his yard and a hailstorm comes down and the stickers are knocked off in the hailstorm? Does he have to go back and pay the fees again to have these . . .? Well Mr. Speaker, these are only a few and I've got pages and pages of questions that's been raised by this group.--(Interjection)--I have.

A MEMBER: Bring them up, Wally.

MR. MCKENZIE: What about the trailer that's got a CSA standard? Does the Minister consider that that's - it's sitting on a dealer's lot today. There it sits.

--(Interjection)--Then it doesn't need the sticker.--(Interjection)--Right, right.

Supposing that the man and the trailer wanted to put an oversize set of tires on it or change the braking system on the little trailer, then he could get it approved. It wouldn't get a sticker even though he's improving the qualities of the trailer, upgrading his trailer, and under these regulations therefore it couldn't be offered for sale. Now this is just a few of the many ridiculous things that's in these regulations. I hope that the Honourable Minister will at an early date call these dealers, there must be 50 or 60 of them in the city here and some of the outlying areas and get them to sit down and hopefully put these regulations in order so that they're more meaningful than they are today.

The other one, Mr. Chairman, and this is the one, you know - and the honourable members from the North - these fees as scheduled here, supposing there was a man at Thompson wanted to have a bunch of trailers inspected, all the fees do not include travelling or accommodation expenses necessitated by any expansion being inspected. So in other words if the inspector had to go to Thompson, that local dealer that had to get him, he's got to pay the air fare and the accommodation and meals for that inspector. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Honourable Minister that he'd better take them back in the office, redraft them, sit down with these; segregate if possible, segregate the mobile homes from the smaller trailers and surely come up with a better set of regulations than we have before us here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the Minister of Labour was confusing my constituency of La Verendrye with that of the Member from Rhineland because I haven't got too many trailer manufacturers in my area and the I think the Member from Rhineland does. But I think there is a problem that we are experiencing right now with regards to this regulation and there seems to be a grey area involved, and I would refer to it to the Minister right now. We're talking about consumer confusion, because to be quite truthful some of the remarks that the Member from Fort Garry made are right on, in that people are refusing to take delivery of any recreational vehicles right now. And I know from personal experience as well as some of the dealers back from my own home town. I just talked to them as late as today, and another dealer had a confirmation from a fellow that said he refused to pick up the trailer till April 1st, till he knew what was happening. So there is a problem as far as the consumer is concerned in the province and I think the Minister can't overlook that.

I think several of the problems that we will possibly be facing with the smaller recreational vehicles as well as the motor homes, and now I refer specifically to the smaller campers that sleep two or three people that are motorized recreational vehicles. Now I understand, as the Minister has said the CSA - and I wonder if the Minister could confirm this - if the people that have a CSA approved unit, do they then apply for a \$2.00 application and then the only thing that happens is that that particular application is processed? And am I right in assuming then that the inspection is not required? Now I think these are all grey areas that'll have to be cleaned up and touched up on.

The other thing I think that the Minister should possibly be looking at, you've got many dealers involved in selling recreational vehicles as far as motorized motor homes, who are dealing in these type of homes, and I understand for instance any units that are

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. BANMAN cont'd) imported from any of the other countries have to meet certain requirements as far as gas installations and that and they do come out with stickers right now. Again, will these people be subject to inspection on those particular units?

Another matter that the Member from Roblin brought up, I'm wondering if the Minister is looking at a form of possibly licensing the motor home and recreation vehicle people very much the same as many other agencies or dealerships have been licensed requiring them to have a bond. I think maybe some of the red tape that's involved with this could be overcome by setting up a system of providing a safety certificate with some of these smaller units. And I refer specifically now to tent trailers and this type of thing where you're concerned basically with the running gear of the unit such as the wheel bearings and proper maintenance, along that line, and smaller lights as far as signal lights, brake lights, and that is concerned. So I was wondering if the Minister has been thinking along those lines at all and possibly by providing something like that he could cut out some of the costs incurred by the department along this line.

The other thing is, the Member from Roblin also mentioned, is the cost as far as rural Manitoba is concerned with the regulations. We note over here in the C Schedule that there's a note at the bottom that says "above fees do not include travelling or accommodation expenses necessitated by any inspection." Now I'm wondering if the Minister could inform the House, if an inspector drives out to Steinbach or to Roblin or to Brandon to do an inspection on some vehicles that a dealer would like - or a private individual for that matter would like to get a sticker on, if that particular person will be penalized for not living in the City of Winnipeg and have to pay an extra travelling cost or accommodation cost with regards to having that unit inspected. So I would just like to say to the Minister at this time, there is definite consumer confusion with regards to this bill. Some of the advertisements I think have, if you look in the papers, have served not to clarify anything. I think they've confused the issue even more and there's quite a few people upset about this particular piece of regulations right now. I would appreciate some more clarification from the Minister and from his department with regards to this particular problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may answer some of the questions of my honourable friend in regard to the travelling for inspection. The only time that would really be invoked would be out-of-province inspections. There's no desire on our part to charge a person say, for instance at Wanless, if they have a trailer there, an additional charge for the issuance of a permit for the interim. It may be construed that way, but I want to assure my honourable friend unless it was sort of a facetious approach, or the likes of that, we have no intention of adding flying time or cost to an individual who is desirous of selling a trailer. But if we go say for instance into any of our sister provinces or the States or the likes of that for inspection purposes we feel that it would only be fitting and proper for a charge to be made.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, how many members who have spoken thus far in this debate have really seen or taken note of the advertisement that has been appearing in the papers. I would like--(Interjection)--well my honourable friend from Fort Garry says, we got it. But they haven't got it insofar as what the advertisement actually says. So for the purpose of the record, I'm going to read it into the record and this is what the advertisements say: "Going to sell or buy a travel trailer or a mobile home? Do you know about the new law? Effective April 1st, 1976 you are prohibited from selling or leasing these units without a permit from the Manitoba Department of Labour. A permit can be issued only if the unit has been inspected and labelled by CSA." Note that, Sir: "by CSA or the Manitoba Department of Labour, and is found to be free of apparent hazards. Act now to save yourself inconvenience and extra costs for inspection at a later date. Distributors, sales outlets and private owners should make application for inspection soon before the April 1st deadline." Then the ad goes on, Sir, to say: "If you are a buyer, make sure your travel trailer mobile home, fifth wheel trailer, tent trailer or whatever recreational unit is properly certified and labelled before you buy. For

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) information or inspection call the Department of Labour." That is the ad, Mr. Chairman. I think it is clear. It's referring to the matter of selling or buying. And that's the important point that we're attempting to make. I'm informed, Mr. Chairman, that as of now, those units that are possibly subject to sale have been inspected and there's no serious problem at all.

I am informed that, if necessary, to augment the inspection staff of the Department to continue the flow of sales, if there is indeed a flow, that there are additional inspectors who are qualified to inspect the units and they will be hired if necessary on a part-time basis so that no one is prejudiced in the sale or lease of the equipment.

Now the Honourable Member for Roblin mentioned, well why don't you let the distributors carry on their inspection and notify the department that they have inspected the unit? Well holy smokes! What a situation that would prevail in cases like - and as I indicated to my honourable friend from Roblin, I know that he's a very competent and capable merchant in his home town, I'd hate like the devil to have him take out my appendix even by designation or any other giving of license because you happened to be in Roblin and I happened to be there and he did an appendectomy - just simply can't come.

I agree with the Honourable Member for La Verendrye in one thing, he's perfectly correct and I do not hesitate to agree with him. There's a heck of a lot of confusions because people have misinterpreted our objectives, including such knowledgeable intelligent individuals as the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. And I only trust and hope that now that he has raised the question on the Estimates of Labour that he will reserve his rights of speaking on a grievance in accordance with the rules to something that he's more knowledgeable about than he's exhibited in the approach as far as the sale of mobile homes is concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister keeps saying, "if it's got a CSA approval." I said when I read the regulations, "Where an inspection of a mobile home under Section 1 shows that the mobile home (a) bears a label" - and there's a list of the labels accepted in the back - "has no apparent safety hazard, the Minister or person acting under his authority shall issue the required permit without any inspection whatsoever." Now under Section 6(1): "Where an inspection of a mobile home under Section 5 shows that the mobile home bears a label," - it shows it bears a label so you've got to have the inspection whether it bears a label or not. To be absolutely sure of your house, but has an apparent safety hazard, "the Minister or persons acting under his authority shall not issue the required permit." Now, you know, I personally if I owned a trailer and after reading that, whether I had CSA or not, I'd call up somebody and I'd say now would you please inspect it or you're going to maybe, maybe the Minister is planning to have garages like Autopac so we can all pull our trailers down to be inspected.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister seemed to get quite a kick out of the fact that I mentioned covered wagons. A vehicle that doesn't have any gas in it, that does not have any electrical in it, does not have any plumbing in it, could conceivably not even apply as a manufacturer to have the CSA people come to his plant to inspect it. He doesn't really come under the CSA on that basis. Yet in Section 7(1): "Where an inspection of a mobile home under Section 5 shows that the mobile home does not have an apparent safety hazard and does not have a label, the Minister shall not issue the required permit but shall require the applicant of the permit to apply for a standard inspection to show that the mobile home complies with the standards on a form supplied by the Minister."

Mr. Chairman, if I happened to own a trailer that's a tent trailer, that is 13 feet but not more than 33 feet or less than 13 feet, and I don't have a label on it, I would have to have what is called an inspection standard - a standards inspection, pardon me; and over 13 feet and between 33 feet it's \$50.00, and under 13 feet it's \$30.00. And I should have to have a standards inspection because of the tent trailer that I own doesn't happen to have a label on it, and really there's no requirement for a label on it because it hasn't got any appliances in it whatsoever. Now that, Mr. Chairman, as far as I'm concerned is a regulation that can't be put upon the people of Manitoba. It's almost like, and I refer to my book, it's been called my library, it's called "Douglas in Saskatchewan"

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) and it says - This is what happened in Saskatchewan when they were looking for more money all the time - and it says, "The report is a long and dreary list of fees, royalties, license charge imposed by various departments of government. Since 1944, 600 new imposts have been levelled, 600 charges of one kind or another have been increased." Now for somebody to have to pay \$30.00 to have a tent trailer go through what they call a standards inspection because it hasn't got a CSA label on it, and that isn't just the dealer that's got a bunch of them on the lot, that's the guy in the street that wants to sell one, is an absolute ridiculous charge.

Now the Minister can talk about covered wagons all he wants to, but somebody is going to have to pay \$30.00 if he hasn't got a label on a tent trailer that has no gas, no electricity, or no plumbing in it. Now, that's what these regulations say, and that's unfair.

Mr. Chairman, we turn around again and we talk about a person, and I know many of them, if you drive by them, people have a lot and they put their trailer on it, and they leave it there. Now there's a 13 or 14 or say, a 20 foot trailer, on a lot that is being left there and the man wants to sell it and doesn't have a label on it, it doesn't have a CSA label on it, and it's down in Falcon Lake, the inspector is going to have to go down and when he gets there and it hasn't got a label on it and the man wants to sell it, and it's a 13 or over 13 foot trailer but under 33, he says, "Well this hasn't got a label on it and Section 7 of the Regulations say, that the permit will not be given out, he must apply for a standards inspection, which is \$50.00. That is unfair. Because there are mobile trailers sitting in Thompson, they're sitting all over this province, they're sitting there beside lakes and they're called mobile homes because that's what they are, but they're never moved some of them, and they'll all have to pay this type of standards inspection fee if they haven't got a label on it. And as I said no tent trailer manufacturer need apply to CSA for a label if he doesn't have the electrical, gas, plumbing, or anything in it. If you want to talk about safety on the highways, if you're going to talk about the wheels on the trailer, talk about the wheels of my car too. But we're talking about the living accommodation within that trailer, and that is unfair the way these regulations are written.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm rather sorry that the Minister in the last response he gave had toned down and adopted a rather docile and conciliatory attitude because it's quite different from the attitude with which he entered the House at eight o'clock and during which he accused me of creating a fervour and of ranting and raving. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, if anybody created a fervour over this issue, if anybody has been in this House ranting or raving about this issue today, it has been the Minister himself tonight in his opening remarks between 8 and 8:30.

And I want to say this to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that he can continue to rant and rave all he wants, all it points up is the fact that he is completely out of touch with the industry, and completely out of touch with the market, and completely out of touch with the situation, and obviously, Sir, he doesn't care that he's out of touch. He has stood up here and said to us that he has consulted so and so and been in such and such a consultation, and told us of the different investigations, and the different discussions, and the different plans that he has either embarked on or he is planning to embark on with respect to this Legislation. And, Sir, all I can say is that the general welter of confusion surrounding this situation is compounded by the fact that there is a great deal of additional confusion over just what the Minister has done, who he's talked to, and who he hasn't talked to. He may think that he's talked to the industry, he may think that he has talked to the people who could advise him, but my information is that he has not done so, and he can put his information into the arena for inspection, he's entitled to do that, but I, thank God for the system, am equally entitled, Sir, to put my information into the arena for inspection. And I tell him that my information is that he has not had any discussions with the Recreational Vehicle Dealers Association of Manitoba, bar none, not one. He has talked to the Mobile Home Owners perhaps, but I want to tell him for the record that the President of the Recreational Vehicle Dealers Association of Manitoba has

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) advised me that this Minister has not discussed with him, or with his association or with his colleagues, either what this legislation is all about or what these regulations are all about. So where the confusion begins, Mr. Chairman, is in the Minister's mind himself as to who he's talked to and what kind of industry and industry spokesmen he's taken into his counsel on this thing.

Of course this is no different from the track record of this Minister and this government since June 25, 1969; they don't consult with industry; they don't consult with the professions; they don't consult with the community; they just consult with themselves, and at that half of them don't caucus with the other half. So how do you expect to get any kind of cohesive direction or cohesive policy on controversial issues such as this. And I'm telling the Minister that I'm not quoting the Member for Fort Garry, I'm quoting the President of the Recreational Vehicle Dealers Association of this province.

He said in his remarks earlier tonight that in his opinion it seemed, or he was assuming that the Member for Fort Garry was in touch with the same source as I have been, meaning as he has been. Well I want to tell him, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Fort Garry obviously was not in touch with the same source as he has been because the Member for Fort Garry was in touch with people who say the Minister has never consulted with them. And they are the people who run this industry.

Now it's true that the Mobile Homes Association is a different situation, but as my colleagues the Member for Sturgeon Creek and the Member for Roblin have pointed out there are a wide number of vehicles that are brought under the legislation and included in the scope of the legislation by definition in the legislation itself, and mobile homes are only one small part of that. And the legislation and the regulations that the Minister has promulgated here apply to everything in this field of recreational vehicles, trailers, tent trailers, and indeed formal mobile homes themselves. The definition, if the Minister needs any reminding of it, is in the statute and it reads as follows, Sir: "That a mobile home means a portable dwelling that: (1) is capable of being transported on its own chassis and running gear by towing or other means; or (2) is placed on the chassis or body of a motor vehicle; or (3) forms part of a motor vehicle and is designed to be used as living quarters or as accommodation for travel, recreation or vacation purposes." And if the Minister thinks he's consulted this industry or representatives of this industry I say to him, Sir, that he's got to prove that to us. Our information is he's only consulted one small part of the industry, if in fact, he's even carried on consultations worthy of that description at all.

My information, Sir, and again I throw it into the arena for challenge, but that is my legitimate right. I hope the Minister isn't so autocratic that he fails to recognize that. And again I reiterate I'm not speaking for the Member for Fort Garry, I'm speaking for people who are concerned about this situation. If the Minister cares not for what may come from the Member for Fort Garry, maybe I can just remind him that like everybody else in this Chamber, I speak for others who have been in touch with me. And surely he can be brought to some concern for their anxieties and for the questions that they raise, Because it is their position that I'm putting forward and they tell me, and again I'm referring to people in the industry, and particularly in the Recreational Vehicle Association, that the inspectors that are being used on this job are not qualified to inspect recreational vehicles. They may be qualified to inspect buildings, they may be qualified to inspect elevators, but the members of this industry who know about their industry, in the same manner that the Minister knows about the trade unions business, tell me that these inspectors are not qualified to inspect recreational vehicles and they wonder where the Minister is going to get enough sufficiently qualified in inspection of electrical equipment and inspection, for example, of propane gas equipment, to do the necessary job.

Now there was a mention of figures and of volume a little while ago, and I can tell the Minister if he's wondering that there are between 5,000 and 8,000 trailers which change hands by commercial sale or by private sale in this province every year, between 5,000 and 8,000 trailers. Those are association figures, and the association wonders why the Minister would not be conversant with that kind of figure and that kind of mathematics, because he could get it from the Department of Highways if he cared to check with his colleague in the Department of Highways.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

Which points up the further question as to whether the two departments maintain any kind of communication whatsoever on this kind of legislation. Certainly they should be in close communication on it. If they were the Minister would know that he's looking at something between 5,000 and 8,000 trailers. And he is looking at recreational vehicles as well as the other kinds of vehicles that could be classified as tent trailers, mobile homes, truck trailers, etc. And mobile homes are living quarters, they're living quarters. Recreational vehicles are not. They're two entirely different things, they're lumped together in the same legislation, in the same regulations, and this is where part of the difficulty ensues and it's certainly where part of the confusion originates.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has made much of the fact that the April 1st deadline is not discriminatory in any way, and that the ad is relatively comprehensible in the manner in which it's worded. I think I prefaced my remarks at four o'clock, or thereabouts, this afternoon on this issue by saying that I was not suggesting that the deadline was discriminatory. I was not suggesting that the fears of some of those to whom I've referred were necessarily supportable, but the fact of the matter is they are there and they are real, and that's the point of the issue and the question that I raised. The Minister read us the wording of the advertisement; I'm familiar with the wording of the advertisement, but I say to him that people who are selling or considering buying recreational vehicles and trailers and mobile homes have said to me, and I'm surprised if he tells me they haven't said it to him, because they've certainly said it to me and my colleagues, that the situation that has been created has been one - to use the Minister's own words - of considerable confusion, considerable anxiety and concern on their part because they're not sure about the meaning and the purport of the legislation and the regulations, and they're not sure about the meaning and the direction of the advertised messages, and as a consequence they have held off in their purchases and in their negotiations with dealers and distributors.

I'm not standing here and telling the Minister that he has imposed a deadline that's discriminatory, I'm standing here and telling him that the way the regulations have been presented and the way the advertising has been presented, has created a situation where people think it's discriminatory, and if people think it's discriminatory and are therefore discouraged from acting and the market slumps as a consequence of that, then I say to the Minister as a Minister of the Crown in this Province, surely that is a matter for concern whether or not in fact he actually took overt steps to force the market to slump. That's beside the point. The fact of the matter is that it has been injured and it has been inhibited by the situation. And if this debate has done nothing else but shed some light on the matter and given the Minister, regardless of any bombast that he's indulged in, given the Minister an opportunity to answer some of these questions and to enlighten some of those who were concerned, then the debate has been all to the good. And that's why I said to the Minister that we would have raised it in one form or another had it not been that we knew this matter was coming up in the Estimates at the present time. As far as raising it on a grievance as an aside, I might say the Minister need have no fear of that because I've used up my grievance for this session anyway, as I believe he has. So I raise it here because this is the legitimate place to raise it, and I raise it as a spokesman for those people in the community who have expressed these concerns to me.

Now I repeat that if the things that have been said here and if the answers that he has produced have helped relieve them of their anxieties, helped clear away the misconception and the confusion and helped restore confidence in the situation in the mobile home market, then it's been all to the good. But that's the purpose of it. The purpose of it was to ask these questions and to raise the issue and to have it clarified because the industry has been suffering, and people who have been interested either in buying or in disposing of units of their own on a private basis have been discouraged from doing so. And any cursory examination of the market during this month would reveal that to the Minister as a fact.

Mr. Chairman, I want to just stress for the record that I recognized that what really is at stake here is the position of the individual who either owns, or is thinking of

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) owning, or is thinking of disposing of one of these units, that's really what's at stake here. But the fact of the matter is that there is an industry involved, and the industry has been in trouble as a result of the confusion that we've referred to, and I knew that my colleagues were going to raise a number of points and a number of issues having to do with the specific private individuals, and my point in raising the question that I raised between 4 and 4:30 was that that was a critical question that had to be met head on first because of the economic situation facing people at the level of commercial transactions.

This is the reason why I launched into that examination with the Minister at four o'clock. It is not to suggest that the only thing at stake here, or the only thing that matters is the position of the industry itself or the position of the distributors and the dealers. Of course the position of the individual consumer is equally important. But it was not an issue that I was able to approach in the time available at 4 o'clock and I chose to acquaint the Minister with what I felt was a critical situation in the industry at the time that was available then, because of the economics involved. My colleagues have developed the case for his instruction and hopefully his edification as to the individual problems created for private consumers, private purchasers, and private owners. There's a myriad of questions that people are asking with respect to the safety certification procedures, and the Member for Roblin has raised a number of them. There are still others, and I think that it behooves the Minister to acknowledge the fact that where there are questions there must be questioners. They're not just coming from the four members on this side of the House who have spoken, they are coming from the questioners who have come to us and asked what is going on here and what can be done to make these regulations more consistent and more manageable and more equitable.

The suggestion of the Member for Roblin with respect to empowering certain dealers, at least those with Sales Tax licences, perhaps to resume the responsibility for carrying out some of these necessary inspections themselves, I think deserves perhaps fuller examination than it's been given, Mr. Chairman. Because the alternative is for the Minister I would suggest by his own admission to have to go into the business of hiring an additional army of inspectors to do the job that needs to be done.---(Interjection)-- Well, an additional army of qualified inspectors.---(Interjection)---Well, I'm not suggesting that my colleagues should carry out the inspections, I'm suggesting and he's suggesting the men and women who are in the industry - and I think we might be willing on both sides of the House to concede that they know something about the industry they're in, the men and women who are in the industry are qualified to carry out those inspections. If not, perhaps there are others in the industry, in the community generally who can be qualified to carry out the inspections. But there's one thing certain, and that is in the view of the association that I've talked to and the industry representatives that I've talked to, that there is no way with the present inspection staff the Minister has in his department, that he can carry out the inspection in any reasonable amount of time, because he simply has not got the people to do it.

We're dealing here with his Estimates. We're dealing here with a particular appropriation of \$855,500, and the logical question follows from his suggestion then is how much of that \$855,500 is appropriated for hiring additional inspectors to carry out the duties that are implicit in the regulations before us. And if none of it is budgeted for that operation, then what are we looking at in terms of additional expense, supplementary expenses, before we're through, for the purposes of carrying out this program. There probably are other more practical, more economic ways of carrying out the program, the Minister may have considered that. Judging by his attitude in the House tonight I would have to conclude that he hasn't considered it. I don't think that the suggestion the Member for Roblin should be dismissed as cavalierly as the Minister dismissed it. If the Minister would concede that anybody knew anything about this business other than himself, he would have to begin by conceding that the members of the industry themselves might have some suggestions as to how these inspections could be carried out satisfactorily, and he might be drawn to the conclusion that he should sit down and talk to them about it and ask their opinions as to whether there would be an avenue there available for having those inspections carried out.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

So I challenge the Minister to the same degree and with the same amount of convictions that he challenged me when he spoke earlier on this issue, Mr. Chairman. I say that there is difficulty in this industry, there is confusion for consumers. The Minister is the Minister of Labour, and that's a two sided coin, labour and management, that is the economic community and he has the responsibility to ensure that misunderstandings that are creating difficulties in the labour field and in the marketplace are resolved as quickly and as equitably as possible. And there are enormous misunderstandings on this question. The first and basic misunderstanding is the misunderstanding as to where the Minister got his information. I've told him where we got our information, I would hope he might be willing to accept it in the sincere manner in which it's offered, if somewhat enthusiastic. The Recreational Vehicles Dealers Association is concerned, is knowledgeable, and is heard at the present time by the effects of the misconceptions and the confusion that the Minister has referred to. I think it's incumbent upon the Minister to clear up those confusions and to meet with the Recreational Vehicle Dealers and to reassure them as to the intent of these regulations, and in fact to get their opinions as to how the regulations might be made more reasonable and more workable.

The question of mobile homes as such and the other related vehicles and their safety and their road worthiness is one that finds no argument, and never has found any argument from us. We've never disputed the concept of safety in these vehicles or road worthiness, or the proper inspection for the utilities and the units installed in them. We supported the legislation, we continue to support it and the concept of safety on the road and safety for mobile homes, travel trailers and related vehicles of that kind, but my goodness, Mr. Chairman, the concept has to be delivered to the community, to the industry, to the public, in a manner that is understandable and in a manner that is understandable and in a manner that is fair and reasonable, and in a manner that inspires confidence in the legislation itself. The fact at issue here is that the regulations don't inspire that confidence or that assurance, they've inspired dismay and difficulty and a slump in the industry itself. And I say to the Minister that that situation is the one that we've been presenting him with in this debate thus far, and that's the situation that we want him to act on and clarify. I repeat, that if this debate has helped to clarify it, then for all the exchanges rough and gentle, the debate has been worthwhile.

. . . continued on next page

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: One statement the Honourable Member for Fort Garry just uttered that is the absolute truth, and that is his reference to garbage. --(Interjection)-- It's your reference to garbage. --(Interjection)-- Oh, you did just two moments ago, which is indicative that my honourable friend not knows two seconds after what he said two seconds before, because he certainly referred to garbage.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the record will show I never referred to garbage. I never used the term.

MR. PAULLEY: He said the discussion created garbage, or referred to garbage. Hansard will bear us out tomorrow, and if I'm incorrect . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. If the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has a point of order he will be heard on that point of order, otherwise we should have only one speaker on the floor at the same time. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that the Minister doesn't want to leave an incorrect impression on the record. I did not use the term. I don't know what he's confusing it with, unless he's confusing it with my comment when I said there's been participation both rough and gentle, then it's been worthwhile. But I certainly did not use the term . . .

MR. PAULLEY: You said it produced garbage.

MR. SHERMAN: I did not. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to leave that on the record, because I don't think it has, I think it's been worthwhile. I said that there have been comments, there has been participation both rough and gentle. I don't know what the Minister is confusing it with. I ask him to accept my word that I did not say it, because I don't feel that about the debate. I think the debate has been worthwhile in the extent that it has perhaps enlightened the Minister on some problems that he was not prepared to face before. I certainly did not use that term. I ask the Minister to accept that because it is the truth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I will accept the word of my honourable friend. Far be it from me, being a very docile individual, one who tries to get along with the world, even with the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, if he did not refer to in the parts of his final remarks and used the word "garbage", then I accept that he did not, but I'm sure that both of us will look at Hansard very keenly in a day or two. It's sufficient for me, Mr. Chairman, then to say that if I thought the honourable member used the word "garbage" and he thought that he didn't, then I apologize because my hearing may not be as keen as it was, but I think I have some support from others; notwithstanding that, okay.

Now let's get the record straight. I admire the presentation of my honourable friend as a Member for Fort Garry. He is so capable. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I love him. I will not bestow upon him the kiss of death, because I believe that he has some qualifications and some capabilities, that given sufficient inducement and sufficient time that even the Honourable Member for Fort Garry can be led into the paths of righteousness and truth, but it's taking a long time.

I want to first of all ask my honourable friend, he was talking about the regulations in respect to the Mobile Homes Act, and he complains of the regulations. He complains because of what is contained within the regulations. Is he knowledgeable of the people who draft it, primarily the regulations that are under discussion this evening and were this afternoon? He in his oration belittled me, and through me. the Department of Labour because of the lack of knowledgeability or input by the industry and those concerned in the industry. Mr. Chairman, the regulations were brought about by a sub-committee under the Building Standards Board made up of:

(1) A representative of the Mobile Home Users Association.

Does that not indicate an involvement of the users of the mobile homes? So I repeat in case my honourable friend did not hear this properly: "A representative from the Mobile Home Users Association."

(2) A representative from the Canadian Mobile Home and Travel Trailer Association.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

(3) A representative of the Canadian Standards Association.

Mr. Chairman, that was the sub-committee that assisted in formulating the regulations, and yet my honourable friend has the consummate gall to stand up in this House and says there was no involvement with the industry or the users. I ask my honourable friend, just as I acquiesced a moment or two ago and apologized to him for a possible misunderstanding of what he said, will now he accept from me, the Minister responsible for this Act, that there was involvement with the very people that my honourable friend indicates were not. His seat mate, the Member for Roblin, and the Member for Fort Garry, chastised me because I did not meet with representatives of the Distributors Association - and to put it in the words as I understand them, and forgive me, Mr. Chairman, if I happen to put wrong words in the wrong mouths - the input was that I could not find time for them because I was so involved in other activities such as the transit strike. I admit that as Minister of Labour I was involved, but I do want to say this, that that didn't prevent an involvement of the Department of Labour. I doubt very much whether either the Member for Fort Garry or the Member for Roblin will ever have the honour of ever being a Cabinet Minister. But if perchance they do, I want to tell them that the Minister of any department has not got full time on his or her hands that they can set aside everything at any time in order to meet at the whim and desire of individuals, but in the operation of the Department of Labour - and I'm sure I'm speaking also for my colleagues, that we know that we can't do everything, but we do make sure that people are heard. And Fred Bromley, I'm naming him, because he was one of the persons that contacted me as a distributor of trailers, asking me to meet with him in connection with the problems that they were being confronted with in the sales prior to April the 1st and the deadline. I told Mr. Bromley over the phone that unfortunately my calendar was filled and that I could not, Mr. Chairman, give him sufficient time to meet with me to go into detail insofar as the problems with which the distributors were faced as a result of the regulations. I asked him if he would be kind enough to meet with the director of the Mechanical and Engineering Department of the Department of Labour, and indicated to him, Mr. Bromley, that I would receive a report of the deliberations from Mr. Lloyd O'Morrow who is here with me, the Director of Mechanical and Engineering Department Section of the Department of Labour.

My honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry said there was no consultation with the Minister. I'm not suggesting for one moment that one phone call constituted consultation, but I would suggest that a two and a half hour meeting which took place between the Director of Mechanical and Engineering in the Department of Labour with some 20 distributors of travel trailers, surely would indicate consultation. Not with me personally, of course, but with a representative of the Minister of Labour who is knowledgeable of the problem far more than I. And for the Honourable Member for Fort Garry to say in this House, and also the Member for Roblin, that the Minister was too busy, I accept but the fact of the matter is that at no time were the distributors ignored. And they met, Mr. Chairman, with the director of one of my sections of the department, on February 26th, where they had an opportunity over two and a half hours to lay before my representative, the director, their problems. They were assured at that time insofar as inspectors were concerned that there would be an availability of inspectors to process those pieces of equipment that became subject to sale on April 1st, in a few days from now. I am informed, Mr. Chairman, by the department and the director there's no backlog of requests for inspections that are preventing the sales of this equipment.

In a report to me, the Director indicates that after a frank and free discussion between the distributors, that there were problems that were raised and that necessary steps would be taken to overcome these difficulties. I am informed that the distributors estimated that approximately 8,000 travel trailers were brought into the province and sold each summer during the months from May, from May to August, not from the 1st of April as the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is attempting to suggest. The distributors estimated that approximately 8,000 travel trailers were brought into the province and sold during the months from May to August. Many of the trailers coming in by trailer loads are sold immediately when received by the distributor. They would

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . therefore like to be able to have an inspector immediately available. And there was no hesitation of the availability.

At the meeting, so I am informed, which was held on February 26th with Mr. Bromley and the President of the Association - I believe I have his name here somewhere it was agreed that the association would submit the names of the members of the association of the distributors to the department so that we would continue and have consultation with the association. Yes, Mr. Chairman, here tonight, I am accused by members opposite of having no involvement. As I said earlier that involvement was only a telephone call but referral to a competent director of the department. And you know, Mr. Chairman, that despite the request that was made to the Distributors Association at that meeting of February 26th, and the request for the forwarding of the names of the Distributors Association for continuing consultation, that list has not been received in the department today. And what is it today? March 23rd, from February 26th.

I don't mind being condemned for what I do not do but I think that it is most unfair for anyone to indicate in an important matter such as this that they have been ignored. Mr. Chairman, I am not attempting in any way, shape or form to use my immunity as a member speaking in this House by naming the one party, Mr. Fred Bromley, because he did meet with my director. I'm trying to find the name of the president of the association, so that I can indicate that he too was aware, but reference was made here to the fact that the president stated that they would send us a listing of all of the members of their association.

I ask in all fairness, Mr. Chairman, to the members of the committee, and particularly the members of the Committee who have spoken in this debate, is it unreasonable for a Minister of a department as complex as the Department of Labour that covers so many varied fields of expertise, is it unreasonable for that Minister to say to enquirers, would you kindly discuss this with the experts or those who have the expertise in the department so that I can get a report? And I received a report; a meeting was held. There was an undertaking, as I indicate to the committee of the forwarding of the names of the distributors. There was an assurance by the department officials that inspections would be carried out to the convenience of those concerned. I say to the Member for Fort Garry I don't know with whom he has been talking, but I say to the Member for Fort Garry that I would appreciate very very much if he or any of his colleagues would get in touch with me or the department and establish the fact that any unit for sale has not been sold as a result of the deadline of April 1st and because of non inspection. We'll look at it.

Mr. Chairman, I have just been informed that my first information regarding a list is incorrect, that the list has now been received, I don't know when. It just came into the office, just recently. But anyway, notwithstanding that, the memo that I have before me, Mr. Chairman, is dated the beginning, earlier this month. I'll check the date of the receipt.

But again I want to repeat that I would like to hear from my honourable friends or the distributors a listing of units that they have not been able to dispose of because of the fact of the regulations coming into effect on the 1st of April, a week hence. And if they have fears and apprehensions in that regard, then I will take, and I'm sure the staff of the department will take whatever steps they can to see that the parties are accommodated.

My honourable friend the Member for Sturgeon Creek mentioned about the tent trailers, or what have you. They are classified, so I am informed, as utility trailers and are not covered if they don't have the equipment in them.

Emphasis was laid in the remarks by the Honourable the Member for Sturgeon Creek of, this is another gimmick for obtaining revenue for the Crown. I reject that. All we are trying to do, and I think this is fair and reasonable, is to recover the cost of the service providing on an individual basis.

My honourable friend the Member for Sturgeon Creek who referred to a trailer at a camp that may possibly change ownership; it might cost \$40.00 or \$50.00 for an inspection of that particular unit because it is being sold. Is it not fair, Mr. Chairman,

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)in the interest of the consumer who may have no knowledge at all as to the functioning of a propane gas heater or other equipment, is it unreasonable that on that sale for the protection of the consumer that an inspection be made of the electrical equipment, the gas equipment, and so on? I don't think so. I think it's reasonable. Far better, far better for the purchaser to have a certificate of worthiness than to purchase the equipment and soon after find it ineffective.

Now I join with the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that this has been worthwhile this debate today. I trust and hope that as the result of the interchange there's a better appreciation amongst all of us as to the problems. I'm happy to know that the members opposite reaffirm their support for the general concept.

They had some questions as to the type of individuals or the expertise of the individuals who were the advisors in respect of the regulations. My honourable friend, and particularly my honourable friend from Fort Garry, seemed to indicate that there wasn't an involvement of people knowledgeable in the industry.

I hope by revealing to my honourable friend the personnel of the sub-committee who assisted in compiling these regulations that he is more knowledgeable. I hope that as the result of the discussion that took place today from about four o'clock until about ten o'clock, with time off for good behaviour, that the public is more knowledgeable. I hope that the message has gone through to all members of the committee that the intent is not to have as the requirement, inspection of units that are still retained in present ownership, but that way no units are sold to another party that the purchaser . . .

A MEMBER: A grandfather clause.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes grandfather clause. Some of your knowledgeability dates back to grandfather but that's beside the point. But the people will be knowledgeable of what they're purchasing is safe, particularly for recreational purposes when they're taking moments off in relaxation from the hurly-burly busy days in which we live. That's the objective, Mr. Chairman, of this legislation, and the regulations, not an imposition on anyone for any ulterior purpose.

And I say to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that I would be glad to discuss further with him any individual problems that his friends the distributors may have. And I say to the distributors as well if they establish any problems that have been unforeseen, we will certainly recognize them and do whatever we can.

And in conclusion I would like to know from my friend the Member for Fort Garry, or any other member of the committee on either side of the House, that if they know a distributor that hasn't been able to sell a unit as of now because of the lack of a seal, let me know, because the regulation does not come into effect for at least another week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well we've just heard the Minister do a tremendous job, or try to do the tremendous job of covering up a lousy set of legislation or regulations.

Mr. Chairman, he has the job of piloting his Estimates through the House, and I admire him for trying to overcome this set of regulations the best way he can by talking about safety and saying to us generally that we are a bunch of bad guys because we would even bring this up. Mr. Chairman, I would say to you that this is not a good set of regulations. Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that trailers, tent trailers are not covered. Well he better make that very clear, he better have an amendment for the Act pretty soon to cover that, because Section H of the Act says: "(h) Mobile Home means a portable dwelling unit that is capable of being transported and on its own chassis and running gear by towing or other means; 2) is placed on a chassis or body of a motor vehicle; or 3) forms part of a motor vehicle and is designed to be used as living quarters or as accommodation for travel, recreation or vacation purpose." Now if tent trailers are not covered in that you'd better make it very clear, because it's very clear that they are there right now.

Mr. Chairman, even under Section 13 of these regulations, when I mentioned before that a person wanting to sell a trailer or a mobile home, if they do not have a

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd)sticker on them, it says in Section 5: Fees for inspection under 13 is \$20.00. I say to the Minister, if he says isn't it marvelous that we have a fee for safety, etc., you could have the inspection for safety and everything else, but what you have done - and I'm not talking about dealers or men with trailers on their lots at the present time; I'm not talking about manufacturers who should have inspection approvals beforehand, I'm talking about the man on the street when he wants to sell his trailer. Right now, right now he's got to have an inspection, CSA or not, because there may be an obvious safety hazard. He's got to have an inspection on anything anything that is designed for or as accommodation for travel, recreation or vacation purposes. And it looks to me, the least, the least he can get away with in this whole fee of schedules is \$20.00. And if you want to say, yes, it looks like a covered wagon would be \$20.00 also.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has talked about these regulations being in effect and being good. What about the man who has a trailer that has nothing in it with plumbing, electrical or anything else, and he buys it, drives down to the recreation person who happens to sell propane stoves and propane tanks or heaters or something, and when he goes on his holidays he puts them in his trailer, and while he owns that trailer he uses it. He has the convenience of having the things that are sold by recreational people every day. And then when he wants to sell the trailer, he turns around and he takes them out, puts them in his house or in his back yard. And the fellow comes along after the man's paid \$20.00 to get the inspection on this unit and then the fellow picks up the trailer, drives around to the back side of the house, and says, the man says, now I'll sell you the propane tank, the heater and everything that goes with it.

You've got an impossible set of regulations in certain areas of this industry. And the Minister is not admitting it, he's trying to overcome it by saying, "safety," he's trying to overcome it by saying, "We're doing the best we can", and everything else. The Minister has not done the best he can in these regulations, for the people. I'm not talking about dealers or manufacturers or distributors, I'm talking about the people who have the right to buy and sell a trailer and be able to do it without too much inconvenience. You know, Mr. Chairman, I happened to buy a second-hand boat about four years ago and I went down to get the registration number changed with the Federal Government, and I was ready to put my hand in my pocket to get the registration changed and they said, "There's no charge, no charge. We just like to have the registration of the boats, but no charge." And here the Minister comes up with a situation where the people who want to sell their trailers, after they've bought them, after they'd made some changes to them, they have to turn around because if you make a change to a CSA unit in any way, shape or form the label's no longer there. And the minute the label is no longer there this set of regulations says that you've got to have a standards' inspection. And if it's under 33 feet it's going to cost \$50.00, if it's under 13 feet it's going to cost \$30.00, and if it's sitting on a lot somewhere and was purchased before this comes through it's going to cost \$20.00. Now to me that's not very fair regulations; that's not hurting distributors, that's not hurting dealers or manufacturers, that's hurting the people. --(Interjection)-- Well I was going to ask that next. I have to look at the bill at the present time, and for some reason or other I'm not quite sure that it applies but I'd like the Minister to tell me.

Offence and Penalty: "Any person who in contravention of any provision of this Act or regulation requirements or order made to impose thereunder does or cause to be done or permits the doing of any of the things set out in subsection 2(1)" - and 2(1) does not say trailers, it does say buildings, etc. But it does also say in 2(1): "Construction, erection, placement, alteration, repair, renovation, demolition, removal, occupancy," and that comes under this Act, Section 2(1), "or contravenes or fails to observe any provision of this Act or regulation requirements or order made to impose thereunder," etc. etc. "and liable on summary conviction for each day that the offence continues to a fine not exceeding \$5,000.00." A guy goes out . . .

A MEMBER: You voted for it.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes, I did. And I think that right now we've discovered

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd)an error. I'll tell you, a guy goes out and robs a bank, he gets a weekend in jail, but if he hasn't got a damn label on the trailer he escapes in he gets fined \$5,000.00.

Now, and the Minister gets up and he quietly tries to overcome these regulations. These regulations are not right, they're not right. They apply to a general situation, they don't apply to an industry that has four or five different divisions in it. And they're unfair, they're unfair to the people of this province. It's another tax, it's just another tax being placed upon the people. If you want to have safety regulations, you go ahead and have them and you inspect as much as you like, and I hope you don't build a bureaucracy. But I'll tell you this, don't start charging the people the way these regulations say they have to be charged. When you read them there's no way around it, there's no way around it, they have to pay these kind of bills in order to sell a trailer in this province now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I think the essential point that we have attempted to make here, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister has not done his homework on this legislation, has not done his homework on these regulations, and has not done his homework on the total industry, the total field of vehicles of this type.

I appreciate the answers that the Minister gave us a few moments ago and the manner in which he addressed himself to the problems raised. And I agree with him, as he did with me, that some progress I think has been made with respect to the over-all situation, because certainly some questions have been answered and I recognize that and acknowledge it.

But, I think, Sir, that the message that has come through from many persons to many of us in the opposition really is implicit in the remarks just made by my colleague from Sturgeon Creek, that is that there are many many anomalies and inequities here and one can only conclude that the total amount of homework, the total amount of examination necessary to make sure that they are workable, fair regulations in this field has not been done. Perhaps it hasn't been possible to do it in the time available; perhaps it hasn't been possible because of other pressures, other commitments, but if that's the case then let's accept that and let's start to draft some regulations that meet the requirements of fairness for the individual, the consuming public and also that meet the exigencies of the industry itself.

The Minister has suggested that he would like to hear from any of us on this side if we can come to him with evidence of inequitable situations. --(Interjection)-- Well that wasn't the term he used, he said that if we . . . --(Interjections)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: He said, Mr. Chairman, that if we could present him with evidence of situations where any sales have been lost or have not been consummated because of the confusion surrounding the whole situation, that he would like to know about that, and if we come to him with that he will do what he can to resolve the problem.

Well I think that I would like to suggest to him that we would be happy to broaden that kind of invitation to ourselves, and suggest to him that we'll come to him and continue to come to him with situations such as those just given in the example by my colleague from Sturgeon Creek - that there are these problems for the public, the private citizen who has or would like to have one of these vehicles; or who has or would like to dispose of one of these vehicles; or who has or would like to make changes to one of those vehicles; and the problems that I have attempted to outline to him in the industry itself.

So essentially, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Minister that I respect the attempts he's made to clear up some of these problems and the attempts he's made to give us some answers, but this debate is not over. This debate on this particular issue is not over, and as we continue to examine the Estimates of his department we will have further opportunities to explore this situation with him. Certainly when we reach the item having to do with his own salary, we will have an opportunity to explore more fully again. In the intervening period we will be talking to people who buy or would like to

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) buy or who have and would like to dispose of mobile homes, recreational vehicles, trailers, and we'll be talking to people in the industry. I want to say to the Minister that we're not talking about distributors, he's had a lot to say about meetings he's had with distributors. --(Interjection)-- No, it is not. The Minister is mistaken again, Mr. Chairman, The Minister heard me incorrectly when I was concluding my last remarks and he obviously heard me incorrectly when I was beginning my last remarks. I was talking about dealers. I used the term on at least six occasions, the Recreational Vehicle Dealers Association of Manitoba, I did not use the term distributors. There's quite a difference between distributors and dealers. Now I don't know to what extent, I don't know to what extent he has met with distributors. I tell him and I told him half an hour ago, and I repeat, that the Recreational Vehicle Dealers Association tells me that he never met with one of them, and I leave that on the record for him to grapple with. And we'll be back to him, because this debate is not over yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to pursue longer at this particular stage the points, I think that I have answered as well as I can the questions. I appreciate and I realize that I'll never be able to satisfy the Member for Fort Garry. I have no intention of attempting to satisfy one of his colleagues because I think it's an impossible task, but I am prepared and willing at any time to continue the discussion. I indicated that among the group that formulated the regulations to the Act there was an involvement with certain people. If I used the word "distributors" instead of the word "dealers", to me it's about the same thing because there's sales of the commodities.

My friend the Member for Sturgeon Creek read out certain clauses of the Act that was passed in 1974 about the onus clauses or whatever the devil type of clauses that you want to describe them. He admits that he has supported it fully. The regulations are not the Act, there is no change in the regulations, it's not consistent with the Act and regulations cannot be in conflict with the Act. Even my honourable friend, the Member for Roblin should know that, he's been here more than a day - or I wonder if he has. But apart from that, he ought to know that.

Now the Member for Sturgeon Creek read out the clauses, not the clauses of the regulation, Mr. Chairman, but the clauses contained within the Act, that he voted for. And I'm not going to chastise my honourable friend the Member for Sturgeon Creek for that. He was right then, and I leave it to his judgment, if he has come to the parting of the ways of his own conscience I leave that entirely within himself. But as I say, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that I can say anything more in respect of this particular matter that was raised by the Member for Fort Garry. I have given indications of what has happened, the involvement with certain people, an invitation for others, including the members of this House, to draw to my attention legitimate problems.

I just want to close and repeat once again that the regulations do not come into effect insofar as permits for sales are concerned until April 1st. If anybody has not sold a vehicle or a home in anticipation don't fault me, they had every license so to do. The protection begins for the consumer in effect on the 1st of April. We haven't any desire to prevent sales. I guess sales are sometimes considered by many as the life blood of industry. We have no desire to do that at all. The whole basis of this legislation, and still some parts yet to be proclaimed, is for the protection of those who are purchasing. So I suggest, Mr. Chairman, and I'm not suggesting closure of anything of that nature, I think I've laid the case before the Committee as I see it. We can continue, and I wouldn't be a bit surprised if my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry and his colleagues continue to prod me throughout the deliberations of the Estimates. All I can say in sincerity and honesty tonight, Mr. Chairman, is that I think that I have laid the case as I see it, as the Minister responsible for this Act, before this Committee for its consideration. And as I said a few moments ago if as a net result there's a clearer understanding of the problems on either side, and hopefully that through the media the selling and purchasing public have a better idea of what it's all about and the intent then I say that the debate has been worthwhile.

So I say I cannot add anything more. I fully anticipate further discussions,

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)arguments, deliberations in debate as the Estimates of the department are proceeded with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, your Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, reports progress, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment having arrived the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Wednesday)