

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



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, February 28th, 1961.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. GEO. WM. JOHNSON (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Eric R. Haglund and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Association of Assessing Officers of Manitoba.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Royal Trust Company Mortgage Corporation praying for the passing of Act respecting the Royal Trust Company Mortgage Corporation.

MR. R.O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Brandon College Incorporated praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Brandon College Incorporated.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notice of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Minnedosa) introduced Bill No. 32, An Act to validate By-Law No. 766 of the Town of Rapid City.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health & Public Welfare) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table the Annual Report of the Department of Health and Public Welfare for the calendar year 1960. And while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, the report from April 1st, 1959 to March 31st, 1960.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to lay on the table of the House the report of the Department of Education for the year ending June 30th, 1960.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources for the period ended March 31st, 1960; and the report of the Board of the Manitoba Farm Loans Association for the period ending March 31st, 1960. Last year, Mr. Speaker, the Department neglected to put on the Blue Ribbon -- we've overcome that difficulty this year.

Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House the answer to the questions asked by the Honourable Member for Elmwood on Monday, February 27th.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MRS. T. FORBES (Cypress) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like your attention to be given to the gallery on your left where there is a group of Grade X1 students from St. Claude High School with their teacher, Sister Mary Elzear. St. Claude is situated in the southern portion of my constituency; I'm very glad that they are here today; I hope they've enjoyed their visit and their trip into the city and I hope they'll learn something of what goes on here during their stay with us.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Monsieur l'orateur, il me fait un grand plaisir de me joindre au depute de Cypress pour souhaiter la bienvenue aux eleves de l'ecole de St. Claude dans cette enceinte. Je suppose que plusieurs d'entre vous avez vu le depute de Cypress s'approcher de moi il y a un instant pour me dire que vous etiez ici et me demander de vous dire un mot en francais en son nom. J'apprécie beaucoup cette gentillesse de Madame Forbes et j'espere que mesdemoiselles et messieurs vous profiteront de votre sejour dans cette Chambre et que vous retourneront bien convaincu de vous preparer pour peut-etre remplacer ici dans cette enceinte le depute de Cypress dans dix, quinze ou vingt ans et que votre journee sera utile et agreable.

Translation: Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join the Member for Cypress in welcoming students from St. Claude school in this precinct. I suppose many of you saw the Member for Cypress speak to me a moment ago to tell me that you were here and to ask me to say a few words in French on her behalf. I appreciate Mrs. Forbes' courtesy and hope ladies and gentlemen that you will benefit from your visit to this House and that you will return home convinced that you should be prepared to replace here in this House the Member for Cypress in ten, fifteen or twenty years from now. I hope that your visit here will have been both enjoyable and useful.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): .....nous offrons une bienvenue chaleureuse a nos visiteurs et leurs institutrices de St-Claude.

Translation: .....we extend a warm welcome to our visitors and their teachers from St. Claude.

MR. A.J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to draw your attention and the Members of the House to a group of students in the gallery on your right. They are accompanied by Miss Edwards; they number 26 and they come from Polson School right in the middle of my constituency, and it gives me great pride and pleasure to introduce this group. That's the school I started in, a grade V pupil, and never did I think when I was in Grade V that I'd be sitting here, and possibly some of those boys and girls up there they may not think they may be in here some time too. So it is with a great deal of pleasure and pride, Mr. Speaker, that I introduce them to you; in that same school I stayed right in until grade VIII -- they didn't kick me out, and from there I graduated to High School.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like also to have the pleasure of calling to your attention, Sir, the presence in the gallery, today of a group of 38 pupils from a school in the Garden Constituency of Fort Garry. A school which bears a very distinguished name, that of the Ralph Maybank School. They are here with their teacher Miss Mabel Morrow and I know that the House would want to wish them welcome and to hope that their stay here will be beneficial in all ways; that they will see their representatives at work and that they will go back a little wiser in the ways of the government of this country in which they are privileged to live.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. E.I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs. How many municipalities voted on the Lord's Day Alliance Act in regards to Sunday Sports last year? How many were in favour and how many turned it down?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Member for giving me notice of his intention to ask this question. Unfortunately I do not in my capacity as Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs have that information. In my capacity as Attorney-General I am attempting to get this information and will certainly supply it to the honourable member as soon as it's available.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. E.R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Is it his intention to reintroduce at this session his resolution calling for educational assistance to underdeveloped commonwealth countries?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, some consideration has been given to this. We are in the midst of certain negotiations and it depends on the outcome of those.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Questions.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the following questions of the Minister of Agriculture. In the first year of operations: (1) What was the total of the premiums collected from the farmers in each of the crop insurance areas? (2) What was the cost of administration in each area? (3) What was the total amount paid out in claims in each of the crop insurance areas? (4) What was the total number of claims in each of the crop insurance areas? (5) What was the rate of commission paid to those who sold the crop insurance? (6) What was the total amount of commission paid in each crop insurance area? (7) Were any other commissions, travelling or selling expenses paid? (8) What are the names and addresses of these salesmen and what amount did each receive? (9) What was the total amount of the Manitoba Government's contribution to the crop insurance plan?

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.).....(10) What was the total amount of the Government of Canada contribution to the crop insurance plan?

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that in respect of getting this information on the breakdown requested here on the basis of areas there may be some difficulty. I've no objection, however, to trying. I expect that the request for information in question (2) What is the cost of administration in each area, poses some real difficulties. We could give you the cost of the sales campaign and so on, but to give an accurate breakdown of the total administration costs as they applied to each district may give our people some trouble, but other than that I have no objection.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I realize the problem in question (2). My only thought was that possibly in establishing the rates that some consideration would be given to this. If it has been tabulated I would appreciate what information there is; if not I accept the comments of the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolutions. No -- adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. J.A. CHRISTIANSON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my first words in this debate should be in commendation of the Honourable Member for Inkster. His many years of experience in municipal and provincial affairs make him a most valuable member of this Assembly. We appreciate his viewpoint, his high ideals and his unswerving dedication to those ideals makes him a most respected member of this House. Fortunately, however, Mr. Speaker, times and governments have changed here in Manitoba since the terrible days of the 30's. We agree with him that the means test as it was applied in those days was a most odious affront to human dignity. It debased not only the unfortunate in need but also the one giving aid. But surely the honourable member is aware that under our Social Allowances Act we no longer have a means test in Manitoba as he knew it. Anyone in need has only to ask that a social worker call. These trained social workers of the department then assess the need on an individual basis; they take into account all factors of the case and the aid given is such as will adequately meet that need.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): How long does it take to get this?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: My friend is aware that tremendous legislation of this type isn't completed overnight. In many cases, Mr. Speaker, the pensioner is supporting a wholly dependent wife below age 65 and here the needs of the family unit are met. The limit is not an extra \$20 a month but whatever is required to provide the generous standards set out in the Social Allowances legislation. In some cases this goes as high as \$40 to \$50 a month. In cases of people on Blind Pensions or Disability Allowance the same procedure is followed. The case is treated on its own merits. The aim is always to preserve the family unit; to preserve the individual initiative and the human dignity of the recipient. These people are not treated as beggars but as worthy individuals who require understanding and help, and in every case, Mr. Speaker, the recipient of social allowances receive a Medicare card. I am sure the honourable member realizes the tremendous impact of this service on the lives of those in need. I am sure he realizes the incalculable value in peace of mind alone that this Medicare card gives the holder. He no longer must go without proper glasses, a hearing aid or any other medical or paramedical need because his pension won't allow it. He realizes, I am sure, that for those in need this is worth far more than a few dollars added to his pension.

I would like also to point out that the reason the honourable member has to wait for an answer to his question on the number of people receiving aid is because of this new policy. No longer are they categorized as old age pensioners; no longer does everyone receive the same allowance. Need is met wherever need is found. The honourable member has said that he thinks it is a good bill -- our Social Allowances Bill, and there is a distinguished group of people who agree with him in this. The enlightened Federal Government agreed that if Manitoba could administer welfare on the basis of need, they would share the program on a 50-50 basis, and in many cases the Federal people are putting up more than an extra \$20 a month. The Social Crediters in B.C. have copied our Act. Nova Scotia is also using it as a pattern. And the great hope of the Liberal Party in New Brunswick, Premier Robichaud, is lifting whole chapters out of our Bill. My main point of difference with the honourable member is on a blanket pension to include everyone. How can we justify giving public money to people who

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd.)....are already surfeited with this world's goods? It is quite true that they will pay some of it back in taxes, but how can we justify the cost of collecting this money in taxes and the cost of paying it out again when there are people in need. Surely we should meet these needs first. And, Mr. Speaker, as industrial governmental and private pension plans expand and cover larger sections of the population the portion of those in need at advanced years will diminish and the whole concept of pensions to all regardless of need will become more untenable.

So, Mr. Speaker, because this government has dedicated its welfare program to meeting need where need exists, I cannot accept the honourable member's motion. I have prepared an amendment to that motion and I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Cypress that the resolution be amended by striking out all the words after "\$55" and adding thereto the words, "per month on the basis of need". The motion now reads: "That this House request the Government to petition the Federal Government for an increase for all old age and blind pensioners in the province from \$55 per month on the basis of need."

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, this amendment is a kind of surprise to me at this moment. If I just got it how it was read -- on the basis of need an increase of \$55. Well in my own opinion we have that social allowance form here, the supplementary assistance is supposed to take care of the need. However, Mr. Speaker, this amendment to me, at the moment, is not holding any water in my own language, because I understood from the last session that this social allowance form would take care of the needy people and that's a needs test not a means test. And now this amendment again will read, "the need not the means test." So if the Honourable Minister of Public Health and Welfare will recollect that I questioned him on the Item 8 in the Social Allowance form, immediate relatives not living with the applicant, when I stated that this will push off the old folks to the next of kin. And then Item (b) "have you transferred any property or other assets owned by you or your spouse during the last five years, if so to whom transferred and on what terms." Actually I questioned the Minister that this application does not establish itself on a needs test but it's on the means test. And just for your information I have here a bunch of letters which I don't intend to read but I would like to have a talk in the department that actually this social allowance -- (Interjection) -- Oh, it's too much to read. It's not a needs test but it's a means test. I'll just elaborate on one or two where a widow was left with a boy of 13 years of age and the boy quit school, he took over farming and when she reached the age of 65 she went and made an application to qualify for the old age allowance. She was turned down because the boy was carrying on the farming there; the boy should give the mother the assistance, and then she received a minimum of \$24. And here's a man that was farming through his lifetime, due to his illness he had to rent his farm and you know how the yield was out in the Interlake country through the wet years and the renter was supposed to pay him \$400 which he couldn't pay; here again the man was turned down for the social allowance. A man here of 70 had to support a wife, had to support his high school student going to school, he applied for the social assistance and again he was turned down. And I can quote these letters from one end to the other. To my surprise, Mr. Speaker, that this social allowance that came into effect last February as it was stated it's not a means test but it's a needs test. And I stress it strongly that how our old people are going to be scrutinized how they are going to be screened; how they are going to be embarrassed. And some old people they tell me that they would rather go without the assistance than be scrutinized. Okay, fine. If they qualify for any assistance, how much do they get -- \$4, an odd one is \$9. And that is the terrific assistance of the Provincial Government here in Manitoba -- the needs test not a means test. Naturally I have nothing against the social worker. They are just doing their duty. They're doing what they are told to do. They carry on the rules and regulations. But what I want to say when this Act came into force, it's going to take care of the aged, the sick, the poor, the indigent. Yes, in a sense it does -- in a sense it does, but to what exactly, to what amount.

Now in such a country as ours it seems to me it's very odd that we people here in this Legislative Assembly passing on justice or judging our fathers and mothers. Thanks to them we are sitting here today, and yet when it comes down to support our parents we can't do it provincially, no, we can't do it federally either. But what is the question, where the money

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.). . . . comes from. You want to spend a lot of money. And just for your information, Mr. Speaker, and the honourable members if they didn't spot this in the Tribune of January 26th, 1961: "We're still paying for extinct Arrow - Ottawa. The government has finished paying for the Arrow -- hasn't," pardon me -- "hasn't finished paying for the Arrow Jet interceptor program cancelled in February 1959. The 1961-62 defence budget includes about one million dollars for additional payment of cancellation fees. The Arrow cost some \$450 million before cancellation." And in my own opinion, Mr. Speaker, honourable members there is not defence, not any more. If we are going to start that hot debate, we ought to destroy ourselves and those old folks with us.

The unemployment, we have a tremendous figure of unemployment. We can use these people to a certain degree to build homes for these old aged. Not only in the city but I would recommend in the villages, in their own community, in their own society where they would enjoy the last of their days. The Honourable Member for Portage here says, if I can quote him right, I stand corrected, he states that the social allowance takes care of all the sick and it's a needs test and not a means test. As I repeated myself and you honourable members on the other side, always a needs test, a needs test. I will challenge any member here in this House that I will offer my car and my time and I'll take anybody out to Fisher Constituency to these old people and let them hear themselves how the old folks feel the needs test or the means test. How they go through scrutiny; how some of the people get offended if they have to support their parents when 15 years ago they left home. As a matter of fact it's embarrassing to say that one of the farmers told a social worker to leave the house. It's an embarrassment in my opinion for a social worker too. Why antagonize these people? Why aren't they entitled to a set figure, and I still maintain that the Government of Canada can afford to give and they are entitled to. Mr. Speaker, I don't need to quote any statistics because my honourable colleague for Inkster he is the specialist man on the old age but I just voice my own opinion how I feel and how I look and how I see the situation in the Fisher Constituency or the Interlake area as a whole. And I'm sure the Honourable the Minister of Health will agree with me that the situation in the Interlake area is not bright. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in concluding this I urge all the support of the members to give unanimous approval of this resolution, not as amended though.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Could I have the amendment?

MR. L. HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon that a special committee to consist of the Honourable Messrs. Roblin, Lyon, McLean; Messrs. Alexander, Klym, Campbell, Dow, Hawryluk, Paulley, Shewman and Smellie be appointed and instructed to consider the Elections Act with a view to recommending such amendments as may be deemed necessary to provide a more orderly and efficient conduct of the elections in the Province of Manitoba. That said Commission make its report and such recommendations as it deems advisable to this House at the present session.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members of the House will be relieved to hear, I'm sure, that I made the most of my speech on the other occasion, so I do not have to repeat it now. I'm sure also Mr. Speaker, that the members realize that the reason that this motion is proposed now is at your own suggestion as the proper way for me to get the matter before the Chamber. As anyone will notice who has read the motion carefully, it's very similar to the one that was proposed by the Honourable the Attorney-General a year ago though certain parts have been left out. It's the same personnel exactly as the committee eventually ended up with. It has the same provisions, except that it does not include the power to send for persons, papers and documents. It makes no provision for payment of members expenses or witnesses or anything of that kind because the proposal is simply that the committee should be reconvened in order to discuss or reconsider one matter and one matter only. That is the matter on which

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....we, in our group, wish to again put ourselves on record in this House, and that is that we are recommending to the House, Mr. Speaker, that we reconsider the action that the government took last year in cutting down the minimum length of time that must elapse between the issuing of a Writ of Election and the holding of that election. We think that last years legislation was a mistake. We think that it should be reconsidered and as I mentioned the other day the question was raised at the time of the special committee sitting, but it was not proceeded with because we recognized that there was a majority on the committee and we thought that it should be brought up in the House itself rather than argue it at any great length in the committee at that time.

Now as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, when the matter came before the House I made a motion that the report be not now concurred in but that it be referred back to the committee. It was your judgment, Mr. Speaker, that that motion was not in order and that the same idea should be achieved by this method rather than by that one. I think you would not mind, Mr. Speaker, if I reported to the House that without attempting to debate the points of order at all that you and I have had some further discussion on that matter. I thought that it was of considerable interest and value to the House that we should try, under our new rules, to get our procedure as definite and as correct as possible. And so, Mr. Speaker, as you know, I drafted a letter to the Honourable Roland Michener, Speaker of the House of Commons, Ottawa, and I took it to you to consider before I sent it to him and after discussion, you also wrote a letter to Mr. Michener, asking him for his point of view as to what the usages and customs of the House of Commons would be in this matter. Now I'm not .....that subject at this time; I have not had a reply from the Honourable Mr. Michener, I presume that you have not either, Mr. Speaker, but in due course I think we will get the procedure firmly established so that a difficulty of this will not arise in the future. But in the meantime this is the one way that I have -- our group has -- of bringing before the House for further consideration, this question of the shortening of the time between the issue of the Writ of Election and the holding of that election. We think it should be reconsidered, and I suppose that I might as well admit Mr. Speaker, that if this motion should be passed, then it would be my intention to make the motion that the report of the special election committee be referred to this committee now being set up. On the other hand, it's quite agreeable to us in this group that the issue be discussed here at this time because it's very clear what we're asking for, simply a reconsideration of that one matter. So having made the major part of my speech the other day and luckily for the members of the House, it came as you remember late in the afternoon so that I had to be briefer than usual, but I think I covered the essential points of the argument as we see it. I do not need to repeat them now. I'm simply following the procedure recommended by you, Mr. Speaker, in asking for the setting up of this committee so that that one matter may be reconsidered.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, it isn't very often that my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition and myself see eye to eye. However, I'm very glad that he, at last, has come to follow the wisdom of this group and is carrying through what I believe we started last year in respect of this question of the time between the issuance of the writ and the actual holding of elections. Because if I recall correctly at that time, it was our group here that protested the action of the government and we went even to the degree, if I recall correctly, of moving a six-month hoist on the third reading of the Bill. However that is merely historical, Mr. Speaker, and I think does establish the point that at long last my honourable friend has seen the wisdom of following us of the CCF, at least in some regards.

The other day Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell was introducing the report of the special select committee, he mentioned the fact that it was a pretty good committee and outside of differences of opinion, the committee did have quite a thorough discussion of the Election Act. I join to agree with him in that. I might say at the offset, it did appear as though the committee were only going to undertake certain portions of the Election Act, but eventually we did go over the whole Act, section by section. Now I support, Mr. Speaker, the point raised by my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition in respect of the question of the time between elections. I'm also happy to note that the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, likewise join with us in the contention that the minimum possible of 21 days in



(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)....respect of the issuance of the writs and the calling for nominations is far too short a period of time in respect of calling of an election. I know that all members of the House, Mr. Speaker, will agree that the Chamber of Commerce, like we of the CCF, are very responsible people and this we see eye to eye and I suggest to the government that they should support the resolution of my honourable friend and reconvene this committee. Because in due deference to the committee, I think that it can be truthfully said that there wasn't a great deal of consideration given to this matter during the hearings of the committee. The letter did come in rather late in our deliberations and consequently it was not acted upon. I think that it is only fair for me to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the committee is reconvened that there will be one or two other points which the members of my group will be raising. I don't think that there is any restriction in the resolution as proposed by my honourable friend, although he does say it's primarily to do with this section of the Act.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the items which I would raise once again, if the committee is reconstituted, would be the question of the lowering of the voting age in the Province of Manitoba. The press had quite a hey-day to some degree at least, Mr. Speaker, during the deliberations of the committee. I noted in one of the papers a headline which said that "Paulley Batted Zero - All of the Motions that he proposed were defeated". But there was one, Mr. Speaker, that was not -- it was actually defeated, but only after receiving the support of practically every member of the committee, and that was the question of the lowering of the voting age here in the Province of Manitoba. The Honourable the Attorney-General undertook to take this matter under consideration and to have the matter discussed, if possible, at the constitutional conference which was to be held at Ottawa. He did consequently make a report of the same. The point I'm raising at this particular time, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that it seems to me that rather than batting zero, particularly on this, I had the general approval of representatives of all of the three parties who were members of this committee. I note in a press release of November 8th of 1960, I believe it was the Tribune, that the Honourable Member for River Heights is quoted as saying he felt that the committee should recommend a lower age without delay. I note also, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, also supported me to a considerable degree not of necessity our contention that the age should be reduced to 18, but that it should be reduced lower than the 21 as it is at the present time. His main point, Mr. Speaker, was that there should be uniformity. However, that again is a question of possible disagreement between us that may be resolved, particularly in view of the fact as I understand it, according to press reports, that the Liberal Party at their National Rally in Ottawa supported the contention of a lowering of the voting age in Canada.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, without burdening the House any longer, I support the proposed resolution of my honourable friend. It will not cost the Treasury of Manitoba anything if we meet at this particular time during the session so therefore of course it's not requiring any provincial monies. I do appreciate the fact that we are all busy at this particular time, but I think that in the interests of democratically conducted elections in the Province of Manitoba, and more orderly and efficient conduct of those elections, this House should adopt this resolution, and even if we didn't agree in the committee during the summertime it may be that members opposite have had time to reflect on the error of their ways and will support the resolution along with the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and myself.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak on this matter, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, "Whereas the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan at the end of 1959 showed a surplus of more than \$174,000; Whereas actual experience from plan operation closely paralleled the estimated 10 percent per annum increase in costs; and Whereas the premium increase of practically 50 percent inflicted on the citizens by the Manitoba Government will result in millions of dollars in excess of what is needed to operate the plan; and Whereas

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.).....such an arbitrary, unwarranted and unconscionable increase defeats the purpose and spirit of hospital insurance, because many people find it impossible to pay these increases; Whereas drastic increases in cost are particularly objectionable in these days of economic recession, high unemployment and low returns for farmers and fishermen, Therefore be it resolved that the increase in hospital premiums be rescinded and premiums restored to their former amounts plus approximately 10 percent to cover increased costs.

MR. SPEAKER: In perusing this resolution I have come to the conclusion that it is not in order and I will quote Rule 31 of our own Rule Book because it anticipates action by the government that has already been given. This question is taken up in the Speech from the Throne and I would quote the notice that has been given by the government, "The Report of the Manitoba Hospital Service Plan on Hospital Financing, Costs and Premium requirements, will be laid before you for your consideration," and on those bases I would rule the motion out of order.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to disagree because there was no mention in the Throne Speech regarding premiums. The report was tabled but it doesn't mention anything about reducing the premiums such as my motion does and the Minister in his statement the other day didn't indicate in any way that the premiums would be reduced, therefore, I suggest that my motion is in order.

MR. M.N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I don't see any difference between the report referred to in the Throne Speech and any other reports that are tabled in the House. Surely because a report is tabled we can't discuss anything that's in that particular report. The reference in the Throne Speech, there's only a reference to the report does not set out any plans or programs that the government intend to bring up in this particular session. It just mentions the tabling of the report that's all but nothing more.

MR. SPEAKER: I disagree with the honourable member and my judgment is that the motion is out of order.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, might I ask if it was Rule 31 that you quoted? Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you don't mind us making representations on the point of order, that this deals with reviving a debate already concluded during the session or anticipating a matter appointed for consideration for which notice has been given. Mr. Speaker, with all respect I certainly cannot see where this resolution introduced by the Honourable Member for St. George violates that rule. If the Speech from the Throne had given any indication that hospital premiums were going to be reduced; if the Minister had said at any time that the matter was under study for reduction; if any Minister of the Crown had stood in his place and said it was the intention of the government to introduce legislation dealing with this question, then I suggest that that rule would apply, but in the absence of any such statement in either the Speech from the Throne or from any member of the front bench I certainly cannot see how that applies.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say in speaking to this point of order that before the House rises the government will be making a statement with respect to hospital premiums. I think that that is implicit in what was in the Throne Speech but for greater certainty I can say that before we rise the government will be stating its position in respect of this matter.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, with all respect I suggest to you that the Honourable the First Minister's statement does not meet the case. Just to say that they're going to be making some statement with regard to hospital premiums, of course they will; but unless there's a statement made that they're going to be reduced this motion, in my opinion, is in order. That's the point of this motion.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't really think so, Mr. Speaker, I think the point of the motion is whether or not the question of hospital premiums will be discussed. I personally have no objection to discussing it either on this motion or on any other. I don't mind at all, the point of order is purely one of procedure as far as I'm concerned. I don't wish to inhibit the debate in any way, but I think that the Speaker perhaps could fairly interpret it in the way that he has.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I feel obligated to say a word or two in this. In all deference to you, Sir, I think possibly your judgment is based on an incorrect part of the Rules of the House. I would join with the Honourable Member of the Liberal Party that your ruling

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . being based on Rule 31 may in all due respect to you, Sir, be in error. I think there are, however, other rules in our Rule Book which would cover the situation if you were so desirous, and may I respectfully suggest that if it is the intention that this resolution be not proceeded with, that a further analysis of other rules be taken under consideration. And in saying that, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Honourable the First Minister and I in no way wish to limit debate on this very very important question. As a matter of fact I'm most anxious to get in on it and I appeal to Your Honour to allow the debate to take place, particularly seeing as I understand my honourable friend the House Leader also is anxious for the matter to be clarified.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, there's another point in connection with this which perhaps you might look at at your leisure and which I confess I'm not prepared to give my opinion on it at the moment because I'm not quite sure of the procedure involved, but I believe, Sir, that the motion is out of order on grounds of wording, namely, that it deals with a repeal or variation in a charge that has been levied by the government on the people in respect of this matter, and if you will refer to the fourth edition of Beauchesne, Rule 243, it deals with that matter. If that rule is considered binding I think one would have to ask the honourable member to withdraw his resolution and reword it in respect of the financial aspect of the matter. So perhaps it might be well, Sir, if you could take that question under advisement and let us know what your opinion on that would be and we could probably check the two points of order that have been raised at the same time, if Your Honour should wish to do so. But I do think that under the financial aspect of the matter, paragraph 243, of the fourth edition of Beauchesne, is relevant in the case and if that would be so held by yourself, that it's out of order on that ground.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak again, I certainly agree with the suggestion that the Honourable the First Minister has made that you take the question under advisement because after all we are operating under new rules and I think it's important that we have considered and firm decisions, but as far as this matter that the Honourable the First Minister has raised now is concerned we do not have to go to Beauchesne because we have a rule of our own, Rule 50, on page 24. It's very plain, "That any vote or resolution or address or bill that deals with either imposing a charge upon the taxpayer or of subtracting from the revenues of the Crown needs to be introduced by a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor", unless it's abstract of course. My answer to that would be that inasmuch as this is a separate entity and not one of the government departments as such, that that rule does not apply. However, I'm very much in favour of the question being let stand for the moment, with you, Mr. Speaker, having a further opportunity to consider it.

MR. ROBLIN: The point raised by the last speaker, Sir, respecting the applicability of the rule to the MHSP, I am afraid I wouldn't share his view at first hearing because it's not a Crown corporation or a separate body in the usual way; it is directly responsible through the Minister as most other departments of the government although it is christened with its own name and its own title, but it seems to me that the same ruling would apply and it would not be considered a Crown corporation. However, that is a point, Sir, that you could examine when you take the matter under consideration.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Honourable Member for St. George would not mind me saying on his behalf that so far as that particular point is concerned that he would be very glad to put in the necessary words of, "consider the advisability of," in order to bring it on all fours.

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if that were done the resolution then would be properly in order. I know we had a hassle of this as far as our group was concerned during one session and that solved the matter. I would suggest that it be allowed to stand and you take it under advisement with the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. SPEAKER: I would be glad to do that. I would point out of course that I have perused Rule 50 and I did consider that possibly in some measure it was out of order on that ground, but one thing that we will need to face is that we have a notice of motion from the Honourable the Minister of Health on the Orders . . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . the order only deals with the reviewing of the financial statement and the projection for the next three years before the Public Works Committee. May I respectfully suggest that that shouldn't have any interference with the resolution as proposed

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)....providing the resolution is properly worded.

MR. SPEAKER: Well isn't it almost the same in subject matter as the resolution introduced by the Honourable Member for St. George? --(Interjection)-- I think that would be a matter of opinion. However, I will take the matter under advisement but I feel that my judgment is sound on the matter. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone: Whereas the cost of buildings and land has increased over the past three years; and Whereas the \$15,000 grant for construction of each added room has proven inadequate, therefore be it resolved that this House request the Government of the Province of Manitoba to consider the advisability of (1) revising the present authorized grant of \$15,000 as a maximum per school room to a more realistic figure of \$20,000 per room, and (2) of making an increase retroactive to the start of school divisions as made.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, at the last session I introduced a similar resolution and it was turned down. At that time, Sir, I was divided in my mind between certain figures that I had given to me by what I thought was competent architects and contractors as against the debate made by the Honourable the Minister of Education in regard to schools that had been built in 1959. Since that time, Sir, I have followed the votes on by-laws throughout Manitoba and therefore I was led to believe that the figures as given in 1959 in my particular instance held true and in the figures as given by the Minister of Education didn't seem to meet the realistic view of building in 1960-61. I don't want to burden the House with all that was said at the last session, and all I want to do at the moment, Sir, is to read a sentence taken from the debate of Hansard, February 8th, 1960, page 331 towards the bottom of the page, and I quote from the Minister of Education where he summed up that "there is however no evidence that \$15,000 per classroom is not sufficient for the requirements of our education purposes at the present time." I might also add, Sir, that in the same debate on the following page this was concurred in by the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party in which he said that, "I think that the present time the grant of \$15,000 maximum is very close to a fair and reasonable figure." So, Mr. Speaker, it was on the basis of that that I being a young member and not too sure that I was on proper ground I didn't follow through and submit my case of figures that I had offered. I'm assuming my argument, Sir, based on the fact that this government does not want to add more to the burden of the real property taxpayer. It has been stated on many occasions that their educational policy was such that the plan was set out to take a greater share of the educational cost in Manitoba and thereby relieve and enlighten the burden to real taxpayers. I feel too, Sir, that we are not being hardly fair to our voters when the major portion of our advertisements that go out suggest that we as members of the Legislature are paying 75 percent of construction grants. So in two votes that were taken in my constituency last summer I attended and pointed out to the Division Board and they so advertised their vote that on the present scale and on the scale of figures that they had from architects and from the approval board of the Department of Education and as approved by the Utility Board that the figure that the governments were given in one particular instance the cost was shared by the government of only 60.6 percent and in another division the government's share was 62.03 percent. Now these are major schools in the divisions that I quote, and therefore, Sir, I feel that this government should give consideration to revising this formula in view of the fact that it was established prior to 1958, and I think we all will agree that the cost of construction -- and I might add land, but the land is not in this particular grant, this is a straight construction grant formula -- that it doesn't come up -- \$15,000 doesn't come up.

From the Manitoba Gazette as published on various days last year I have read that out of 16 divisions, Sir, and I won't burden you with them all but I might say, Sir, they were taken from the Gazette and in no case in the 16 divisions that were voted on last year was the figure less than \$15,000 per school room. It ranged all the way from \$16,000 to \$19,000 per room. I have them in detail, Sir, and could read them but it's quite lengthy -- 16 divisions. I just want to point this out that everything over the \$15,000 as submitted by way of the formula grant is a direct charge to the community or division or the real taxpayer. I have taken the figures and the rooms that are over and above the \$15,000, and I have multiplied them and I come up with this figure that unless some change is made in the formula construction grants that of the

(Mr. Dow, cont'd.)....16 divisions that have voted this past year, the direct cost to the taxpayers in those divisions for school construction alone -- this has nothing to do with their share of the 25 percent of \$15,000, this is all over \$15,000 -- that the direct cost is \$1,675,020. Now, Sir, if you were to divide that and pay the grant on it then I'll admit that it reduces it to four hundred thousand odd dollars. So you can see, Sir, that I am greatly concerned that a continuation of many more divisions to come, the ones that have already voted, are paying dearly for the construction costs of their schools, inasmuch as they -- at the present time it's a varying rate from around 60 percent up. So, Sir, I have no hesitation in asking the House to request this government to consider the advisability of revising a formula that has been in existence for some time and doesn't meet the realistic view of costs of school construction in Manitoba at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks: Whereas the cost of living has been rising steadily since the end of World War II; and Whereas average wages have been increased in order to keep in line with the cost of living; and Whereas in many parts of Canada, including Manitoba, minimum wage rates have not kept pace with the increased cost of living; therefore be it resolved that this House wishes the government to give consideration to the advisability of taking the initiative in proposing to the Federal Government that in conjunction with all the provinces, steps should be taken without delay to institute a minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour for all workers in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETERS: Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth time in my young political life that I am introducing this resolution and for the life of me I can't see why I should of had to bring it in the second time. In my estimation it should have been passed the first time. That the cost of living has gone up steadily there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, we just referred to the price indexes of December 1960 of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. In 1949, the consumer price indexes have increased steadily and I won't read them out year to year, but in 1949 they were 100, now in 1960 122.2. It might be a point of interest to the members of this House, Mr. Speaker, that one of the items that has helped to increase the cost of living more than anything else is health care. And on the basis of 1949 equalling 100, hospital care in 1960 is up to 213.5 -- pardon me, 215.87 -- hospital rates, 213.5, doctors' fees, 143.6, and prepaid health care 172.6. Mr. Speaker, those figures speak for themselves. How can we stand here and say that we have a satisfactory minimum wage, that we shouldn't approach the Federal Government to call the provinces together and see what they can do about getting a federal minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour? The other day when the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre was speaking on the Throne Debate, he was saying that they would be in favour of a minimum wage if they could afford it. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the province, the provincial government is paying less than \$1.25 an hour to the people that they employ; surely the province is paying at least that much. Is that what he meant when he said, could we afford it?

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I simply meant that if the economy could afford it, for the country as a whole.

MR. PETERS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the economy of the country can afford to pay it, because in industries the wages -- and I could quote from wage rates and salaries, hours of labour, from the Department of Labour Economic Research -- wages have increased by index from 1949 equalling 100, to 1959 -- and that is the latest figures that are available -- in logging to 17.65; in mining 16.0; manufacturing 16.9; construction 18.7; communications 174.3 and so on. And I could read on and on. And surely if in industry and everywhere else they can pay increased wages -- and I'll read you some of them, and this is a female rate: female bacon wrapper in Quebec gets 1.45 an hour, in Ontario, \$1.44, Manitoba, \$1.63, Saskatchewan, \$1.61, Alberta, \$1.69, British Columbia, \$1.68 -- surely, Mr. Speaker, if industry can afford to pay those wages, we should be able to institute a minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour. Now, the government saw fit to increase the hospitalization rates when they said they were needed. How

(Mr. Peters, cont'd.) . . . . do they expect people on the minimum wage that we have in this province of 66 cents an hour for females and 66 cents an hour for males to pay for these increased costs of hospitalization?

Mr. Speaker, we're not asking for anything drastic in this resolution. All we're asking the government to do is to approach the Federal Government and get the other provinces together. As far as the trade unions are concerned, Mr. Speaker, they don't need to worry about minimum wages. They're all well above and triple the minimum wage. They're concerned about the people that aren't organized, that can't fend for themselves and governments won't look after. That's the people we're concerned about, Mr. Speaker. Some will say, Mr. Speaker, that if we have high rates that we're going to price ourselves out of the world markets. That is not true, Mr. Speaker. Speaking of the Second Annual Labour Conference on World Affairs, Leon Keyserling, former chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisors, has charged that the United States is pricing itself out of world markets because of excessive profits -- not high wages. That, Mr. Speaker, I say is wrong, that the wages of the top men in industry is too high and the wages of the ordinary man that produces is too low. Here is another article on labour costs. It has all the figures are needed to tell the accurate story of labour's share of the sales dollar. H. W. Fowler, President of Federated Co-op illustrated this in an address to the annual meeting of his organization. This is his comment: "In examining our federated records over a ten-year period, we find that while labour and wages have substantially increased in ratio, the records tell a different story. In 1949 with a volume of \$15 million, our total expenses of which about 65% is labour content, were 8.05% of the sales dollar. In 1959, ten years later, with their volume at \$61-1/2 million, the comparable percentage of total expenses with about the same labour content is 8.4%. Thus in a ten-year period our labour wage and salary costs have increased only a quarter of one percent.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities) (The Pas): What industry was that?

MR. PETERS: Federated Co-op. Now, what does it take, Mr. Speaker, for an average family -- and this is taken from the City Family Expenditure - 1957, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and it's the latest survey that they took, and this is on a number of families, 1,088 in nine cities. The cities are St. Johns, 77 families; Halifax, 79 families; Three Rivers, 99 families; Montreal, 255 families; Toronto, 213 families; Kitchener-Waterloo, 84 families; Winnipeg 100 families; and Edmonton, 90 families. Their average costs, Mr. Speaker, their budget for the year, and I won't read out each individual item such as food and housing and household but I'll read you the totals -- in St. Johns, it was \$4,171 for the year; Halifax, \$4,814; Three Rivers, \$4,321; Montreal, \$5,024; Toronto, \$5,203; Kitchener-Waterloo, \$4,478; Winnipeg, \$4,723; Edmonton, \$5,009; Vancouver, \$4,795. I note here, Mr. Speaker that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics didn't bother to go to Saskatchewan. Probably their wages are so high there, they were afraid to show up the rest of the country. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth time that I have introduced this resolution, and if the government is really serious about doing something, have they contacted any of the other provincial governments with a view of approaching them together? They haven't . . . . . for once, Mr. Speaker, we should take the lead, because certainly with the minimum wages that we have in this country, it's a disgrace to the people of this country to put up with a minimum wage of that sort.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): Will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. PETERS: Go ahead.

MR. GROVES: We know that in all of the briefs that organized labour presents to the government they always request a minimum wage of \$1.25, and this is policy of the CCF or part of your program, that the minimum wage should be \$1.25, and I'd like to know how come Saskatchewan in the ten years that the CCF has been in power hasn't got their minimum wage up to \$1.25.

MR. PETERS: We are asking for a national minimum wage, not a provincial minimum wage and as I stated the first time that I introduced this resolution if any provincial government went it alone that they would be in trouble, because industry has a tendency to move to a low wage area and get cheap labour to produce. As you know under the free enterprise system, the motto is: "Produce as cheap as you can and soak the public all you can."

MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher the following resolution: Whereas cancer continues to take a heavy toll of human life in Manitoba; And Whereas the treatment of cancer often creates an extremely difficult financial situation for the people afflicted with this illness; And Whereas in many cases debts are created which take many years to repay; Therefore be it resolved that this House wishes the Government to give consideration to the advisability of establishing a program whereby the diagnosis and treatment of cancer would be paid for by public funds.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of this resolution for the third time I again wish to thank the Canadian Cancer Society and the Manitoba Cancer and Research Foundation for their fine work. I also wish to express my appreciation for the work of the Honourable the Minister of Health and Public Welfare. His job has not been an easy one and we are most impressed by his very fine human qualities. I do not intend to go into all the details that I did last year in making a comparison between the Province of Saskatchewan and our own province in regard to the three services of cancer diagnosis and treatment, but I would like to emphasize a few points. And one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, I might say, is today we have the Report of the Cancer Society filed, which will give you an opportunity to look at it. Mr. Speaker, in this House we toss around such words as brotherhood, freedom, conscience and dignity -- wonderful words but only if taken seriously. May I once again make the point that there is no dignity in becoming indigent. The Social Allowances Act has been exemplified as a panacea for the indignity of financial embarrassment so often suffered throughout prolonged illness such as cancer. To support my contention I wish to quote the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare when he replied to my resolution last year, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, from Hansard of February 23rd, 1960. The Honourable Minister said, "Now, I might also say the Social Allowances Act, I think, will go a long way toward helping in this regard. I often think it isn't so much the cost of the medical care during the illness that is so disastrous, it's the lack of earning power and the inability of the patient following extensive treatment of any nature to get back on his feet. This is the distressing thing with old people, the aristocrats of Manitoba, who find it so difficult when they have prolonged surgery and so on and feel indebted to anyone when they do recover. And I feel our Social Allowances Act is tailor-made to prevent people getting in to that category." From this, Mr. Speaker, one gets the impression that assistance is available without having to accept the means test, or as the Honourable the Minister prefers to call it, the "needs test". The needs test to me -- it is quite obvious that a person without means certainly has needs, and under this Social Allowances Act the needs are not considered if one has means. Now this is as it should be, but let us not try to give the wrong impression by the use of semantics. "Tailor-made to prevent people from getting into that category," said the Minister. I submit that it means the category of the indigent, and a person does not get assistance unless he is indigent.

In the matter of cancer, early diagnosis is of prime importance, and it follows that we must encourage people to see a doctor much earlier than many are now doing. There are many who do not go because of the fear -- fear of cost. Cancer is not a disease which demands immediate attention such as the toothache. It is slow and insidious and often without pain in the early stages. There are enough emotional reasons why people hesitate to go to a doctor; surely there should not be financial ones too. If we really want to reduce the loss of life from cancer, this once dread disease that now responds so well to early treatment, we can do it by encouraging early diagnosis. We are aware of the fact that protection can be had through Manitoba Medical Association; but anyone in Manitoba who gets the minimum wage of 66 cents per hour, or a little better, and pays a \$6.00 family plan charge for hospital services, certainly cannot pay the MMS charges without denying his family adequate groceries. Now we all know that the hospital insurance plan takes care of all hospital charges for cancer, but the Honourable

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) . . . . Minister gave the impression last year, unintentionally I think Mr. Speaker, that in the main, cancer care is free to all. And I wish again to quote him from Hansard February 23rd, 1960, page 851, when he said, "Now I'd like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time the only charge that is made for diagnosis for treatment of cancer in this province is the surgical and medical care supplied for private patients, that is, patients going to their own private physician and seeking his services. The only charge that is made is the charge to patients going to their own private physician". The Honourable Minister speaks of this as if it were a super deluxe service, this going to your own doctor. I submit that this is what most people do, see their own physician; and it's not free. I believe that the introduction of compulsory comprehensive medical care in Saskatchewan will be much easier because they already have, and have had for 15 years, the free treatment of cancer. The Saskatchewan Government allocated 1.3 million in 1959 for the alleviation of much human misery in regard to this most baffling ailment, and who will rise and say that this is not worthwhile. Mr. Speaker, when I think of the money that will be spent, and it's a worthwhile cause too, in making a park in front of this building which will--it's estimated, I believe, at \$750,000 -- when one realizes that in Saskatchewan they only have to raise \$1.3 million for all the fine work they're doing there, it makes one wonder.

Now much is going to be said in the near future about the comprehensive medical care by both old line parties; so much, in fact, that they will forget that the CCF Government of Saskatchewan initiated the idea. But we have not forgotten the fact that as far back as 1919 the Liberal Party have promised health insurance, yet have not spent one nickel toward making good that promise up to the day in 1957 when they were voted out of office. Is it any wonder we did not take the Liberal amendment seriously when it deplored the fact that this government had not lived up to its pre-election promises and had added greatly to the burden of Manitoba taxpayers. Taxes are a means by which a community redistributes its wealth and provides basic and essential services to all the members of society irrespective of their ability to pay. It's easy to have low taxes -- just don't give services. There's no point in telling people, Mr. Speaker, to paddle their own canoe when they haven't a paddle. I'd like to point out a comparison of costs for some of our provinces, Mr. Speaker, and I use mental health on a per capita basis. Saskatchewan is spending \$9.12 per capita on mental health; British Columbia, \$6.32; Alberta, \$5.75; and Manitoba, \$4.28. In the large field of health, education and welfare, Saskatchewan on a per capita basis spend \$96.82; Ontario with \$79.54; Manitoba, \$76.31. I think these figures speak for themselves.

Now I really think that the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare is on the right track and that he is fully aware of the things I speak of, but I am concerned that he may be sidetracked by the administrators and the economists, very useful people, but their first love is for figures. And while I believe they are working for the ultimate welfare of humanity, I still think of them as welfare workers without tears. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the MMS have recently announced a plan of comprehensive medical care regardless of age. I remember the time when I wanted to have my own mother and father covered by the plan and I was willing to pay for it and I was unable to do so. I'm inclined to think that they see the warning signs along the road for public demand for a better deal in health care, especially for our older folk, and here I was referring to the MMS, Mr. Speaker. A few years ago we were able to buy polio insurance, and now I read that cancer insurance is being offered by a New York Company, and I wish to quote from Time Magazine, March 7th, 1960, Mr. Speaker. "Insurance against the costs of cancer care was offered in a simplified policy by a New York Standard Security Life Insurance Company with a maximum total benefits of \$10,000; \$3,000 in any one year. Cancer is broadly defined to include leukemia and Hodgkins disease. The main argument for a separate policy, since other forms of health insurance may offer as good coverage, the belief that the fear of the high costs of cancer care keeps many victims from their doctors until the disease is too advanced for effective treatment." Mr. Speaker, inevitable as it is, I believe it will be some time before we have here in Manitoba the kind of health care we would like. And for that reason, I sincerely ask this government to consider the advisability of establishing a program whereby the diagnosis and treatment of cancer will be paid for by public funds.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du



(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.) . . . Bonnet, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the following resolution: Whereas physical fitness is a matter of great importance to present and future generations; and whereas physical fitness depends in large measure on facilities for recreation, training and leadership; and whereas the present physical fitness program is inadequate for the needs of the Province; and whereas a study of needs in physical education and recreation in the Province of Manitoba has been made as authorized by resolution agreed to in the Legislature of Manitoba, March 19th, 1957; and whereas a program of physical recreation does not cope with the problem of physical fitness standards; therefore be it resolved that the Government give consideration to the advisability of establishing a program of physical fitness based on the recommendations of the report of the committee on this subject, submitted June 26, 1958.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I'm just wondering if this isn't the case where we are dealing with a matter of -- the phrase has escaped me -- anticipation, because in the Throne Speech there's reference to the fact that an appropriation will be proposed regarding a physical recreation program. Now it may not be on all fours with the ideas that my honourable friend has, but it does seem to me that this might well be a matter of anticipation and I ask your ruling on the point.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I contend that in that resolution you will see that I clearly pointed out that the program of physical recreation is not the same as a program of physical fitness in our schools. There's a considerable difference.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech makes no reference to a program of physical fitness in the schools. It's quite another matter.

MR. PAULLEY: I'd like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is in order, that if the contention of the Honourable the First Minister was established in this House, then we on this side of the House and indeed on that side of the House as well, would be prevented from almost talking about anything simply because of a word or sentence in the Address from His Honour. I'm sure that if my honourable friend is permitted to pursue his resolution that the First Minister will see that there is a great difference. Now I don't know what he has in his mind insofar as the words in the Speech from his Honour, but I'm sure that there's no bearing on each other.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I do think they are the same. In my judgment they are closely related. I, however, am quite willing to leave it to your judgment to decide whether it is anticipation or not, but I really think it is and that we should wait until that proposal is placed before the legislature; and then if it's not satisfactory to the honourable gentlemen, they have a full opportunity to make their views known.

MR. PAULLEY: The only one objection to that, Mr. Speaker, is the fact -- although I sometimes say differently than this -- is the fact that as far as private members are concerned they did forego their resolutions last Friday in order to facilitate the business of the House, and if we continue in doing this I don't think that this is on a parallel with the resolution of the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker . . . when a point of order is under discussion might I say that neither the honourable member who is moving the resolution nor his Leader have discussed the resolution with me, which they might have done if they had been so inclined, and I would have advised them, without fee, but it appears to me that they have drawn it very carefully in order to escape the rock of anticipation, because it's very plainly stated here, evidently in recognition of the fact that the Speech from The Throne had a reference to recreation, it's very plainly stated, "whereas a program of physical recreation does not cope with the problem of physical fitness standards," then they go on to talk about something else. Surely, the Honourable the First Minister is not serious in suggesting that that was the anticipation.

MR. ROBLIN: The whereas is an expression of opinion and it seems to me they ought to wait and hear what the government program is in this respect before the matter is debated, but I don't wish to press the point. I don't want to give the impression of trying to prevent the

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . debate on the matter because we know we're going to have the debate whether it's on this resolution or in some other way. I merely am trying to ascertain whether the regular procedure is being complied with. I am quite willing to admit that I'm not always right in my views on this subject, but I merely suggest that the Speaker should consider the matter. If he rules that it's in order, well we'll have the debate, but I just raise the point and ask for his view.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I, Mr. Speaker, cannot take any objection to the point raised by the Honourable the First Minister that you take it under advisement but I do wish in order to facilitate debate in this House that in future when my honourable friend opposite is writing the Speech from the Throne that he may take us into his confidence so that we know what he's going to suggest in order that we can propose our resolutions that fit in with the Speech from the Throne, but I would suggest we'd have no particular objection, Mr. Speaker, and . . . . may be your duty to take it. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It's apparently the wish of the House that I consider this matter. I might point out that we're on dangerous ground, however, because the motion has technically been accepted by the Chair when the debate commenced, but with those reservations I'd take it under advisement.

MR. PAULLEY: May I please suggest then, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable colleague be permitted to develop his point seeing as you have given it to the House, and then if after that, your Honour, that you wish to discuss the advisability of continuing it we'll take that under advisement.

MR. ROBLIN: You know - - I apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the House, for bouncing up and down on points of order this afternoon. I realize how tiresome it is, but I just wonder, Sir, about the implications of your statement that once the question has been put it's not proper to raise a point of order in respect of it. I just wonder whether I should not enter a reservation here and say that perhaps we should give some thought to that, because the question may be proposed and you may deem it in order but, if some member at that stage rises and raises a point which perhaps you may not have considered, then it's proper to do so at that particular time. Now I don't want to provoke another round of discussion on this and I'm not going to press the point, but I merely say that I enter a small reservation in case we should be establishing some precedent here that afterwards we might find we did not want to adopt.

MR. SPEAKER: I would think if the honourable member was allowed to continue his speech, and then the debate be adjourned, we could decide our procedure from that point on.

. . . . .Continued next page.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly did not think that I would provoke that much of a procedural hassle by introducing this resolution because I think that it's important enough to warrant consideration by members of this Chamber. I think, too, that the very . . . . . that I can say with some amount of certainty that at least there is one supporter for this resolution sitting in the benches opposite. I say that because of the fact that the wording of the resolution is taken practically in entirety from the resolution sponsored by the now Minister of Industry and Commerce some few years ago, and at the time when he made motion of this resolution the problem was there; today, some years later, the problem still remains with us, and I think warrants debate as much now as it did during his time on this side of the House.

Three years ago members will recall a special committee was set up to study the needs of physical fitness and physical education standards in this province and it was a rather extensive and thorough study. Some 160 different organizations presented briefs to the committee as it held hearings throughout the length and breadth of the province, and after considering the briefs the committee handed down a report with over 84 recommendations. Now it is certainly not my intention to press the government for implementation of anywhere near that number of recommendations, but certainly I feel that contained within the pages of that report are some recommendations which certainly should be implemented and which certainly are not covered by any type of legislation that the cabinet or the government might bring down with regard to community recreation. This is quite a different matter. Some allied interest, of course, but taken in its broadest sense there is quite a difference. Well I suppose, Mr. Speaker, I could pose the question even now: "Is there a need for improvement of physical education and physical fitness standards in this province?" I know some members here will say that this government is taking some action this session by means of legislation which will bring in a program of community physical recreation and last year I was speaking on this matter in anticipation of just such action on the part of the government. I commended the Minister if indeed he would take action on community recreation. Now that it's coming, and I assume that it will be extensive enough to warrant mention in the Throne Speech, if it's on that large a scale, then I commend him again for this action. I certainly hope, however, Mr. Speaker, that it is not of the size and extent as their sewer and water program turned out to be because, if you recall, it had special mention, a paragraph of the Throne Speech last year. Well even assuming, Mr. Speaker, that the community recreation program to be laid out before us is fairly extensive, I'd say let's not stop there, because if a program of community physical recreation is not based on a sound solid program of physical fitness in the schools, then it is chasing good money after bad; it is building a superstructure on a very weak foundation. It is not putting taxpayer's money to the best possible use, and I think naturally this is a matter of concern to any government and certainly I would think to this one. So I would urge the Minister and his colleagues to think seriously before they embark on any grand schemes of community recreation, to think of the groundwork that is necessary first, and goodness knows we are still not anywhere near the standards of physical education training in our schools that we could and should be. I fail to see, Mr. Speaker, how a program of physical recreation can be developed at the adult level in communities without the people possessing, first of all, adequate skills so that they may participate to the fullest and most worthwhile extent. Where can they learn these skills, Mr. Speaker? There is only one place where physical education, physical fitness skills can be learned, and that is the school, or that is at least where they can best be learned, so let us attempt to do something at that level. In order to do something at this level, Mr. Speaker, it seems that it is necessary to have adequate facilities, it is necessary to have instructors fully qualified to carry out this type of work. If the opportunity to teach physical fitness skills is lost during the school years, the opportunity is almost never regained and certainly never regained very easily.

Having said all this, Mr. Speaker, having said that there's an obvious need for better standards of physical education in the schools, I now make the assertion that physical education standards in our schools are far less than adequate, especially in rural Manitoba. A year ago -- I must admit that since the committee on physical education reported something has been done. It seems to me one thing was done, namely the holding of a series of tests throughout Manitoba to determine the physical fitness standards of a cross-section of students of the province. This was done last year, and what were the results? Well it appeared, according to

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . . the records, that a startling and consistent trend was shown to the effect that children in urban schools had a much better performance record than those of the rural part of the province. If this is so, and it appears to be the case, it proves then that where there are adequate facilities and where the physical education teachers are fully qualified, the results are soon seen and soon established. It proves also and naturally in . . . . . to that, it proves that in rural Manitoba we still lack adequate facilities and we lack teachers -- I say this with emphasis -- we lack teachers with proper qualifications, with sufficient qualifications and ability to teach physical education in rural Manitoba schools. This should not have to be especially now that we have most of Manitoba under the larger secondary school areas -- divisions -- it seems that these divisions are almost natural areas from which can be based modern up-to-date adequate physical fitness training programs. The implications of this lack of proper facilities and instruction can no longer be ignored and I'm sure that the members here do not choose to ignore these implications, so then there's need for some action, I submit, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to put before the House at least four positive steps or points that might be embarked upon.

First of all, it seems that the province should be zoned into areas into which properly trained instructors could be sent, not only to instruct themselves, but to instruct the instructors because in rural Manitoba there certainly is a need for that. In Ontario and in Saskatchewan, I might say, they do have this scheme of doing things. There are zones in the province into which the instructors are sent, they hold clinics showing other instructors the latest in techniques and methods and so on. Perhaps two or three divisions would constitute a zone to which such a person could be sent. In addition to that there is need for, I would say, action on the part of this government toward making physical education equipment accessible to the divisions on the same basis as grants for science laboratory equipment, etc. Thirdly, and I certainly don't want to underemphasize this, there is a need for degree-granting university courses in physical education in this province. It seems to me that this perhaps is the biggest reason why we don't have sufficient numbers of properly qualified teachers in this field because those who are interested and wish to become properly qualified must leave the province, go to the United States or to other provinces and this isn't always easy, this often puts a hardship upon those, especially if the teachers happened to be married.

I would like again, Mr. Speaker, lest my intentions here not be clear -- I would once again like to commend the government for whatever action it might be taking this session with regard to community physical recreation. I just hope that the details, when they do come, will bear out my enthusiasm for what I think they will be doing in this regard. I would like to quote just two or three statements, Mr. Speaker, to support my contention that physical fitness standards in this province are still next to abysmal, especially in rural Manitoba. I would like to quote from the statement made by the Director of Physical Education, University of Saskatchewan. He says: "Children must be taught the basic steps of physical education in school, because skills like these are not just picked up, they have to be taught". And he goes on to say, and I quote: "Physical education in the schools of Canada are for the most part unsatisfactory". Then too, let me quote from the statement made by the Sports Advisory Council of last year: "The Council is of the opinion that problems raised by general deterioration of standards of physical fitness among Manitobans and indeed among Canadians generally, must be recognized and have been recognized by every authoritative study on the subject in recent years. There is no question that in the standards of physical fitness, Canadians fall far short of western European countries and in all probability, very far behind those of Communist countries". Then I would like to make one last quote, Mr. Speaker, from the report in this province of the committee that was set up to study physical education needs: "In this province there is a definite lack of facilities and equipment which further inhibits instruction in physical education". I don't think I need to carry on, Mr. Speaker. People who have made it their business; people whose main interests lies in the field of physical education are practically of one mind that we need improvement and we need it as soon as possible.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make these two points. It's one thing to say that we need improvement, but let's not think that we can have it simply by setting up community recreation programs because they do not cope with the problem at the ground floor. And certainly this government would not want to be guilty, I don't think, of spending public money on a

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.).... program of adult community recreation which is based on a very weak foundation. The best way, or the way to use public funds to the best advantage then, would be for the government to accept the implications of this resolution and to do its utmost towards the setting up of physical fitness programs in our schools, not only in urban but in rural Manitoba, so that when community recreation projects are set up and are there, the people participating therein will have been taught the skills which will enable them to participate to the maximum advantage.

MR. K. ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the following resolution: Whereas an increasing number of citizens of Manitoba are now living in the cities and towns of this province; and whereas many of our people lack proper housing accommodation; Therefore be it resolved that this House wishes the Government to give consideration to the advisability of establishing a departmental division on housing, adequately staffed, and with sufficient funds so that cities, municipalities and voluntary non-profit organizations, interested in improving housing for their citizens would be encouraged to proceed with an expanded program of housing development, under the terms of The National Housing Act.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, adequate housing to meet the needs of Canada's citizens is one of the most important social problems which still face the people of Canada and their government. Other countries, such as Great Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Australia and New Zealand to mention just a few, although they have a lower per capita income than Canada, have done tremendously more than we have done to meet the housing needs of their people. What are the needs of the people in this province? I just want to mention a few examples as reported in the press within the last year. Typical, Mr. Speaker, is a report which appeared on January 6th, 1960 in the Winnipeg Tribune headed "Rat Infested House Doubled as Playground for Children". And I want to quote from that article, Mr. Speaker: "Mrs. Rose Walrick, of 37 Derby Street, looked at the boarded up holes in the walls of her home and said 'I would never have come here if I had known this was going to happen.'" The article continues "The boards were her only defence against rats which are gnawing their way through from two neighbouring vacant houses which were condemned by the city five years ago". She says further: "I have six children, including a three-month old daughter, and I'm afraid a rat may bite her". The two rat-infested condemned houses at Derby Street and Jarvis Avenue are examples of why the Civic Health Committee said Monday: "All condemned houses in the city should be demolished if necessary renovations are not made in one year." Mrs. Rhoda Mulvaney, of 41 Derby Street, mother of five children, said that she had seen children come out of the condemned houses, swinging rats by the tail. This, Mr. Speaker, in the year 1960 in the City of Winnipeg. On October 8th of 1960, the Winnipeg Tribune carried a story headed: "A Six Room House for \$40 a month" - this was an article by Val Werier, and I quote: "Mr. and Mrs. 'P' and their five children live in a cubicle of a house only 12 feet wide for most of its length. It has two tiny bedrooms jutting out at the rear converted from what may have been a bedroom at one time. It is the best they can afford. The rent is \$50 a month and they cannot pay more unless they cut down on their food bill. Mr. P makes \$1.15 an hour as a labourer; his income is \$204 a month, to which can be added the family allowance of \$28 a month. The outside of the house hasn't been painted for years but inside it is as neat and tidy as a military establishment awaiting inspection." I think, Mr. Speaker, that members who have heard the arguments that people live in slums because they don't want anything better or they don't know anything better ought to take particular note of that. Mr. Werier in his article goes on as follows: "The parents occupy one of the two tiny bedrooms, four girls sleep in the other, three of them, 17, 10 and five years of age sleep in one bed. The other four year old sleeps in a crib in the room, the boy sleeps on a couch in the livingroom. This house isn't bad, you should see some of the others, said Mrs. P. She is right" said Mr. Werier. "I took a look at two squalid houses around the corner on Jarvis Avenue. These families with four and five children have even less

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.).... space. They live in three small rooms where there are no closets, no bathtubs, no hot water."

Mr. Speaker, these are just two illustrations of many which appear in the daily newspapers almost every week. I have referred to Winnipeg, but I am certain that on a smaller scale the same conditions prevail in the City of St. Boniface, in the City of Brandon, in the City of Portage la Prairie and in The Pas. I have seen them, Mr. Speaker. A large number of surveys as to what our needs are and where we need to begin to redevelop the City of Winnipeg have been made. If they were brought into this House, Mr. Speaker, they would probably reach from my desk to the ceiling. Typical is a survey made by the Welfare Council of Greater Winnipeg of the south Point Douglas area two years ago. This showed that of 309 residential buildings in that area examined, only 1.76% could be classified as being in good condition, 25.6% are in fair condition, 27.2% are in poor condition and 45.26% are in very poor condition. Further, the report says that in the same area 20% of the houses have toilets shared by more than six people, 27% have no baths, 32% have no wash basins, and 34% are heated only by stoves. Mr. Speaker, we like to talk about the high standard of living in this country. In the light of this type of condition, I think we all ought to hang our heads in shame.

On June 25th of 1960, the Tribune carried a story headed "We're Paying to Preserve Life, Expert Claimed." It goes on to say: "Winnipeg slums which year by year take a big slice of the municipal tax dollar are still unsanitary eye-sores that breed disease and crime," says W. T. Haxby, the Research Assistant of the Urban Renewal Board. "Slums are the hidden charity to which all city taxpayers are contributing. It costs four times as much to service slums as it does to service residential areas," he said. "As soon as the tax dollar goes into the city treasury, it goes right out again to pay for extra police, firemen, health officers and other services the city must provide for these areas." Well, Mr. Speaker, people whom I represent, people in our party, people in the labour organizations have been supporting slum clearance, urban renewal for many years. I had thought, Mr. Speaker, that the age of miracles had passed, but lo and behold, on September 15, 1960, the Tribune carried a story which is headed: "Businessmen Swing their Support to Favour City Subsidized Housing." It goes on to report that the Chamber of Commerce supports an assault on slums. "The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce today threw its whole-hearted support behind subsidized housing, reversing its long-standing opposition in the past. It's good business for Winnipeg to enter into low rental housing agreements under The National Housing Act," said the Chamber report. Prominent businessmen in the city compiled a report under the chairmanship of Alex Robertson. Other members included E. J. Aronovitch, F. J. Kane, A. U. Chipman, R. A. Hobday, W. L. Palk, C. E. Simonite, and A. A. Lauder. "Notwithstanding the historic stand of the Chamber of Commerce against subsidies, the disadvantages of subsidies is out-weighed by the advantage of having people adequately housed at rents they can afford", says the Chamber report. The report noted that at least one-fifth of the Greater Winnipeg families earn less than the minimum necessary to qualify for housing loans under The National Housing Act. Further note, that a housing survey conducted by the city in 1956 showed a need for 3,900 low rental units. This need has increased due to the number of housing units since demolished. Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't surprise me that if the Chamber can change its mind that possibly even the Leader of the Opposition can change his mind and support this type of resolution.

MR. CAMPBELL: Why even?

MR. ORLIKOW: Well, if the Chamber can change its mind, I hope you can change your mind. You haven't supported it in the past but there's always hope for the future. On October 12th, 1960 the Tribune carried this story headed: "Wipe out Slums - Church". "The Winnipeg Presbytery of the United Church called upon the Provincial Government to get the ball rolling on urban renewal and low rental subsidized housing", says the United Church Report. And I quote: "Winnipeg is the only major Canadian city where urban renewal, slum clearance and public housing programs are not underway. We feel that the province ought to share in such projects and that approval can and should be given to plans that they have had for some months. On October 15th, another story in the Tribune headed: "Big Push Given by Church Groups." The story says, "City Council voted unanimously Monday night to embark on some slum clearance without provincial aid after hearing Roman Catholic and Protestant Church spokesmen and the Welfare Council tell them diplomatically to quit stalling. The Winnipeg Presbytery of the

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.).... United Church, the Social Service Committee of the Anglican Church, and the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Winnipeg all urged Council to embark on public housing and slum clearing immediately. Reverend D. E. Pratt presented a United Church brief stating that "Winnipeg taxpayers are subsidizing the renewal of every other community but their own". Mr. Pratt said his presbytery would press the province to participate in the project. Reverend E. W. Scott, representing the Anglican community, said people living in slum housing are beginning to feel that all the talk about slum clearance is just a way of avoiding the problems. And Father Peter Dunphy, Director of Charities of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Winnipeg told Council that many Winnipeg citizens are suffering undue hardships and should be given the incentive and the environment to be good Christians and good citizens. Mr. Speaker, I think that the requests of business and of the Church speak for themselves and I can only echo what they have said so eloquently.

One project has now been approved by the City of Winnipeg without support from the Provincial Government. I refer to the proposed redevelopment of the Sutherland to Selkirk, Main Street to Salter area, which happens, Mr. Speaker, to be in my constituency. I mention this because the city has decided to go ahead and not because it's the only one which needs doing. There's the whole area from Logan to Notre Dame and from Main Street to Arlington which should be high on the priority list as well. On December 10, 1960 in the Winnipeg Tribune, Val Werier had an article dealing with the area which the city is proposing to begin to redevelop, headed "A Change in Living for 1,650 Citizens." He said in part: "Most of the houses are over 50 years and most have been converted to multiple use. On Jarvis, a tiny house built in 1899 for two, today houses a family of seven, where three children sleep in one bed. A house on Robinson designed for a single family today accommodates three families with 16 people. Of the 337 families in the area, 129 have five or more children, and most live in cramped, poor quarters. Some have no bathtubs, no hot water. Tenants in terraces and rooming houses themselves take in roomers and boarders today. Further," he said, "today about half our seasonal workers -- last winter 97 families received social assistance, representing 407 persons or about 25% of the population." I want to remind members and particularly Ministers on the other side, Mr. Speaker, that 80% of this cost of keeping these people is being paid by this province, paid by the tax money raised from the people of the Province of Manitoba. "Many low-income families," says Mr. Werier, "live in the neighbourhood because of low rent. Families with children are discriminated against even in the slum areas. One couple without children pay \$35 a month rent, while a family next door in a similar house pays twice the amount."

February 16th, 1961, the Tribune carried a story headed: "Slum Clearing Project Expected to be Bigger". And the report says: "The Urban Renewal Board and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation are pretty well in agreement on the city's plea for the first slum clearance and redevelopment project. The plan would cost \$10.3 million and provide new housing for more than 2,000 people. Development will take place in north Winnipeg in an area bounded by Flora to Jarvis Avenue and Aikens to Derby Street. The meeting between the Urban Renewal Board, the City Council and CMHC will likely be held next month. There is no doubt that Ottawa will provide the usual assistance for slum clearance, which is 50% of clearance and land acquisition and 75% of new housing costs and operation. It may be a year or slightly less before actual work begins." November 29th, 1960, the Tribune carried a story headed: "\$10 million Slum Clearance Plan Given Go Ahead". The story by Bob Preston says as follows: "The plan will cost \$10.3 million and provide housing for more than 2,000 persons. After months of consideration of the project the Provincial Government Monday made known its approval in a letter to City Council. Provincial approval is necessary to obtain federal assistance. It is estimated to have cost \$4,684,000 for land purchase, expropriation and demolition, with another \$5,656,000 for construction costs, landscaping and terracing. On the assumption that the Provincial Government will stay clear of helping finance the Urban Renewal Board estimates that the annual costs of the entire project to the city on the basis of its paying 50% of the clearance and acquisition and 25% of the construction costs will be \$268,000 a year for 20 years."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to just quote one paragraph from that story which disturbed me very greatly and it's as follows: "According to Alderman Peter Taraska and Mayor Stephen

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.).... Juba, provincial approval came only after some hard bargaining and harsh words between them and Industry and Commerce Minister Gurney Evans." Now, Mr. Speaker, all that the province was asked to do was to give its approval. In this project the province wasn't asked and wasn't prepared to pay five cents, and the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg reports that they had to do some hard bargaining with the government. This, from a government, Mr. Speaker, which prides itself that it has a forward look and pledges that it's going to look after the needs of the people of Manitoba. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if this story is true, and I for one have seen no correction of that statement, I think it's a pretty shabby attitude on the part of the Provincial Government. Mr. Speaker, other provinces are paying towards this type of plan. I have here a pamphlet printed by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in August of 1959, and I want to just read from a table which they have prepared. In the Province of British Columbia, the Federal Government's share of such projects is 75%; the provincial share is 12 1/2%, the municipal share 12 1/2%; in Alberta, the federal share is 75%, the province pays nothing, the municipal share is 25%; in Saskatchewan the Federal Government pays 75%, the province pays 20%, the municipality's share is only 5%; in Manitoba the Federal Government pays 75%, this province pays nothing, and the municipality's share is 25%; in Ontario they have two projects: one, those housing projects which are economic, i. e., those which carry the cost by themselves, the Federal Government pays 75%, the provincial government pays 17 1/2% and the municipality pays 7 1/2%. In those projects in Ontario which are subsidized, the Federal Government pays 75%, the provincial government pays the entire 25% remaining and the municipalities are asked to pay nothing. In New Brunswick, the Federal Government pays 75% of the cost, the provincial government 12 1/2%, the municipalities 12 1/2%; in Nova Scotia, the Federal Government pays 75%, the provincial government share is 12 1/2%, municipal share 12 1/2%; in Newfoundland, the Federal Government pays 75% of the cost, the provincial share is 25% of the cost, and the municipalities are asked to pay nothing. — (Interjection) — Even Smallwood, that great Liberal. So, Mr. Speaker, to summarize this table, only two provinces, the Province of Alberta and the Province of Manitoba have not agreed up till the present time to pay any of the share of building low rental houses. Now it's not surprising, therefore, that if you turn to the annual report issued by Central Mortgage and Housing for the year 1959, the last year for which they report, if you turn to page 44 and 45 of that report which lists federal and provincial projects under the Housing Act by locality, from 1950 to 1959, you see the following, I think, interesting figures. In Newfoundland they have authorized the building of 584 housing units of which they have completed 448; in Nova Scotia they have authorized the building of 509 housing units of which they at that time had completed 161; in New Brunswick they had authorized the building of 488 units and they had completed 488 units; in Quebec they had authorized 796 units and they had completed 114; in Ontario, with a Conservative Government, Mr. Speaker, they had authorized 5,890 units and they had completed 4,741 units. I want to just mention three cities in Ontario which I think are in some ways comparable to the City of Winnipeg; Hamilton had authorized 1,123 units and completed 1,028; Toronto had authorized 1,930 units and completed 1,775 of them; Windsor had authorized 926 units and completed 628. Saskatchewan had authorized 265 units and completed 155; British Columbia had authorized 443 units and completed 443. Mr. Speaker, I think it's of significance that Manitoba does not even appear on this table. It doesn't appear because we haven't authorized or completed one single unit under the provisions of the National Housing Act which apply to this type of development. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to add my plea that it doesn't make much sense for the people of Manitoba to be subsidizing the building of this kind of unit in other provinces through their tax dollars while we are not even beginning to do the job here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the municipalities in this province are limited in the funds which they can earmark for housing by their lack of financial resources; they are limited even more in their lack of technical staff required to plan and carry out such needed projects. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, to this House that a provincial housing division with sufficient staff could help the municipalities evaluate their needs, help them draft concrete plans, and get such a program on the road. I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that the government give serious consideration to setting aside an adequate amount of money to get housing for the people who really need it begun. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that nobody thinks it can be done immediately or completely, but I would suggest that a million dollars a year for ten years, if the province would



(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . . put up such an amount, and if the province would agree to pay 12 1/2% of the money required, would give us \$8 million a year housing for ten years. Ten million dollars of this would come from the province, \$10 million would come from the municipalities and \$60 million would come from Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no objection to the money which we are spending and have spent and will spend for Hydro Electric development, for schools, for bridges, and for roads, but I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that adequate housing for the people of the Province of Manitoba is just as important as other things which we have already begun to do. Mr. Speaker, in urging adoption of such a resolution, I'm not urging this province to pioneer, I'm merely urging that this province begin the work which has already been begun by practically every province in this country. Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in moving this motion.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, the following resolution: Whereas The Fair Wage Act now sets rates of pay which must be paid to construction workers in Greater Winnipeg and certain other cities and towns in Manitoba, at rates which are considered equitable after discussion between labour, management and the government; and Whereas some of the largest construction projects in this province are being carried out in areas not now covered by the provisions of The Fair Wage Act; and Whereas we believe that workers are entitled to fair wages and proper working conditions wherever they may be working; Therefore be it resolved that this House wishes the government to give consideration to the advisability of amending The Fair Wage Act to extend its provisions to cover all construction workers in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HARRIS: In speaking to this resolution the principal objection to the present zone A and zone B system are sufficient substance in lieu of the great industrial development taking place in Northern Manitoba, and particularly in the vast northern regions. Practically every occupation listed in this schedule is engaged in construction industry on the northern projects because of industrial progression in that area and indeed in other areas throughout Manitoba. The time has come to take a close look at this outdated zone system and let zone A apply to all of Manitoba and to all of its peoples engaged in construction work. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, we have had many cases of contractors evading the clauses of The Fair Wage Act. I have even heard of men quitting in various projects all over northern Manitoba because of trouble with regard to these contractors not living up to The Fair Wage Act. And Mr. Speaker, I would urge this government to bring in the Act to cover all of Manitoba. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 20. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. R. SEABORN (Wellington) presented Bill No. 20, An Act to amend The Margarine Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SEABORN: Mr. Speaker, as you know, I made a suggestion to the women of Manitoba by means of a letter to the various editors throughout the country, and a large number of the country editors published that letter. In it I said that if the women of Manitoba would support me in my efforts to get a favourable reception for the Bill now before you, we could have factory-coloured margarine by June. It was my feeling that if the women would take the trouble to write in expressing their feelings, this Legislature would not ignore them. I anticipated heavy mail from Winnipeg and I got it. What surprised me and pleased me was the wonderful flood of letters from points outside of Winnipeg. There are over 1,000 such letters here from all over Manitoba -- Amaranth, Dauphin, Emerson, Treherne, Neepawa, Manitou, Morden -- there was well over 40 letters from the Morden district and they're still coming in -- Haywood, Selkirk, Carman, Lac du Bonnet, Russell, Virden, Cranberry Portage -- I'm beginning to feel

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) . . . . like a station agent -- The Pas, Oak Bank, Stonewall, Gonor, Souris, Pine Falls, Arborg, Cartwright, Bowsman, Gilbert Plains, Oak Bank, Dominion City, Swan River, Woodlands, Rivers, Binscarth, Birtle and many, many more towns. There may be dozens more by now because the mail just keeps piling up and I just can't keep up with it. Not all these letters are from women, though most of them were; quite a number of men, particularly old age pensioners, wrote me too. Farm women wrote to me to say the fact that even if they were farmers' wives did not mean they did not want coloured margarine. They want it too, because they use it and they see no sense in colouring it. Now I had no intention to make a speech at all today, Mr. Speaker, I was simply going to read from all these letters. I had thought that these people from all the corners of Manitoba ought to be heard. And I know members would like to have heard them too, but the members might be interested to know I checked with Mr. Speaker, and after he looked up the rules we decided I should not read these letters to you. Naturally I wish to abide by the rules, much as I regret the fact that they preclude the reading of these letters to you - these letters that are sometimes articulate, sometimes angry, but always reasonable.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable member a question? Is he stating that you have told him that to read a letter or letters here is against the rule?

MR. SEABORN: Will you answer that, Mr. Speaker, or shall I?

MR. SPEAKER: If I may answer that question, I informed him that if he read letters in the House he may be required to table them.

MR. CAMPBELL: I agree with you on that. That's quite a different matter from the statement that the honourable member was making.

MR. SEABORN: However . . . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: The . . . . . is that the honourable member has stated that he would like the opportunity to read, I presume not all of the letters, but that he would like the opportunity to read some of the letters. The only point that I'm making is that if he really wishes to read them, he has the opportunity of doing so with the proviso that you have mentioned, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SEABORN: Well I understood from speaking to Mr. Speaker that if I read extensively from these letters I would be expressing opinions of others besides myself, and that the feeling that we had was that I was here to express my own opinion, not the opinions of others who have written to me. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that that is true. It's for, of course, the House to judge whether the letter is expressing other opinions than yours, and it's certainly one of the functions of a Legislature and the members in the Legislature that they're here to express their own opinions.

MR. SEABORN: Well, I'll just go on with what I had to say, Mr. Speaker, without making any more of an issue of this. I'll just refer to the letters and tell you that letter after letter that I received told of persons being put on vegetable oil diets due to a heart condition or for other health reasons, and since their doctors had ordered them not to have butter in their diets, but to use margarine, they could see no reason why they cannot be allowed to buy the margarine factory-coloured. It seemed to them that it was tribulation enough to suffer from too much cholesterol in the system without being forced as a result to colour margarine. I had no notion the tremendous number of doctors who are telling their patients to use margarine instead of butter, and there's a veritable army of Manitoba people who cannot use butter, coloured or uncoloured, and forcing them to do without colour in margarine is certainly not helping the dairy industry in any way.

I received letters from mothers with large families -- rather irate letters, understandably, pointing out that the price of butter puts it entirely out of their reach. They could not buy butter even if they wished to do so, and they could not use more margarine even if it were coloured. They cannot for the life of them see why the members of this Legislature, who are all so much better off financially, yield so easily to the pressure from the dairy people while remaining so strong-hearted at the pleas of housewives who are poor and must feed large families. The letters from old age pensioners were particularly touching. Letters written often with arthritic hands and with considerable difficulty. More than one of these older pensioners pointed out that they simply couldn't afford butter from their small pensions, and that

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) . . . . it was very painful and difficult for them to mix in the colouring. I think that members who are letting pressure from the dairy people influence them would find themselves courageous enough to resist such pressure in order to spare these older people the colouring of margarine if they could read some of these letters I have received.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SEABORN: Yes, I'm waiting.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What's to stop these people who want to buy margarine from eating it the way it is now? Why does it have to be coloured?

MR. SEABORN: The appearance of a product.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What is that answer please?

MR. SEABORN: I beg your pardon. I said, the appearance of a product is often the part that is appetizing to the person. To place an article before a person in an unappetizing manner is not conducive to the good appetite, is it?

MR. GUTTORMSON: . . . . . understand you that you want to make it look like butter so that they'll think they're eating butter?

MR. SPEAKER: . . . . . the honourable member be allowed to continue his speech.

MR. SEABORN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. From out Manitoba came a letter signed by two young men. Their mother, an old age pensioner, cannot mix the colouring herself so they must go over each week and mix it for her. Whatever their views about margarine were at one time, they now want it coloured. I have these letters, every one of them. -- (Interjection) -- I have, but I hope that some of you -- I especially hope that you women in the Legislature will take the time to read them after the House has adjourned. I am convinced that these signed letters, hand-written, sincere, and often pathetic, would do what no amount of argument can do, would lift this ban, this ridiculous ban. We have coloured margarine in Manitoba. The only question is whether it's been mixed in the factory or whether the women, the old age pensioners, or those under doctor's care, or the Salvation Army hostels, or poor families must mix it in themselves with the resulting waste both in time and in the product. I have received as well about four or five dozen letters against my bill. I must confess about half of these were unsigned, and some of them were written in a manner that would preclude reading them to you in this House. The other letters were sincere, well-written letters, usually from farm men or women who milked cows most of their lives. They feared that factory-colouring of margarine would affect their cream cheques. Now we all know that if margarine were factory-coloured there would be an increase in the purchase of that product for a few months. Women who have never bought it might give it a try. This is what happened in other provinces and in other states in American, but within a year the normal relationship between the sale of margarine and butter is re-established. The difference from sales is dependent on price, not on colour, that the Waines Report made clear. In short, thousands of women being forced to colour margarine at home are being penalized to no purpose. The cream cheque would not be affected. Indeed it is altogether likely that within a year butter would gain a better share of the market than it does now, because this annual fuss in the Legislature turns all sorts of people from margarine, and quite a number of those letters are from women who vowed that they will never buy another pound of butter as long as the Legislature maintains the ban. In British Columbia, after the change was made, the sale of margarine within a year had gone down in relation to the sale of butter. Now I know that arguments will not prevail in this House -- not on this contentious subject. If this gigantic petition from the women, housewives, pensioners, and poor people of Manitoba cannot touch you, facts will never touch you or change you. I think the women through their tremendous response have surely convinced you that we should have coloured margarine by June. If you turn a deaf ear then I'm sure these thousands of homes are going to lose faith in this Legislature. If this bill is tossed out as it was last year, if it does not even get into Law Amendments, it will be, in my opinion, an arrogant, an inhumane turning of the back on the low-income voters in city and country alike. It will be an act of coldness towards pensioners and citizens who because of doctors' orders cannot use butter. It will be a decision that will be regretted by the Legislature and by the dairy people too, because the issue will be back here next session and the next. I do not make this statement on my own. I make it in the name of all these people who have sent in these letters, signed them and mailed them. If these

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) . . . . letters cannot be read aloud in this Legislature, which I feel they cannot be . . . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I must raise a point of order again, because we can't allow the honourable gentleman to keep repeating that they can't be read here. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. I wouldn't suggest that he read them all if he has a thousand, because that would certainly -- running into trouble with the forty-minute rule, but if he wants to read specific letters, let him read them.

MR. SEABORN: If you would like to hear from these letters, Sir, I'd be very glad to start right from the beginning of my file and read every one to you. They would be quite educational.

MR. CAMPBELL: It isn't a case of me wanting to hear them. My honourable friend keeps repeating that he wants to read them. Let him read them.

MR. SEABORN: Well, the thing is, Sir -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I would like to. I'll read you the one from Swan River. That might . . . . . "This is to offer my support as a housewife in your effort to obtain coloured margarine for Manitoba. It is hard to understand why the dairies and butter industry do not receive more support from the farmers as they bring their cream to town and many of them buy margarine. I have noticed when shopping that people from the country buy margarine from the stores, and I feel that the country people buy much, if not more, than the town people. The dairy industry seem to force the public to buy margarine. Just before the time I was doing Christmas baking last year, they advertised that baking would be much better if butter were used, and then they put the price of butter up to 70¢ a pound. Very few people can afford to pay this price for butter for cooking and definitely a family with small children cannot afford it for eating. I trust you will be successful in your efforts to obtain coloured margarine and save us all the greasy job of doing the colouring." It's from a lady. -- (Interjection) -- I'll let you have the name, Sir. -- (Interjection) -- I don't know why this margarine is such a big joke to the Legislature when it's such a serious matter to both the producers who want to try to protect the cream cheques and feel that we are trying to jeopardize it when we're actually not -- it's a question of price -- and the housewives of Manitoba who want coloured margarine, treat it in a very serious vein. I don't think it's any laughing matter. Here is a letter from Birtle: "We are much in favour of the sale of coloured margarine. Our farmers sell this milk, cream and butter at a protected bonus price much too high for ordinary families. They cash the tickets and buy margarine for use in their own home. I know a large number who do this." Here's a suggestion that he places, so that they're not always working detrimental to the dairy industry as is suggested: "Place a provincial tax of five cents a pound on margarine to bring it a little nearer to the competitive price for butter and remove the odious task of mixing the colour in as is done today. The sale price of margarine would still be in reach of our poorer families and the provincial budget would be helped and the producers of vegetable oil assisted."

Well, I'm not going to keep on speaking to a House that treats it in such a light vein. I think it's about time that the House realize that it is a serious question and a question that's violating the principles of democracy, that a small group of people are trying to compel a larger group of people to buy a product in a manner in which they do not approve, and you're compelling them to mix this product with a small package of colour against their will, and I don't think this is democratic. I think that it's about time that we settled down and faced this issue quite realistically, and try to get these people away from doing this unnecessary and senseless chore of trying to colour their own margarine. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask that the Honourable Member for Wellington table the two letters he read.

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I hope that I won't be longer than 5:30. -- (Interjection) -- Better not be; well, I can finish it. We have listened to some letters, and the Honourable Member for Wellington did state that he has many, many more, thousands more. I don't think that we should ask him to read the letters, in fact, he didn't seem to be too anxious, but I would say that there are always two sides to every question, and I am sure that if any of the members in here would have made an appeal to Manitoba to housewives who do not care to have it coloured, probably would have had many more letters than what the present member from Wellington had stated, opposing the lifting of the colour ban. He talks

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . . about compelling. Why should the members here compel the housewives to buy margarine? I disagree there; we're not compelling them to buy margarine; it's a matter of choice; they wish to buy margarine; we're not compelling them. And another word he used, that we are compelling the housewives to mix -- we are not compelling them to mix; it's their own choice; they wish to mix. The colour is there, and they wish to mix. Then I heard in one letter that one of the housewives -- the honourable member did not give her name -- stated: "Why should I be compelled to colour margarine", and then she mentioned immediately after that: "for the purpose of baking". I do not think that margarine needs to be coloured for the purpose of baking. Yes, I used to batch for about ten years, so I'm not a qualified cook but I can do a little bit of it. For the fourth time in as many sessions I have come to the defence of the dairy farmer in opposing the lifting of the colour on margarine. Now as stated before, this has become a perennial subject here, and I don't know if I understood the suggestion right, but the suggestion was given, at least that's the way I understood, that we should get rid of this question because it will come up again next year. Now for us just to vote "yes" to get rid of it, I don't think it would be quite in order. We should vote "yes" if we feel -- if we are convinced that that's the best thing for Manitoba, and I really and truly think that the people of Manitoba would not insist that we bring this in or the majority of the people. If some of us members here didn't persist in bringing this up every year I'm sure that the people of Manitoba -- most of the citizens are not so concerned about having the margarine coloured as some of the members would like us to believe. But every session, people are incited and naturally they invite them to write letters. They would do so, just to oblige, because we can always find a few extremists in every field. Manitobans we know are good people, and I am sure that if they were convinced that it will hurt a certain segment of Manitoba, certain producers, that these housewives themselves will not insist on the colouring of margarine because they'll simply come up and say, "Well, we do not want to hurt the dairy farmer or whoever is concerned there. We're not lazy; we'll do our own mixing", and so on. The lifting of the colour ban on margarine, yellow, I feel will definitely hurt the dairy farmer. Statistics have proved that in certain other areas in North America where margarine was allowed to acquire the colour of butter, the sales of margarine increased by as much as 40%. True, the honourable member says it's only temporary -- it levels off afterwards. But I do not think that it will level, go back to the original level.

Now, not only will the colouring of margarine hurt the dairy farmer, but it will hurt every citizen in Canada because as we know, and if Ottawa supports the price of butter fat, we know there are certain times, certain years that we have a surplus, as this year, and therefore the government, as it has done before, has to sell the butter at a sacrifice price. Now who pays for that? The citizens -- not the citizens, but the people in Canada, so it will not only hurt the dairy farmer but it will also hurt everyone living in Canada. A survey in Winnipeg proved . . . .

MR. SEABORN: Who pays for the subsidization of the butter in the first place?

MR. TANCHAK: The people as a whole pay for the subsidization of butter, but I say that it will simply aggravate the situation because there will be less butter used if margarine is allowed to be coloured, so it definitely will hurt the people more -- of Canada. Statistics have proved last year, or surveys have proved last year, that housewives even in the City of Winnipeg were asked if margarine were coloured yellow would you use more of it, and the answer was yes. I think you heard that last year, they would use more. Now why colour margarine yellow? The speaker just before told us that colouring of margarine yellow will not improve the taste, it will be more appealing to the eye. Why should we deceive ourselves? The honourable member here asked isn't it going to deceive? Wouldn't the consumer be led to the deception that he is eating butter? I don't think there was an answer. I think that this is deception. You may say that butter is coloured yellow too at certain seasons of the year, I agree, but the natural colour of butter is yellow. At certain times of the year, which isn't the fault of the cow I do not think, when the farmer feeds the cows dry hay, therefore we have to colour butter to bring it back to its original colour -- the colour that really belongs to butter, so nobody is deceiving the consumer by colouring butter in the wintertime, and I say that this will definitely be a deception. Why insist on the particular colour of butter? It would be a deception. Either deceiving the public or deceiving yourselves. We know that in the States

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . . when margarine was coloured yellow -- I think it was in the year 1952 -- it was proved that the people of United States paid \$33 million to the producers of margarine who fraudulently misrepresented the product. They thought that they were eating butter. Thirty-three million dollars is quite a bit.

Now let's come to this making fun, a joke of this. I don't think it's a joke. I don't think it's a joke at all. I think that anything we discuss in this House isn't a joke, but it seems to me it's in the manner that it is being presented, and if it has become a joke I think it's the fault of some of the members sitting right in this Legislature, quite persistent bringing different gimmicks into the House and trying to demonstrate. Or why persist in awkwardly demonstrating how margarine is being coloured. Naturally if that happens it does become a joke. The Editor and Chief of the OB Minuterial, he had the same comments to make. He said that the members were laughing; they thought it was a big joke. I disagree with him. I don't think they were laughing just because it was a big joke that it was brought here. Sometimes maybe they want a little fun but it isn't -- they do not -- I'm sure that none of the members here consider it a joke. Now while on the subject of the OB Minuterial, and it was also mentioned by the Honourable Member from Wellington, that the people of Manitoba are going to lose confidence in the MLAs here. Well, I do agree that the people of Manitoba will lose confidence, but I'll say that they should not lose confidence in the MLAs -- the editor would have been more to the point, or I'd say he'd been right if he'd said the people would lose confidence in the present government, because he states in that minuterial that the members should have had enough time already to consider this, and since last year we had the commission's report, therefore double reason for a conviction -- that a conviction should be decided upon, and I say, that since the government members and the government did receive this report, it was up to the government to make a stand on it on policy. The government isn't bound by the decisions of the commission but at least the government should have stated a policy. Most of the members, not all, in this House look up to the government for leadership and guidance in this House, and I say that there has been no guidance and no leadership as far as this question is concerned.

I see my time is very short. I'll just end by saying that I'll oppose the colouring of margarine yellow because I abhor deception, and I claim that that would be deception. In 1952, as I said before, the people of the United States lost \$33 million -- not lost it, but they bought a fraudulent product. Butter is our own product and we should do all we can to promote our own product in Manitoba and also in Canada. Margarine -- most of the oils used in the manufacturing of margarine are imported. Butter contributes about \$13 million cash income to the people of Manitoba while the manufacturing of margarine -- most of it is imported; there are only two manufacturers here in Manitoba -- it only brings a cash income of about \$10,000 a year, a little under that. And we have no guarantee that after the margarine is coloured yellow that the price will remain cheap. It will be a cheap spread as the speaker referred to it, a cheaper spread. We might find that after it is coloured yellow it will not be as cheap as it is now, and as far as freedom of choice, as mentioned before, I agree with that. There should be freedom of choice, but we should consider if that freedom of choice is going to harm by allowing the freedom of choice to one segment of people, and it's going to harm another segment in the same nation, I do not think that this freedom of choice should be granted. That's all I have to say today, and I hope that members will see fit to vote against the second reading of this Act. I thank you!

MR. SPEAKER: I call it 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 8 o'clock tonight.