

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, March 7th, 1961

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

CLERK: The Petition of Isbrand Rempel, and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Association for Retarded Children in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

Notice of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

HON. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health & Public Welfare)(Gimli) introduced Bill No. 37, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Insurance Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders of the Day, I wish to lay on the table of the House a reply to a question by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, dated February 21st, 1961, relative to the A. D. Little Company of Cambridge, Massachusetts.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. About ten days ago, or 12 days ago, I was asked a very simple question on some figures for the Social Allowance Act. I think a stenographer in the office could have given it to me, but the Administrator refused; the Deputy Minister refused; and I phoned the Minister's secretary. Finally, I placed an Order for Return. It's still not here, and personally, I think it should have taken only three minutes to give me these figures.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question which has been asked by the Honourable Member from Inkster, we have pretty well got this information ready and it should be tabled in a day or two. When he approached the Deputy Minister, they started to assemble this. Some of this is up to fairly recent information, and I have to trust the staff that they are doing everything they can to get the exact figures that the honourable member has asked for, and this will be returned; but there was no reluctance on our part, Mr. Speaker, not to meet the demands of the honourable member and I think the Order for Return is the proper method.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, about a week or more ago, we asked for an Order for Return showing the cost to date, to the province, of the Brandon inquiry. Now I assume the costs are pretty heavy but surely they're not so heavy that it takes all this time to tabulate it on the adding machine. I wonder when we can get that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Il me fait plaisir de pouvoir par votre intermediaire presenter a tous les membres de cette Chambre 50 jeunes hommes de l'Institut Collegial Provencher de St-Boniface accompagnes de leur professeur Monsieur Antoine Gaborieau. Il me fait bien plaisir de voir que ces jeunes s'interessent aux affaires municipales et je suis sur que je puis en votre nom et aussi au nom de tous les deputes ici leur souhaiter la bienvenue.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to introduce to you and to all the members of this House, 50 young men of the Provencher School, St. Boniface, accompanied by their Professor, Mr. Antoine Gaborieau. It is indeed gratifying to see these young men taking such interest in politics and municipal affairs, and I am sure that in the not too distant future we might be able to see some of those intelligent faces sitting here and being with us here in this Chamber. Thank you.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to take this opportunity to introduce some guests that we have with us today in the gallery. Mr. Suwala, of the Tecumseh School District, has brought in 5 young people who are in Grades VII and VIII in Tecumseh School and I would like on behalf of the members to welcome them here today, and to hope that they will take away something with them today that will not only help them understand their history lessons, but will help them to understand the procedures in the process of democratic government.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would just like to mention here that last week we heard about the very important curling game between 4 members of our party and 4 members of the Liberal Party. I would like to extend, on behalf of 4 members of our Party here, a challenge to the members of the press to a curling game at a date convenient to both parties. I think that we have 4 members here who are very high class talent, and we would like to find out how good a curler the members of the press are.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Questions -- the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, the question occurring in my name is (1) What was the provincial financial contribution to the resort area development adjacent to the PFRA Dam at Rivers, Manitoba? (2) When was the contribution or contributions made? And (3) Is this policy applicable to other similar areas such as Neepawa?

Mr. Speaker read the questions.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, am I expected to say anything further or will it appear in . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Questions are not debatable. Was that in the form of a motion or are you just asking the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I understand that the answers will appear in Votes and Proceedings.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that an order of the House do issue for a return showing: (1) The date when the move into the Norquay building was started. (2) The date when it was completed or, if not yet completed, the date when it is anticipated it will be completed. (3) Whether tenders were called for the moving contract. (4) Whether they were opened in public. (5) What were the tenders. (6) If tenders were not called, whether estimates were requested. (7) What were the estimates. (8) Which firm or firms, or individuals did the work. (9) Whether they were paid by hourly rates, contract, or other method. (10) The amount paid to each firm or firms, or individuals concerned. (11) What was the total costs of the moves.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Leader of the CCF.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, my words in connection with this resolution will be brief. I principally adjourned the debate the other day because the sponsor of the main resolution, the Honourable Member for Inkster, was out of town. However, after the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie had proposed the amendment and the Honourable Member for Cypress had spoken in this connection, I thought that it was incumbent on me to say a word or two briefly in connection with the resolution. I think, Sir, that it will be understood by the House if I rise and oppose the amendment to the amendment.

This could lead conceivably to a return to the jungle, in respect of Old Age Pensions or Social Security Allowances, paid at the federal level. We had that sort of a situation for many many years and it wasn't until after constant endeavour by our group here in the Province of Manitoba, and in the federal field, that the means clauses in connection with old age pensions was eradicated from social security allowances. I can see a grave danger, Mr. Speaker, to amendments of this nature being introduced here in the Legislature of Manitoba. It is quite conceivable that our federal authorities could construe from a resolution or amendment of this nature, that the basis of a means test, or to use the phraseology so well-loved by our friends from across the way as the needs test, the federal authorities could make this applicable to many other conditions of grants, which would add to the burden of our old age and blind pensioners. And indeed, while the resolution does not include them, those in receipt of other pensions as well.

I was surprised the other day, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Honourable Member for Cypress give us as illustrations the fact of sons and daughters of old age pensioners visiting them and having a cup of tea or a lunch with the old age pensioner, and it was an indication to me that she was suggesting that if this wasn't done the \$55.00 a month would be adequate. I really don't think that my honourable friend meant what it sounded like, because

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.)....I am sure that she would recognize, as we all recognize that when people reach the ages for which they qualify for old age pensions, they have enough problems; they have enough loneliness without visitations from their friends and children. I would like to suggest to my honourable friend that if, as a result of these visitations the \$55.00 may not be enough, may I suggest that that is an indication, Mr. Speaker, as to why the basic pension of \$55.00 should be increased, as a right, rather than on a means or a needs basis. Surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, that after the contribution that these people have made to Canada and to Manitoba, they are entitled by right to more than just the meagre living that \$55.00 may give them today. The Minister of Health and Welfare points with pride, with some justification to his Social Allowances Act which, as he calls, is on the needs test basis.

The objective of this resolution is in respect of the universal pension right across the whole of the Dominion. I do not think that we cannot help but gain if we supported this resolution in its original form in this House. We are dealing today with great misgivings of the fact that we have with us a considerable amount of unemployed. You may say to me, what is the relationship between unemployment and the granting by right, in our opinion, of a more reasonable pension to our old age and blind pensioners? I think it is a well known economic and basic fact that in periods of recession we should increase, rather than limit or hold at ridiculously low limits, the amount of money available for distribution. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as our old age and blind pensioners, with their meagre income of \$55.00 a month, that they could be assisting in the problems of unemployment were this increase granted. It can be well said that many who do not require the old age security pension are now receiving it. We recognize that, but would my honourable friend suggest that after the many years of endeavour, and united endeavour by all of the political parties in Canada, that we should return back to a means test as we had formerly. May I suggest to my honourable friends who do not seem inclined to support this resolution that the real alternative, if there is a fear of the increase in the amount of money because some of those may receive it that do not need it, the answer would be a return strictly to the basis of need, or means, or call it whatever you will. And I'd suggest, Mr. Speaker, that no one, no political party, even the so-called forward-looking party of my friends opposite, would suggest a return to that. After many years of fight, it has become the accepted method of old age security and blind pensions in the Dominion of Canada, that it should not be with a means or a needs test, to use the phraseology of the amendment.

So I would suggest, in all deference to the mover of the amendment, that unless he is prepared, unless his party is prepared to return to the former means test or needs test in respect to all old age pensions and blind pensions, that he should withdraw his amendment. As I say, the only answer to the criticisms which I have heard in respect of the increase is because somebody who doesn't need it is now getting it, and will gain as a result of the increase from \$55.00 to \$75.00 a month. I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that if that is the opposition to the resolution as such, the mover of the resolution or the amendment, and those who support it, should stand firmly by their convictions and simply amend the main resolution by calling for a change in the basic principle of our Old Age and Blind Pensions Act and forthwith call for a means test right from the start. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say we cannot accept the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment of this resolution, it is true in Manitoba that people really believe that all old age pensioners are taken care of, because of the high pressure propaganda and window dressing by the present government. Why even the Honourable Member from Cypress has been taken in and believes it. Well, Sir, it's not so. They are resting their amendment in this case on change in the resolution on a basis of need. Well, they all need it, only in their amendment, everyone would have to prove it. Well, Sir, I'll guarantee \$55.00 to anyone in this House who can exist on it for a month. It is absolutely impossible, just for a bare existence, right from scratch and no assistance. I agree with the Honourable Member from Cypress that welfare workers are doing a good job, but nevertheless, not like her, do I feel sorry for them or sympathetic, because they get well paid on the sufferings of others. It is absolutely tommyrot to say that old age pensioners need assistance from welfare workers to budget their meagre \$55.00 a month. What they need is more money, not advice. Also, that they give their money away to their daughters and sons and haven't any money left. What money -- \$55.00 a month? It is also mentioned that many old

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.) . . . . age pensioners feed their families on a pension, that they are left in dire circumstances. Well, Sir, most of the cases that I know of, if the family didn't assist the old age pensioners they'd starve half the time. As any sensible person must realize, \$55.00 a month these days is just a mere pittance, regardless how simple or how humble your requirements are, Sir.

You know at one time we had no old age pension plan, and when it was proposed you heard the same cry as now, we can't afford it; it will ruin the economy of the country -- it was either the Liberals or the Conservatives, it makes no difference. So that aspect, Sir, we shouldn't worry over, whether the economy of the country can carry the load or not. Remember these people were also taxpayers for many years and paid for others. They should reap their benefits now. Well, Sir, it's up to us to say whether we can afford to give our old age pensioners a decent standard of living. It would not only benefit them, but would benefit our whole market if pensioners had sufficient money for necessities of life. Also, they would not seek employment.

Actually, Sir, what old age pension should do, everyone that needs should file an application with the Health and Welfare Department, and then we would have a true picture of what they are really doing, because it has been mentioned that the government has hit the hard core of help that is needed in this province. Well, Sir, the hard core is first to crack the Welfare Department. That is the most difficult part of it -- to show them your need. They won't assist you in paying any debts which you have acquired recently due to medical bills, because if a person is taken ill suddenly and does not carry a Medicare card, it's just too bad. I invite any member to go to Medical Arts Building, Room 322. There you can talk with the receptionist and she will tell you of case after case of old age pensioners having acquired heavy medical bills and trying to pay, out of \$55.00 a month, a couple of dollars on their debts. These people have been refused assistance, because debt was acquired before they applied. How silly and stupid that sound to me, Sir. Naturally if they had no debts, they wouldn't need help; but the Department says "sorry" -- and this we call justice. All we are asking for is a decent standard of living for the old age pensioner. The public should smarten up when they watch, year after year, the two old line parties refuse to help, except when they are forced to gain popularity before Federal elections. Yet, mark my words, the Federal Government will boost it up before the next election, yet our present Provincial Government hasn't the gumption to just propose to them at the present time that assistance must be given. That is what people should remember, not all the election propaganda which they spread on pretty thick.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. -- Order stand.

Adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain and the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I find this situation developing -- by the proposer of this resolution, puts me in a bit of a quandary. Here we have a group of people on this side of the House who protest that local real estate taxes are becoming too heavy; that the taxpayer should be relieved; and at the same time, in many instances, urging the expenditure of greater amounts of money by this province. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a situation that develops very frequently when we have costs shared by various levels of government. I have noticed, through my years in this House, that whenever sharing grants are involved, each government tends to look upon the money that it is going to spend as its own personal money, and in many instances, doesn't realize or forgets that ultimately the taxpayer must bear the burden of all the costs; and all the costs, of course, are split between various forms of taxation. So that in the interests of good government, in the interests of the citizens who the government represents, and not only represents but should protect from the ever-increasing burden of costs, the overall picture should always be looked at rather than the narrow viewpoint of how much this is going to cost my particular level of government or this

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd.)....particular group of taxpayers. The resolution, I think, overlooks the fact that once money has become available in surplus quantities to any group of citizens then that particular group tends to spend up to the limit of their budget -- (Interjection)-- I beg your pardon? -- Well I'm speaking of if this is increased to include a surplus.

Now we're all familiar that a church group, for example, if they're running a little tight we have real economy practised. This is true of any group of citizens. If they're held a bit tight, then we get economy in their operations because they have to look at their dollar before they spend it, and examine the number of dollars they have. It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, and subsequent to these points I'm going to enumerate first, I'm going to propose a few ideas of my own affecting the economy of school building in this province, but it is my contention that while probably at present the actual costs of average school rooms are very closely approaching the maximum set now, this maximum should not be raised to \$20,000. As proof of this, I took the trouble to go to the Department of Education and asked for a list of the schools that have been built during '59 and '60 which have successfully been built under the present limitation of \$15,000 per classroom. I have a list totalling 21 schools in '59 and 18 schools in 1960, all of which came in under the maximum limit; and the size of these schools range from a 57 classroom school in '59 down to a one classroom school. All came in under the limit. In 1960, 18 schools from a high large size school of 63 classrooms down to several one room schools came in under the limit. The most recent figure to be opened in public bidding, I understand, was the Hastings School at St. Vital, a school of 30 rooms which came in at a little over \$11,000 per room. So, Mr. Speaker, I would contend that from examination of these figures that certainly, while it is always good to examine limitations set by government in regard to anything of this nature, certainly there is no conclusive evidence to point to the fact that the limit should be raised. It should not be, in my opinion, in the interests of economy to the taxpayer.

I would like to suggest to the government, and to this House, a few ideas of my own which I believe would be of great economical interest, not only to the government but to the taxpayers of this province. I know that in certain quarters these suggestions may raise a scream of anguish, but, nevertheless, I'm going to propose them. If I were in a sort of a dictatorial position I would call for a competition among architects for all the various classes -- and don't confuse that word classes with classrooms -- all the various types of schools that we need in this province. I would call for that competition with the understanding that all plans became the property of the Province of Manitoba, and then, as the property of the Province of Manitoba, would then become available to the various school divisions at no cost. Now I will elaborate on this as I go along. But immediately of course you would say, well what you're asking for is stagnation. We're going to have one type of school and we'll go on and on and on. Well, I would, having then called for this competition and having the plans at my disposal, I would set up a committee of people from the practical end of the building field, certainly representatives of the architects; representatives of the sub-trades; and representatives of the actual users of the schools, probably represented by the teachers; and form a small group who would review these plans annually. In all buildings that are built, "bugs" present themselves - objections to the design in layout and so on; correct these as we went along; keep the plans from becoming obsolescent or obsolete; and make any minor improvements in aesthetic appearances. This could be done for a period of five or ten years, whatever period of time you wished to set, at which time you could then, feeling that new developments had necessitated it, then you could call for a further competition. But during this time these plans would be available to the divisions at no cost to them. Now I know immediately, too, in your criticism of this suggestion you're going to say, well local conditions vary. The building we built here may not be suitable in another location. Basically, I would suggest to you that the only objection you could raise on that ground is to the soil bearing capacity, as to whether the soil was of such a nature to carry the building designed, as it would be with the particular type of foundation. One thing that this group would have to do would be to take the responsibility, of where you have poor soil conditions, of providing a modified foundation plan to carry the loading which poor soils might not withstand.

Now then you say, well if you have this type of competition, we're going to scream that probably we are ignoring the aesthetic end that we're going to have many schools which look

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd.)....the same. Personally, I see nothing wrong with this. None of us object to buying a Chevrolet car on the grounds that there are thousands and thousands of other Chevrolet cars available. These would be good schools. We'd analyse them and try to improve them so that they were perfect -- letter perfect at the time. And personally, I can see nothing wrong with 3 or 4 schools in the same locality all looking the same, if necessary, in the interests of economy. I would go even further than that. I'm particularly interested in economy and I would go through the details and -- for example, you will find if the windows and frames are wood, you will find a multiplicity of various designs and details on the frames and windows, and I would standardize them. I'd take the advantage of standardizing to the ultimate degree, so that schools of this particular period of years employed various types of design all acceptable but uniform throughout the schools, so that replacements could be made easily. You wouldn't have the extra costs of grinding special knives for each run of millwork for each individual school. You'd try and standardize on the mill design.

Now I would also pay attention to true economy, because I think there has been, over the past few years, a tendency of school boards to examine only the prime or principal cost -- the capital cost of the building. Now there are other costs which enter the picture, which must be considered in the interests of true economy of building. For instance, I don't suppose there's ever a building been designed that you couldn't take those plans to practical people in the practical building field and have them suggest that this particular item would be very costly to construct by changing the methods, and we could arrive at greater economy. Then the matter of maintenance, for years and years in the building field we came gradually to evolve interiors, smooth finishes, plaster finishes that you could wipe down and wash easily. Over the past few years, in the interests of the aesthetic, or the attractive, the beautiful, architects have tended to go off on a tangent into texture surfaces; and you know that if you had a porous texture in a kitchen, you'd be hopeless to keep that kitchen clean. Therefore, we should examine all these various things in the interest of maintenance costs. And then heating -- I suspect that there are a great number of these buildings that have been built in the past few years, examining only the initial cost, the capital cost, which are very poor buildings, very costly buildings when you consider what it costs to heat them through the years. These are things which are largely beyond the reach of an ordinary school board, composed of laymen that know literally nothing about building construction; and it should be the duty of the department responsible for asking for schools being built in the province, to examine these various factors and see that the people of this province get the very most in economy for their dollar being spent. Now some of these items will raise the initial cost. If it's found necessary to build a building a little warmer, to include more insulation, change the design to get warmth and ease of heating, then certainly that is going to have the effect of increasing the capital cost. But in referring back to my idea of looking at the ultimate economy to the taxpayer, then it's good business to put that little extra into the building in search of that greater economy.

I think that there is only one question that we, either as taxpayers or representatives, should ask ourselves in the extra expenditure of dollars in school buildings, and I think that this is a question that many boards tend to forget. They forget this prime question that they should ask themselves -- Is the expenditure of this extra dollar going to educate any one boy or girl in Manitoba better than he has been educated in the past, and if the increased cost is for beauty, well you can afford to buy beauty when you have got the extra dollars to buy it. That, in my opinion, is the question. I think that there is a real tendency on behalf of architects -- and it's understandable, and it's natural, and it's healthy -- a real tendency to build attractive, beautiful buildings that they can point to with pride. You or I would be the same in their position, but there is also the tendency on the part of boards, and I am not castigating school boards in this group, there is a definite tendency of groups of people interested, and tempted to build monuments, so that a few years after they're off the board they can point with pride to this building and say, "Now look what we accomplished when we were on the Board." Now basically, there is nothing wrong with this. It's a natural tendency; it's human. It's a human failing, but the point is that if we can afford extra frills, fine and dandy, but when we have this tremendous explosion of population where we have to expand so many of the educational facilities in this country, I think that the prime interest should be always that of economy. If these few suggestions have any value, and they're to be found to contain any merit by the Minister, I

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd.)....would be very pleased to have further discussion with him on this.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, much has been said on this resolution, or this kind of resolution, in past sessions. I have not been in favour of it or the intention which you imply to the resolution, and I'm still not in favour of it because, in my humble opinion, this type of resolution covering social and labour matters are not in the long term interests of the labouring force of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, there are two parts to this resolution. The first part concerns the minimum wage, which this resolution requests the government to take steps to increase to \$1.25. The second part is that they approach the Federal Government to have this done across the country. Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the first part very briefly, I consider this inflationary. It results in the reduction of the value of the dollar and not only gives in the long run no beneficial return to the individual paid, but also increases considerably the already considerable hardships on those people in our province and in our country who are dependent on a fixed income. I fully appreciate that such a resolution is very popular. All of us, including myself, welcome an increase in pay, but I think it is for us to look a little beyond this charitable standpoint and look upon the long term as to what the person's going to get. Frankly, I feel that the cure in the long run is worse than the disease. My honest belief is that the real cure is the opposite way. The real cure is, if we could, is to reduce the wages and thereby reduce the cost of living; thereby giving the person a greater return for his efforts.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): What about profits?

MR. STANES: Ah, that's a very good point. Are you figuring gross or net?

MR. PETERS: Both kinds.

MR. STANES: You might say, Mr. Speaker, that we are speaking here of a minimum wage. We are not speaking of an average wage. But I was very interested to listen to the Honourable Member for Elmwood when he quoted, or stated his own wages. Well, I think, insinuating that the two are wrapped up into one -- I think they are wrapped up into one. I don't think one can touch the minimum wage without affecting the standard or the average wage. So therefore, we are really speaking about the two things in one.

MR. PETERS: I never mentioned my own wage at any time.

MR. STANES: I beg your pardon. My honest belief is that the present safeguards have proven themselves, to some degree, adequate to take care of the situation. If they have not in some isolated cases, then I think we should turn to those safeguards which we have in existence. We have, for example, the normal balance between the employer and the employee which, I understand -- in fact I know of several cases where the Department of Labour of this province has stepped in and have been of considerable assistance. We also have, of course, the unions who, in my opinion, have been doing a very fine job, and I'm quite certain that they are capable of looking after those who come under their auspices. After all, Mr. Speaker, if a man is not paid what he thinks he is worth, there are a number of steps that he can take in order to cure that situation. Perhaps our trouble is that we think we're worth more than we really are.

The minimum wage, working agreements, trade agreements, and so on, do not produce the security that some people think. The real security which we all know in our inner heart, is within ourselves. That is the security we have. And I believe that government action should not be taken in this or in any other case until all other methods have failed. In my humble estimation, all other efforts have not failed in this case. Remember this resolution concerns a minimum wage, a minimum wage of protection; not a fair wage.

The second part of this deals with such legislation through the Federal Government across the country. We are all perfectly aware that most industries in this province, excluding agriculture, depend upon raw material from other parts, mostly down east. If the standards of living and the standards of wage were brought up in these parts to that of eastern Canada, it

(Mr. Stanes, cont'd.)....would remove one of the greatest incentives for industry coming to these parts. I fully appreciate that nearness to markets is a great advantage, but only at a price. With the increase in freights, this is another disadvantage to our industry -- from maintaining our industry in these parts. Consequently if we did have a wage, a minimum wage across the country, it would bring up our wage scale, our standard of living to that of the east, and there would be very little advantage to those already manufacturing in these parts and new manufacturers in coming in; thereby increasing the wages of the employee and, in the ultimate, destroying the employer. As I said before, the increase in the basic wage, or the minimum wage across the country, would take away the many advantages for manufacturers being in these parts and would create more unemployment, and we have enough already. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this resolution.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I still remember very vividly, during the depression years, the unemployment. Those who were receiving relief were allowed to earn \$10 a month, and the \$10 a month then became the minimum wage of \$10 a month with quite a few. We are dealing with human beings. We are not dealing with different characters, different aspirations and different ideas. We are now dealing altogether with people who all have hearts. They may have hearts -- others are broken -- so when we found out that some of the big blocks and apartment homes have hired men, give them a little 2 by 2 room and pay them \$10 a month-- that is all they were permitted to earn -- the wages at that time were \$10 a month, so that this government, not this government but the government of that time, had decided that the minimum wage be 25¢ an hour. Records are here. And the minimum wage of 25¢ an hour at that time became the maximum with many. Not with all perhaps, but with many. Then the depression was eased a little and the unemployed commenced to work. The employer did not come up to raise their wages, except for certain individuals which they had to have. Sometimes they were exported labour from other countries because they had to have that particular profession. So it's the workers -- the unions have demanded high wages from time to time. I do not recollect what any government in this province has offered willingly, came up with a bill, that they are going to increase the minimum wage at this session. I have never yet heard the Lieutenant-Governor reading his speech from the Throne suggesting, that the minimum wage were 50¢ an hour, or 35¢ an hour is still being . . . .compulsory to 60 or 75, so naturally we had to fight for it, so we are doing it now. This similar motion has been defeated a year ago, it was defeated three years ago, and it may be defeated now; but unless we ask for it , we'll never get it.

Now secondly, higher wages creates a bigger purchasing power, and this in itself is a good thing, it creates work. The tragedy which credits so much goods are now being imported from other countries, like Germany and Japan -- I am not interfering with the trade agreements of the Federal Government, they know best -- creates unemployment right here. So at least when a man works, let him earn the \$1.25 minimum, and don't forget, the minimum will become the maximum. Surely to goodness they are entitled to have it -- \$1.25 an hour -- eight hours a day. That's the maximum that people work these days, outside of the Legislators. It's not sufficient to maintain an average family of four or five. Rent is high, rent is twice as high as it was; food is three times as high as it was at the time when they were getting 35 and 40¢ an hour. I know from personal experience when I was getting 10¢ an hour, I probably wasn't worth any more than 10¢ an hour, but at that time I could buy for the 10¢ an hour just as much, if not more, than I am buying now. Bread was 4¢ a loaf; meat was 5¢ a pound, and butcher meat, don't forget. So I feel that this request is a very very reasonable one. It's in the interest of the people. Don't forget again that the majority of the population in our community are the workers, the builders. It's true that 25 or 30 years ago, or 40 years ago, they built this immense building at a low wage at that time -- at a low wage -- still we have a monument here to show for it.

Now I think that the wages must be protected. If you leave wages on the basis of demand, supply and demand, I don't think that it would protect the workers for a livelihood and, in the long run, they'll come back to us. If they haven't got any work, if they don't earn enough, they come back to the state and ask for help. Let them be self-supporting rather than helping them. I remember that during those days of relief, we had suggested at that time that instead of giving them relief, let's provide work for them, and the powers to be at that time felt that

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)....relief was a little bit cheaper. That's why with employment, even at the rate of 25¢ an hour. We gave, and justly so, the farmer the full price. We protect his price on butter; we protect the price on eggs; we protect the price on other commodities. Surely to goodness a human being is just as entitled to be protected as much as chattles and produce and products, which is also very very important.

So I think, personally, that this request is a very good one. We have already on the Statute Books, legislation protecting the workers. We realize already their needs. We realize that they require protection from the state and we have agreed to protect them in every other way. We have a Department of Labour checking up that every employer pays good wages; whether they have sanitary working conditions; and whether they work proper hours and so on. Everything is already on the Statute Books. All we ask is a penny more, a loaf of bread more, for those who produce the wealth of the world.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak in this debate, but the speech of the Honourable Member from St. James, it's so full of misconceptions about the economic situation in this country and so lacking in social conscience, that I feel it incumbent to say a few words. I find it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member from St. James would suggest that an increase in minimum wages to those people who are now in the lowest income groups in this country, is inflationary. If it is true, Mr. Speaker, and I reject that completely, then surely it is even more true that those who are in the higher income brackets, who get increases, are contributing as much or more to inflation than those in the low income brackets. Not a word about that from the Honourable Member from St. James. Today's Winnipeg Free Press carries an interesting story apropos of this question, Mr. Speaker. It's headed on page one, "Best Paid MD - Manitoba leads rest of Canada" and here is just one sentence from this article, Mr. Chairman, and I'll quote from it: The medical profession led all Canada in average income - \$15,264 per doctor. In Manitoba the average doctor earned \$18,241." I didn't hear a word from the Honourable Member from St. James about the fees earned by doctors. I want to be very clear, Mr. Speaker, I'm not being critical of doctors. I don't think they are making too much. I think they work very hard and they are entitled to what they make. I didn't hear a word about the increase in the profits which is being made by Canadian business. No, we just heard the usual old-fashioned Tory refrain about the low income groups. This speech should have been made 20 years ago before the Conservative Party changed its name to Progressive Conservative. That's where the speech fitted in, Mr. Speaker, not to this so-called forward-looking Progressive Government.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member talked about increasing the minimum wage as being inflationary. Well, why didn't he give the Minister of Health and Welfare a lecture when we increased the Social Allowances? Surely if increasing the minimum wage is inflationary, then increasing the Old Age Pension is inflationary; increasing the Mother's Allowance is inflationary. Are those inflationary? Why didn't you vote against it, if this is inflationary? It's inflationary because you didn't propose it. That's the only reason which you are suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that this is nonsense from beginning to end.

Now the honourable member says that if we increase the minimum wages we will drive manufacturing away from this province. Mr. Speaker, this indicates to me that the honourable member knows nothing, or virtually nothing about manufacturing in this province; because in fact, Mr. Speaker, who are the people who are now getting the minimum wage of 66¢ an hour, that magnificent and satisfying amount which the Manitoba Government thinks is enough for the people of this province. Is there anybody in the manufacturing industry making 66¢ an hour? Of course there isn't. The people who are making 66¢ an hour are people who are in the service fields. There are virtually no people in manufacturing making 66¢ an hour, so you can increase the minimum wage from 66¢ to anything over it and you don't affect the cost of producing goods at all, and the honourable member ought to know it. So much for his economics.

And one other matter which he suggests, that if we increase wages, we will drive business and industry which wants to come in here, we will drive them away. Well, Mr. Chairman, let's just look at that suggestion. If this is true, if business and industry, if manufacturers look for low wage areas in which to locate, if this is the big factor, then it's very strange, Mr. Speaker, that we don't have a rush of manufacturers opening plants in provinces like Manitoba and the Maritime Provinces. These are the traditionally low wage

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.)....areas. Why aren't they flocking in here? If you look at what is happening to manufacturing; if you take a look at where the business and industry which employ large groups of workers are locating; you find a very interesting thing. They are locating in the Province of British Columbia; they are locating in the Province of Ontario; they are locating in the City of Montreal, which is the high wage area of the Province of Quebec. Why aren't they locating in the backwoods of Manitoba if low wages encourages them. They're locating in precisely those areas, Mr. Speaker, in which the market is and in which the skills are, and the wage level is not the important factor. If it was, they would have been coming to Manitoba; they would have been going to the Maritimes; which they are not doing.

Mr. Speaker, one other matter and then I'm through. The honourable member intimated, I'll use the word which the Honourable Member for Swan River used so well the other night, he inferred that in our resolution we were proposing that this province do something about minimum wages by itself. Now I don't think that the -- (Interjection) -- Yes you did, and if you read Hansard tomorrow you'll see that you suggested that. I don't think that the honourable member could have read our resolution, because our resolution was drawn up specifically in the way it was, Mr. Speaker, because we realize that it is difficult, if not impossible, for one province to raise its minimum wage. Now I draw to the attention of the honourable member, and of the government, that the Province of Alberta recently raised its minimum wage to 85¢ an hour, so it can be done. We recognize that Manitoba is not in the first line of economic development; we recognize that one has to be very hesitant in recommending improvements, because if one is too drastic, one certainly won't get the support of members opposite. They have to be very cautious in everything which they do. So we didn't for that reason, propose that this province act on its own. What we suggested is very simple, that we ask the Federal Government to convene a meeting of all the provinces and to try to get national action by all the provinces.

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, by suggesting to the honourable member, and to the government, that they might well take a look at what is happening in the United States. United States recently had an election, and elected a new President. In the last couple of days I saw a report that a Gallup Poll, which was taken in the last week and which asked the people of the United States what they thought of the job which the President was doing, showed that 72% -- I'm speaking from memory and I may be out a percentage or two, but I don't think more than that -- 72%, a higher percentage than ever supported President Eisenhower, thinks that President Kennedy is doing a good job. I want to suggest to the honourable member that if he hasn't looked at the press clippings lately, he should, because one of the number one proposals of the President of the United States is that the United States adopt a minimum wage policy of \$1.25 an hour. And I like to think, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to close on this note, that the people of Canada are not second class or third class or tenth class citizens, that we're just as good as the people of the United States or anywhere else; and if it's good enough for the United States to have a minimum wage of \$1.25, then I think it's good business for the people of this country.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question? Why doesn't the Province of Saskatchewan have a minimum wage as suggested by the resolution, and why don't they forward such a resolution to Ottawa?

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, the Province of Saskatchewan can't have a minimum wage of \$1.25 for precisely the reason which I mentioned earlier, that is, that no one province can do this on its own. This is why we're suggesting a national policy. As to why they haven't, I'm not even certain that they haven't. I'm concerned with this Legislature and what's good for the people of this province. I think it's good that we suggest this to the Federal Government. If Saskatchewan will go along I'll be very happy. Maybe they've already done it. I don't know.

MR. ROBERT G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question? Did the honourable member see the other item in the press, I believe of last night, wherein it was stated that most of the legislation which the new Kennedy administration had brought in to the United States is patterned directly upon legislation introduced by the Federal Government of this country?

MR. ORLIKOW: I saw where a certain Cabinet Minister suggested it, but I take that statement, like most of the statements which come from that side of the House and from most

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.).....of the Conservative members, with more than a pinch of salt.

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member for St. James would permit a question? He mentioned....

MR. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): This is not in order.

MR. SPEAKER: It's not in order to ask the Member for St. James a question.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare.

MR. G. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I just want to join in this debate for a few minutes concerning the suggestion of the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks that the diagnosis and treatment of cancer be entirely paid from public funds. Certainly I share, and I'm sure we all do, the genuine concern of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks for the catastrophic illnesses of any kind, particularly a dreaded illness such as cancer. And I think we have to be concerned when we notice the cancer registry since 1941, when it had 6964 reported cases, now carries -- the registry of cases over the years totalling 41,000, which averages out around 2,000 new cases reported yearly; with 2669 in the past year. Now these are all statistics we know, but it just shows the magnitude of the disease; and catastrophic illness from any cause is becoming a concern of governments; and we are dealing with the medical and social problem. In that I agree with the honourable member.

I would like to point out, however, the bright side of the story in the Province of Manitoba, for which certainly this government takes just part of the credit since we have been in office in the last couple of years. But gradually we have seen evolve in this province, in the field of cancer, a completely comprehensive free biopsy service. In this past year we saw the Medical Association and the hospital authorities get together to introduce a completely comprehensive tissue service, that is, all tissues removed in all hospitals are now examined. Through the introduction of the Hospital Services Plan across Canada we see the catastrophic burden of hospitalization removed from the backs of the people; we see, while in hospital, complete in-patient diagnosis investigation as part of the hospitalization program. In this province, through our Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, at total public expense, all radiation therapy, treatment with radium, cobalt, radio-active isotopes, chemotherapy -- all this is provided at public expense. And I think my honourable friend and I come back to the same question we did a year ago -- what is left? Well I think we have to agree that what is left is the diagnosis of the illness by the private physician and the surgery by the private surgeon.

Now in the past year and a half we have been working in this area quite actively, and for the recipients of public assistance in this province, we have initiated a humble beginning in the area of the provision of comprehensive coverage for those people who are direct responsibility of the Province of Manitoba. We have found that wherever a physician or surgeon in this province refers a patient to the Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, this foundation carries this service. We find in this province, unlike some areas, a most comprehensive prepaid medical care plan covering 388,000 people in the province, which is available to those who have the means to purchase premiums. What is left is the large area of so-called medical indigency; those who are not in receipt of public assistance and those who are not able to pay their own way. Here I think, we should record that a private physician can refer a patient on diagnosis to the Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, and the complete diagnostic and treatment facilities are available through the university clinics of our teaching hospitals. The future role, and how this is going to evolve as comprehensive care becomes more universal, is a very real problem which both the profession and the university authorities in this province are looking at at this very time. I think we must always, I feel, be aware of the tremendous contribution, and I know my Honourable Member from Seven Oaks doesn't question this at all, but the tremendous contribution that has been made by these clinics in the future; and I think with the introduction of comprehensive hospital care programs across the country and the necessity to centralize high cost diagnostic and treatment facilities at key points to prevent unnecessary duplication will, despite what may happen in the future, tend to bring these people to central points which will be staffed, no matter what we do, much in the same

(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd.)....manner as they are today by our senior physicians and our leaders in the medical and surgical field who are concentrated at these points.

But I submit -- the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that I think the answer is not to pick out conditions of illness as a basis for a program. I think over the years we have seen this in the area of tuberculosis, mental illness, TB control. We've picked these things out one at a time and made them complete public responsibilities for various reasons which are now no longer valid. I think we should just say at this point, that the services for diagnosis, the services for treatment, the availability of many to make these services available unto themselves, exists. And governments have become -- this government has already become involved in the comprehensive care to the recipient of public assistance, and I think governments we see across Canada, and parties, Mr. Speaker, are becoming increasingly more concerned with the introduction of comprehensive medical care plans. But I would submit to this Legislature that much groundwork has to be done; much groundwork has to be accomplished in the area of laboratory and X-ray facilities; much has to be done as to what the future role of our university clinics are going to be; centralization of these services; and I don't think the time is right to fragment our efforts by picking out these individual conditions one at a time. I think we're better to look at the whole overall picture. These are all of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I commend the House to these remarks. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Member for Roblin is absent at the moment, I request the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be in order if one of my colleagues spoke on this resolution and then the adjournment stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Recent studies, Mr. Speaker, both private and public, have revealed disturbing deficiencies in the fitness of American and Canadian youth. Since the youth of our nation is one of our greatest assets, it is imperative that we do something about improving the physical standards of this asset. I also deplore the fact that most people, by the time they have reached their 30's have resigned themselves to an inactive, premature middle life. President Kennedy said recently, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, "that physical fitness is not only one of the most important keys to a healthy body, it is the basis of a dynamic and creative intellectual activity. By keeping physical fitness in the forefront of the nations concerned, the Federal Government can make a substantial contribution for improving the health and vigour of our citizens." There are those, Mr. Speaker, who would say, "Why all this concern for physical fitness? Are our children really less fit than those of other countries?" Well in the United States, 68% of the children who took the Krause-Webber tests failed; whereas in Europe only 8% failed. An authority on this subject informed me that, in his opinion, about 30% of our children in Winnipeg only would pass the test. In view of the fact that what takes place in the United States today usually happens here tomorrow, I think we had better be concerned about this matter.

In my opinion, one of the greatest disservices done to our nation was the withdrawal of the Federal Government of their support in 1955 from the Federal-Provincial Scheme for Physical Fitness. The province followed by repealing the Manitoba physical Fitness and Recreation Act of 1945. A committee of interested groups and individuals approached the government, that's the Manitoba Government, Mr. Speaker, with a request that a study of provincial needs be made. In March, 1957, the Legislature authorized this study and, as a result, an excellent report on physical education and recreation in Manitoba was issued in June, 1958. Despite the good work of many people we have here, Manitoba has just been floundering around in this important matter of physical fitness. If there ever was justification

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.)....for going it alone, this would be the time. We are not making full use of our schools either, Mr. Speaker. I know of an instance where a square-dancing group was refused the use of the school gymnasium. Although this building was designed with the full evening use, with wash-room facilities adjoining, in spite of that, it's only being used for the school portion of the day.

A recreational program for our older folk too, in my opinion, would help to reduce the cost of caring for many of our senior citizens. At present we have no recreational service, no department assigned to assist in this type of progress. It would seem to me that the responsibility should be delegated to one department, so that it would not be necessary to apply to the Minister of Education, which is the procedure at present. Leisure time is becoming a problem as well as a blessing. Even labour leaders of the stature of Walter Reuther are becoming concerned over its use. People very close to the problem of physical fitness are worried less much be done for recreation and little for fitness programs. Our Falcon Lake area is an example offered by many, and though it is considered a wonderful resort, its cost is now in the millions. We suggest that \$50,000 be allocated for advancing the cause of physical fitness. It is a well known fact that rural young people who are coming to the urban areas at an ever-increasing rate, are not learning the skills of physical fitness necessary to adapt them to city life. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are few ways of spending money that will bring larger dividends than that of investing it in the future health of the people of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETERS: I am given to understand that it's going to stand in the name of the Honourable Member from Roblin.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear what you said.

MR. PETERS: I believe this order was supposed to stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, in starting, I wish to acknowledge the good work done by the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce in the preparation and presentation of their fine brief to The Winnipeg City Council on the need for low-rental housing in Greater Winnipeg. It's not often that we see eye to eye with this group, and when we see one of their conclusions reading like this -- and I would wish to quote, Mr. Speaker -- under Clause (c), it says, "Notwithstanding the historic stand of the Chamber of Commerce against subsidies, the disadvantage of subsidies is outweighed by the advantages of having more people adequately housed at rents they can afford to pay." I think, Mr. Speaker, that this statement deserves applause. In looking over the brief we see the needs for this type of housing; the need for and desirability of low-rental housing in Greater Winnipeg. Now if we accept the following premises, and I'm reading from the brief again, Mr. Speaker, "if we accept the following premises the problem is simplified: (1) It is Agreed that all Winnipeg citizens should be adequately housed. (2) An individual cannot be expected to pay more than 25 or 30% of his income for unserviced living accommodation. (3) Since the lowest cost adequate accommodation which can be provided for a family of five, under Section 16 of the National Housing Act, 1954, is \$64 per month for a three bedroom unit, the wage earner must earn \$233 per month. (4) At least 1/5 of the families in Greater Winnipeg earn less than this figure. In the CPR and Notre Dame area, in a study of 1955, 77.3% of the families had incomes of less than \$200 per month. The unknown factor of cost-sharing by the province is considered to be a major problem, and if we are ever to get a worthwhile program of low-rental housing launched in Greater Winnipeg, the Government of Manitoba will have to appropriate funds to assist." Mr. Speaker, only two provincial governments in Canada have not seen fit to assist in this worthwhile work, the Province of Alberta and our own.

Last Saturday's newspapers announced that the government is about to embark on a road-building program which will cost in the neighbourhood of \$400,000,000, financed over 20 years. A program that will rebuild every road in Manitoba. Surely the time has arrived, Mr. Speaker, when housing, especially housing for our low income groups, deserves a rating comparable with that of roads. Greater Winnipeg is a low wage area as compared with many

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.)....other cities. From the 1955 Department of National Revenue Publication, "Taxation Statistics," we learn that in the Greater Winnipeg area, 26,560 people are earning less than \$2,000; and 63,000 people in the Greater Winnipeg area are earning less than \$3,000.

Now I am disappointed that there is nothing in the estimates for urban renewal or slum clearance. According to last evening's Winnipeg Tribune, The Winnipeg Council of Women are certainly concerned, and there are many more public-spirited groups concerned also. I want to read from last night's Winnipeg Tribune, Mr. Speaker, "The Winnipeg Council of Women will reportedly act as spokesmen for three other womens' groups, Council of Jewish Women, The Ukrainian Women's League and the Catholic Women's League." And I have just noticed the paper of today which reports, and I probably should read you the headline in tonight's paper -- "\$8.4 million approved by the City Council for housing. Decision follows five women's briefs". While I don't care to go into the details, because I haven't read it, Mr. Speaker, I think we should be concerned when public-spirited groups such as these are so worried about it. I should say that council also approved an effort to bring the Provincial Government into the public housing program. Now to me, that seems a sad state of affairs when council is trying to bring the Provincial Government into the public housing program. One would think that, knowing this urgency, that the Provincial Government would get its ear a little closer to the ground.

We were impressed by the speed in which the government implemented the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education in regard to the larger school divisions, implemented it even before the final report was received. Of course we know that an impending election sometimes provides much incentive in getting things done. To the question, Mr. Speaker, where is the money coming from? I would answer that it will come from the same source as that that was allocated for the golf course at Falcon Lake, for the sewer and water installations that are there; the same place its coming from to make a park across the street from this building; from the same source that will pay for rebuilding all the roads in Manitoba. In July, 1960, when the First Minister was alarmed over the City of Winnipeg considering the building of a new City Hall across the street, it did not take long to come to a decision and to make a firm offer in regard to urban development and slum clearance. Has there been any abatement of the problem since then? Do we need more than the recent tragic fires to refresh our memory? Have the pictures in our daily papers, showing the deplorable living conditions among many of our citizens, not aroused our concern? Is it not a fact that the shortage of decent living accommodation is responsible for maintaining these fire traps at rents that are unreasonable? In fact, rental values have increased and inspectors think twice before they condemn these buildings, because of the very shortage of adequate housing. Was the government more concerned in July, 1960, in making this offer about the proposed site of a new City Hall than they were about slum clearance in general? I do not like to think so, Mr. Speaker, but the fact remains that there is nothing in the estimates that I can find, unless there is something in the capital estimates, that there is nothing for this urgent need.

The clipping referred to a minute ago also mentioned, and I quote again, Mr. Speaker, "Alderman Peter Taraska told a meeting Saturday of the Citizens Committee on Low Cost and Subsidized Housing, that City Council should make an announcement about slum clearance within two weeks. Alderman Taraska assured the board that Council was interested in an urban renewal project for the Burrows-Fyfe area and Jarvis Avenue districts. The committee meeting decided that members of the Advisory Board should call on Premier Duff Roblin to ask the government to share in the cost of slum clearance for projects undertaken by the city. An immediate start on such projects would help to ease unemployment, said one member of the Advisory Board, Mrs. G. D. Noble." I wish to point out again, Mr. Speaker that it seems strange in this day and age that we have to impress upon the Provincial Government the need for assistance in this matter. I wish to refer, since I quoted it in the article, Mr. Speaker, on the Burrows-Fyfe area. As I said before, although I see the large headlines in this evening's paper about a \$8.4 million housing council, and my eyes scan where the United Church had looked upon the whole project rather dimly because it points out that some of the more modest programs which could be implemented almost immediately had not been given serious consideration.

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.)....In this fine brief prepared by the Chambers of Commerce, I wish to draw your attention to an extract here called "Study No. 5", which mentions this Burrows-Fyfe project and it gives a complete picture from accommodation, capital costs and so on. I do not wish to burden the House with this, Mr. Speaker, but to point out that the total cost of this is \$723. The Federal Government are willing to put up 75% of the cost, which leaves \$180,810 to be borne perhaps equally by the Provincial Government and the City of Winnipeg, which would make the government's contribution to this project \$90,000. Now could anyone suggest a better way to invest it than for the welfare of our citizens in this regard? Economists are telling us that the transformation from a war economy to one of sanity and peace can best be accomplished only if governments are wise enough to give priority in the huge spending necessary to accomplish this, to education, health and welfare, unemployment, housing and planning.

I just read Stuart Chase's new book, "Live and Let Live", and it contains a good definition, in my opinion, of the word "planning" -- calls it intelligent co-operation with the inevitable-- intelligent co-operation with the inevitable. In 1956 the Liberal Government did not heed the warning that unless a new deal in education was forthcoming, the inevitable would happen. It did. And unless my friends to my left heed the warning signs that much has to be done to improve living conditions of many of our citizens; that they must extend intelligent co-operation with the other levels of government to achieve this; then they will be replaced by a government which will do these things. Surely the elimination of slums and the creation of a healthy environment, particularly where there are large numbers of children concerned, is a matter of vital importance. There are other reasons that make early consideration of this problem of housing so necessary, such as the reduction of municipal costs for welfare, police, juvenile court, etcetera, many intangible things too. It is also good business practice as the Federal Government puts up 75 percent of the costs and the city possibly 12 percent -- 12 1/2 percent. For every 12 1/2 cents that this government would invest, one dollar is put into circulation. Of this dollar spent on construction 35 cents is for direct labour, and a substantial portion of the balance remains with the community. We hear much about "do it now", Mr. Speaker. Men and materials are available, but what about the money? The Federal Government has appropriated money the City of Winnipeg is willing; it now remains to be seen whether this government is really sincere in this most important task, and the time to do it now is March, 1961.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JAMES COWAN (Winnipeg Centre): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that the debate be adjourned.

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

.....continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the indulgence of this House to let the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand? Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, this, on the face of it, looks like a very good resolution, and if the number of times it's been before this House and under the variety of sponsorship in which it's been here is any indication, it has much to commend it. It seeks to rectify the inequity that must inevitably result when an arbitrary boundary is drawn in the field of assessment or of taxation. Those who fall just outside the line are automatically hurt or seem to be unjustly dealt with. However, we must look a little deeper and examine some of the implications that are attendant on this resolution. What would happen in the unincorporated villages of Manitoba where we have farmers living who have their farms in the same municipality but removed considerably from their dwellings? Under the terms of this resolution those dwellings would then be exempted from taxation, and what effect would this have on the whole structure of the unincorporated villages — on their ability to meet the burdens of education and other things that fall in their jurisdiction? The same thing is true in the cities and in the towns. Conceivably a man could live in Winnipeg and if his total income was from farming, his house in Winnipeg would be exempted from taxation. That may seem like stretching it quite a bit, but the legal interpretation would be there, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the lawyers are quite capable of putting the interpretation on it.

A MEMBER: Why don't you stretch it a little more?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Now the whole subject of exemptions is at present under review by the Municipal Inquiry Commission. Over the course of the last many years the whole tax base, the whole municipal tax base has been badly eroded by special exemptions from one sort and another, and this has created more inequities than I think it has sought to cure because it unfairly loads the balance of the taxable properties in the municipalities with the total load. The new economic blood in Washington, D. C. is currently proposing that in the field of income and corporate tax in the United States that all exemptions should be removed. This would have the effect of broadening the tax base and lowering tremendously the tax rate. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps it's time to have another look at the whole field of municipal tax exemptions, and that in the long run the inequities may be considerably reduced if this were done. Now last year, Mr. Speaker, a similar resolution was brought before this House and it was passed, and the recommendation of the House was that when the report of the Municipal Inquiry Commission was brought in, that full consideration should be given to that report. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we would be serving little use in making further amendments to The Municipal Act at this date; that we would be much better advised to wait until this Inquiry is received and to give full consideration then to the report that is handed down.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, would the honourable member permit a question? What Municipal Advisory Commission is he referring to?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: The one which Dr. Fisher is Chairman -- the Municipal Advisory Commission.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, might I ask a supplemental question? What has that Commission to do in respect of this Legislature, for it's my understanding that's an independent commission between the union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Urban Municipal Association.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there couldn't be a better organization set up to inquire into the whole field of municipal legislation and to bring in suggested recommendations for the changing of that legislation.

MR. PAULLEY: Might I ask one further supplemental question?

MR. ROBLIN: He called your bluff.

MR. PAULLEY: Who said so?

MR. ROBLIN: There are rules. Look it up.

MR. PAULLEY: Where?

MR. ROBLIN: Look it up.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, you look it up, Bud, because you haven't got it right on this one.

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . Is there any obligation on this commission to report to this Legislature?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the commission was set up. Well now, I'm not completely clear on this, whether it was set up by the Legislature or the government, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker that the report will be the subject of discussion in this Legislature as soon as it is made, whether it is made to the Legislature or to the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that the 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 Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, this is perhaps the third or fourth attempt . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that you would have to move the resolution.

MR. SCHREYER: Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the following resolution: Whereas The Agricultural Stabilization Act of the Federal Government has failed to provide to western farmers a fair share of the national income; And Whereas the prices of basic western farm commodities have continued to deteriorate while the costs of commodities and services the farmers must buy have risen steadily, particularly in the production of wheat, oats and barley; And Whereas the application of the 80% national ten-year average calculation of prescribed prices in the administration of the Act has failed to provide parity prices to farmers based on cost of production; And Whereas the use of the 80% national average to arrive at a prescribed price on any commodity without consideration of increased production costs or the amount of deficiency payments paid in any year will automatically curtail the value of The Stabilization Act each year to the point where it will become ineffective as a price support program in Canada; Therefore be it resolved that this House urge the Government to give consideration to the advisability of using its influence upon the Government of Canada to provide necessary changes in the administration of The Stabilization Act, in such a manner as to provide the farmers of Canada prices based on parity in line with full production costs, in order that the family farm will be assured a standard of living comparable to all other segments within the economy.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as I was attempting to say just a minute or two ago, this is perhaps the third or fourth time that either myself or colleague from Fisher, have attempted to introduce this resolution in this Chamber. We do so without apology at this time because so far as everyone knows the problem is still with us in even an aggravated form. Original Bill No. 237, which was passed in Federal House of Commons in the winter session of 1957-58, is not coping with the problem of farm prices -- and of course this is no surprise -- at least it's no surprise to we in this group, because at the time when it was brought in to the House of Commons, CCF spokesmen were well aware that this was nothing much more than a hoax which the Federal Government was attempting to perpetrate upon the farmers of this country. I might say that a good many keen-minded people were taken in by it, including some rather outstanding members of parliament, including one or two from even the CCF Party. They were fooled by the provisions of Bill 237. And at the time I recall them saying that this legislation appeared to have the makings of answering at least a good part of the problem of farm prices. But there were some, even then, Mr. Speaker, who saw through the implications of the bill and who saw full well that it would not cope with the problem. So today, some three years later, Mr. Speaker, we are still faced with the cost-price squeeze in agriculture farm debt despite whatever my honourable friend, the Minister of Agriculture, tries to make of it, farm debt is rising and rising substantially. According to a press clipping, December 23rd, I note that farm debt in Manitoba stands at 84 million 7, the highest since the depression, and an increase of 88% since 1950. Now I know that the Minister tried to explain this away by saying that land values had increased, but I defy anyone to even so much as intimate that farm land value has increased anywhere near half of 88%. So let's not try to becloud the issue by saying that farm debt has increased but so has land values, it's simply an absurdity. Let's face the fact that farm debt has increased and it's increased tremendously because of the altogether

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . . insufficient farm price structure which exists in this country. Now I know that the basic problem involving prices is to be taken in conjunction with the matter of markets, but there again, certainly we cannot even hope to grapple with the problem of prices if we're not willing to accept a possible one of two propositions with regard to marketing of grain, and I shall come to that later.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, let me make the assertion that it serves some of the government leaders in this country right, it serves them right for now being faced with the problem of unemployment. It's a pity that this has to be taken out on the people affected. But some years ago when they were asked to take adequate steps towards the provision of parity prices for farmers, they procrastinated on this and tried to shelve it by means of a spurious agricultural bill which wasn't intended to do the job. So what's happened? Since 1958 we've slid into a recession, we've slid into a recession, Mr. Speaker, which I submit, and which I contend is a farm-led recession. If farm prices had been adequate throughout the period 56-57-58, I doubt that the recession we are now in would be anywhere near as deep as it is. And I have adequate proof because in the United States the situation is much the same, thanks to the policies of the Republican Administration under Ezra Taft Benson, they fell into the same mess as the case here in Canada. Ezra Taft Benson tried to fight surplus, rather than the matter of price and as the result of that, the farm economy sluffed off into a decrease -- and what happened? They're facing a recession there too. A recession which is, in the words of Walter Reuther, a labour man, a recession which he contends is a farm-led recession, and I want to quote simply two or three sentences from Walter Reuther's testimony to the American Senate Committee on agriculture, and he says this: "A drop in farm income of 1.6 billion over a two-year period with the end not in sight does not indicate a sound financial condition for the country. It is not sound for agriculture, and therefore it is not sound for the national economy as a whole. I am of the opinion that a one billion dollar drop in farm income results in a \$240 million drop in farm spending for machinery and other goods and services, which effect is felt and its accumulative effect upon the rest of the economy. Normally farmers use more steel in a year than goes into the output of automobiles; more petroleum than in any other industry; enough electricity to meet the needs of cities;" -- and he names some of the biggest cities in the country -- "It is clear, therefore that agricultural purchasing power must be maintained if a faltering farm economy is not once again allowed to drag the rest of the economy into a farm-led depression." And, this, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, are the simple facts of it. We're in a farm-led recession because the present Federal Government has not, by any stretch of the imagination, come near to tackling the main problem. How to tackle it, Mr. Speaker? Well, we can do one of two things; we can pass an intelligently worded resolution, which will put farm prices on an intelligent formula basis with proper limitations to prevent the enriching of those who need it least -- I'm sure that the Minister would agree with that; or we can take the other alternative and pass some spurious amendment which would have the effect of calling for acreage payments or some other rather silly arrangements which nobody really asks for, which nobody really wants, except members of the group opposite. Let us for once and for all, acknowledge the problem; let us acknowledge that the solution lies in a formula price system, with proper limitations.

Now I know that the Honourable Minister thinks more and more keenly about the problems affecting agriculture than a good many people -- sometimes he's hard to follow however, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to quote just a sentence from what he had to say speaking to this resolution last year. He seems to admit that the problem is there and so on and so forth -- "And in order to solve this problem we have to spend money. But it's going to take time and we have to spend it in the right place, and in the right way, if we're going to effect a solution to the present crisis. But if we do this indiscriminantly without solving the basic and fundamental problems in agriculture, in the long run we're doing no one a favour." What are the basic and fundamental problems in agriculture, Mr. Speaker? Isn't this and the problem contained within the context of this resolution, the basic problem? What are the other basic problems? They're other problems, but they're ancillary, they're not basic. So let's not have any more skirting of an issue. Now the Honourable Minister's colleague, on page 330 of last year's Hansard did come out rather forthrightly and admit that "The Federal Government has not come to grudge", I think were his words, "The Federal Government has not come to grudge with the central

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . . . problem." But then what did the Honourable Member from Hamiota do? He brought in an amendment which advocated the Federal Government taking certain action to solve the problem consisting of the consideration of acreage payments again, and so forth and so on. A stop-gap measure, perhaps; a solution, certainly not. And I think the Honourable Member should realize that. So what are the prospects of attempting a permanent, or at least not a permanent, but a fundamental solution to a fundamental problem? Well, we can look as far as we like but we have to face the problem of economics in a broad way. I would like to quote just a sentence or two from an interview held with John Kenneth Galbraith, whom I'm sure all of you are familiar with, and he's asked this question: "Do you see a solution to the farm problem in this country?" Of course this is pertaining to the U. S, but I think that we can glean a lesson or two from it. And he goes on to say this, and I think this applies to Canada, especially so; "The difficulty about the farm problem is that we haven't really tried to solve it". I don't think we have so far; not by acreage payments, Mr. Speaker. The essence of our farm difficulties in these last years is that we've had price supports at levels just low enough to anger the farmer, and our egg and hog deficiency payment programs perhaps fall into that category. So we've had price supports at levels just low enough to anger the farmer and just high enough to have to make him produce the maximum extent. That combined with the technological revolution of the last years has resulted in a perfect flood of production, especially in wheat and feed grains. He goes on to say this: "We must guarantee an adequate price based on production, cost of production. There must be reasonable limits on the amount of production that is guaranteed in price." And I think that even though this man is an economist and removed from the practical requirements of politics, he has his finger on a very, very important view. It's the view that I certainly haven't heard from my friends opposite. I certainly haven't heard it from my friends opposite, and I don't know how long they're going to attempt to sit here and try and evade taking a definite stand on this resolution. There's a saying among teenagers that "If something happens, I'll just die." Well, I wouldn't want to say that here but, if they had tried to amend it again, Mr. Speaker, by bringing in a request for acreage payments, then, -- if I don't die, perhaps some farmers will, though.

MR. HUTTON: Will the Honourable Member from Brokenhead permit a question?

MR. SCHREYER: Certainly.

MR. HUTTON: Will he advocate production controls for agriculture in Canada?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'll deal with that question near the end of my remarks. Not right now because . . . . .

MR. HUTTON: Yes or no.

MR. SCHREYER: Oh, just relax Mr. Minister. -- (Interjection) -- What happens to an administration which concerns itself with the matter of surplus production and tries to solve the agriculture problem by trying to cut down on the production by means of non-incentive prices? This is what Ezra Taft Benson attempted to do in the States, and the picture of American agriculture from 1953 to 60 is indeed a dismal one. Let me just quote you some figures; Net income in '53, 15 billion; in 1960, 11 billion; parity ratio from 100% down to 80%; farmer's share of the consumer's dollar down 10%; farm debts up practically, well it's up 84%; a dismal record for an administration that attempted to solve it in the wrong way. Why be concerned for surplus production. I don't know that any government has even the moral right to consider surplus production a curse. It seems to me it is more of a blessing. Goods certainly can be used if the administration has some initiative and some imagination.

Now I was glad to see in last night's and today's paper, that the Honourable Minister in Manitoba is volunteering to lead a march on Ottawa to try and sell the idea of the need for Canada supplying needy countries with surplus grain. There's only one thing gratifying about that, Mr. Speaker, and that is the fact that, for the first time that I know of, a Cabinet Minister is endorsing the idea of supplying needy countries with surplus food. Certainly in itself this idea is not new. Let me just quote, or point out to you that the idea of supplying food to the needy people is an idea which the Canadian Labour Congress advocated several years ago; before that the old CCL and PLC. The CCF as long as 20 years ago advocated this. The Inter-provincial Farm Union Council advocated this 10 years ago. Nobody seemed however to give it the amount of credit which such an idea should have received. There was always fear of spoiling the normal markets. Mr. Speaker, I contend that you can't spoil markets where

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . . they're not. There are no markets for a good many products existing in the under-developed countries; there are no markets to spoil among the starving people of India, Pakistan and Africa, and so we certainly can't be spoiling any markets. So what's kept us back? I don't know, but I think -- and I don't think I'm far out -- I think the reason we have been kept back from any kind of massive food surplus distribution program is the fact that our leaders did not have the daring and the initiative, and as a result of that, not only have people been left starving across the seas, but back home we have been left with a surplus which was left to accumulate in the bins, in the storage facilities throughout the country, to eat up huge federal appropriations by way of storage charges and so on, doing no one any good.

I simply must read to you, Mr. Speaker, where, in an old program dating back to 1955, the the CLC, -- this is 1956 -- advocates full support for Columbo Plan, technical assistance, food disposal programs, long-term loans and so on. The implication is clear. Oh yes, the National Farmers' Union, several years ago called for the establishment of a National Food Bank through which surplus foods could be purchased by the Federal Government. But at that time, Mr. Speaker, when these things were advocated, these people looked upon it as though they were mad, and today I can quote you from the Winnipeg Tribune of -- no dates on it, but it's only two weeks ago I think -- where the Tribune in an editorial is advocating this approach; "So far" and I quote: "Food gifts have contributed relatively little to the export of Canadian grain, but it is possible than an active food for peace program will take a bigger portion in the future. These are the directions we should be looking for in a real reduction of our wheat surplus since it is evident that reliance on a traditional market, while necessary, will only keep the carry-over at or near its present level." The implication is that a food disposal program to help people who need it, across the seas, will not in any way, or any substantial way, impede or damage the normal markets; and so why haven't we been doing this before? We haven't, and as a result of the pile-up, adverse publicity was engendered in this country, which more or less created in the minds of most non-agricultural people the impression that we cannot begin to offer adequate cost of production prices to the farm, or guarantee these prices to the farm people, because this would simply encourage a greater surplus production. To me this is one of the most unfortunate developments of the post-war period. In the United States it is worked in the same way and the Minister of Agriculture has fell for it. Last year when I said in this House that the parity price program as practiced immediately after the war was not a failure, the Minister got up some time later to say that the price support program in the United States was a failure. Depends what he means by it; if he means the way practiced by Ezra Taft Benson, I agree with him; but if he means that the concept of a guarantee farm price program will lead to disaster, then I couldn't disagree more. I think that certainly it is time that we come to grips with this problem; it's time that we accept the premise that government has responsibilities to the agricultural segment so far as price is concerned; it's time to accept the premise that government has responsibility towards the market, not only so far as normal markets are concerned, but also responsibility to make available on a massive scale -- and not just to talk, but on a massive scale -- "food for peace" in the nature of 80, 90, 100 million bushels a year -- even more. Destroy normal markets? Well, I'll let you think about that.

While I'm on the matter of normal markets, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether the present Federal Government has a clean slate or not in doing its utmost in expanding normal markets. Certainly I do not wish to become embroiled in an argument of the present government's tariff policies, but it seems to me that when you try to discourage the sale of goods in this country by a country who is buying wheat from us, that the government isn't doing too much for the farmer, and I am pleased to note that the Canadian Labour Congress, which you might ordinarily think would support tariff increase, came out flatly in opposition to any increase in tariff that might be harmful toward the farm community. I was pleased, Mr. Speaker, last night to hear the Honourable Minister say that he was not opposed to farm subsidies per se. He is not opposed to them -- you did say that didn't you, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HUTTON: I didn't say per se.

MR. SCHREYER: The inference then -- (Interjection) -- Well I said, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister was hard to follow and there is proof that this is the case, because I certainly thought that he meant that. The point which I am trying to lead to, Mr. Speaker, is

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . . simply this -- as I said, it is unfortunate that within the minds of the non-agricultural population of this country, a bias has been built up, one way or another, in opposition to any type of government program of price subsidy. And yet is this so justified; is it so wrong to ask for farm price support in view of the fact that in the manufacturing segment of our economy, in our industrial segment, there is one type of subsidy after another out of the public purse, to protect and keep that particular industry buoyant. The oil industry has its depletion allowances; manufacturing industries have their tariffs, and I don't see them going down. Transportation has its subsidies; gold has its subsidies, too. I did this last year and I want to read into the record again, Mr. Speaker, the words of a social scientist of an American university who is speaking on the moral economic problem of subsidies, on subsidies for agriculture. He happens to be a Jesuit and a social scientist and he says this: "Those who oppose subsidies to farmers, those who denounce them must obviously not consider the huge subsidies to the mail-order and the newspaper people with their special mailing privileges; the metal and mining industries, the aircraft and airline companies, the oil industries, electric power companies with their enormous write-offs", and he goes on and I conclude with this: "Anyone who is eager for a free market for agriculture should pause to consider the implications of the -- should try to restore the free markets then to the steel industry, the automobile industry, the drug industry." It seems grossly unfair, Mr. Speaker, to expect agricultural prices to be left in an open market atmosphere to the extent that they are when the prices of so many other commodities are administered in this country. It seems to me that as a result, the fact that agriculture has led -- and I use that term advisedly -- has led the rest of the economy into a recession, and we're scooting from one recession into another now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to come every 18 months, we're out of one, we're into another -- that this problem can best be licked by attacking it at its source, and that is -- agricultural prices.

And what better way to conclude, Mr. Speaker, than to point out that the present legislation on the Federal statute books, which is supposed to guarantee some semblance of protection, is not accomplishing this purpose. I am sure that my colleague from Fisher would agree with me wholeheartedly. We want normal markets expanded. The Federal Conservative Government with its tariff program isn't too successful there. We certainly endorse the idea of a "Food for Peace" program on a massive scale; we endorse it because we were the first to propose it, and certainly no one -- but of course when we did that some years ago, we were looked upon as though we were quite mad and frothing at the mouth. Now I see respectable people and respectable news media are advocating the same thing. For instance, raise the parity level; let us look upon food production and food surplus as a blessing and not a curse; let us make the best use of it, and I call upon members opposite to engender within themselves enough intestinal fortitude to act as some of their federal counterparts from Saskatchewan have done. I have a clipping here to the effect that -- oh yes -- "Western Tories Revolt!" -- See some of them have enough fortitude to revolt when things get rough enough. They revolted against proposed tariff policies of the present Federal Government. One of them, the Conservative MP from Rosthern, Mr. Nasserden, was the only one who had enough fortitude to get up -- (Interjection) -- Yes, the guts, plainly speaking, to get up in the House of Commons and really take the government to task for the dismal showing and performance that they have perpetrated in this Bill 237. It's been a farce from the day it was put on the statute books and it's continuing in that manner. So that's why, Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I and others thought it as extremely important now as it ever was to bring to the attention of the present Federal Government the need for something really substantial in the way of farm price support legislation.

Now then, to answer my honourable friend's question. He asked me whether I was in favour of production controls. I would be in favour of production controls to the extent -- and I think the economist here puts it rather well -- "In some cases controls will work." The option should be given to the producers and if they choose to have controls for the sake of having price support, that is their privilege. But in either case, Mr. Speaker, there's no dilemma. You can guarantee prices by having production controls. There's another way. To me it appeals slightly more, and that is to have price support up to -- up to a certain level of production, beyond which let the product be sold on the glorious free open market. Let the government step in and do some thing as far as food for peace is concerned. Perhaps we shall now, because the Honourable Minister, the first Cabinet Minister that I know of who has endorsed this as

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . . heartily as he did, and I hope that most members here will be in a position to support the resolution.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SCHREYER: Certainly.

MR. COWAN: In your resolution, and several times in your speech, you referred to the "cost of production". Now I'm from the city and I'm not very familiar with cost of producing grain, and I was wondering if you could tell us what is the cost now of producing a bushel of wheat, a bushel of oats and a bushel of barley.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that cost would vary with the locale, with the farmer, with the producer, etcetera. If the member is referring to the average, there is a national average, a regional average. I really don't know what figure or what he is referring to. If he wants the average for western Canada, I think that I could get him the figure. It might be a little old but I think I could get him a figure reasonably close.

MR. COWAN: I think we should get an up-to-date figure, after all we're voting on this resolution as to the cost of production and we should have a little bit more information as to what we're voting on.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, before the honourable member has to vote on this, I will try to -- I can almost guarantee him that information.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable Member for Brokenhead a question. Does he think that the present price of wheat under the Wheat Board -- the present Wheat Board price -- is below the cost of production or does he wish it raised higher?

MR. SCHREYER: Is the present price -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I would think so.

MR. McKELLAR: Well, do you think so though? I mean, that's what I want to know.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, I'm of the opinion -- yes, of course.

MR. McKELLAR: In all cases, is that -- are you looking at the small farmer or the big farmer? Who do you think is suffering?

MR. SCHREYER: Now look, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind answering questions, but there is a principle involved here and members should concern themselves with the principle. If they want to know the cost of production per bushel in some location or another, then they should hire the services of an economist. I don't think I have to answer specific questions like that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order! Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the 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 CCF Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to allow this resolution to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Matter stand. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member from St. John's.

MR. ORLKOW: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of this House to let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand. Second reading of Bill No. 34. The Honourable Member for Assinibola.

MR. GEORGE JOHNSON (Assinibola) presented Bill No. 34, An Act to incorporate The Association of Assessing Officers in Manitoba, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSON (Assinibola): Mr. Speaker, the Association referred to here was formed during the latter months of 1955 when its present constitution was drafted and the first inaugural meeting was held on January 18, 1956. The objects of the Association are: to co-ordinate the work of all assessors and to help any assessor who may have need for joint co-operation from this group; to improve the standard of assessment practice and to act as a clearing house for

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . . the collection and distribution of information and research relating to all phases of assessments; to foster the development of equitable uniform and related assessments throughout the province; to co-operate with agencies and others interested in assessment procedure. Regular membership in this Association is open to a duly appointed official or any person engaged by a municipal corporation in assessment appraisal work. Any individual interested in the theory and practice of municipal assessment, appraisal work, but not eligible for regular membership, may apply for an associate membership. Subscribing members consist of any corporation representative interested in the principles and objects of the Association. Total membership to date numbers 85. Association activities consist of a program of monthly meetings at which guest speakers are invited to talk on subjects allied to the assessment field. During the course of its existence this organization has held discussions on assessment problems of various kinds. The Association of Assessment Officers have also advised and assisted with the formation of an assessment manual and rating text which is presently in use in Manitoba. A series of lectures along educational lines have been held for assessors. These lectures have been well attended and a great deal of interest has been shown by the members; as a result the membership of this Association have indicated a strong desire to pursue their studies further. In order then that we may work in closer alliance with the University of Manitoba, and so that any credits awarded for study and proficiency in the field of assessment appraisal valuation may be given due recognition, this Association has deemed it advisable to seek corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that most of the members in the House have had at some time municipal experience and I feel that on many occasions, particularly at times of Courts of Revision, that the knowledge of the assessor is of such vital importance, and that on many occasions, perhaps due to lack of interest on the assessor, that differences of opinion have come up for debate. It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the incorporating of this Association will strengthen the assessors who are so vital to all municipalities, and I feel that this Bill should receive the unanimous support of the members of this Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 25. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN presented Bill No. 25, An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Brandon College Incorporated, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, there's really no explanation required, I believe, in this particular bill. Members will recall that Federal Government loans to CMHC became available as was announced in the Speech from the Throne in Ottawa, to colleges on the construction of dormitories, and since there was some doubt in the solicitor's mind for Brandon College that we had the power to place mortgages upon any of our properties, this amendment was thought desirable through our charter to give us that authority and take advantage of low interest rates that might be available in these loans to us.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 14. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that Bill No. 14, An Act respecting The Royal Trust Company Mortgage Corporation, be now read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, this is simply a bill to enable this company to carry on a loan business in Manitoba and they are not asking for any special privilege.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 20. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate. My colleague, the Honourable Member from Fisher, prompted me to take part in this debate. In the few remarks he had made, he had mentioned that the manufacturers of margarine, also manufacture soap. Certainly they manufacture soap; they manufacture peanut butter too, and they process

(Mr. Peters, cont'd.) . . . . beef and pork. But they don't use the same equipment, Mr. Speaker, so I thought I would -- usually my honourable friend, the Member from Fisher, has his facts pretty straight, but this time he was just a little bit out. One thing I was interested in, Mr. Speaker, the remarks he had made about, I believe it was the Netherlands, that was very interesting -- there was apparently 100,000 people who broke out in a skin rash or something. What I was interested in out of those 100,000 that they found 60,000 beds, hospital beds, for these people, so they sure must be a lot better off as far as hospital beds are concerned than we are here. So he did bring out a few good points anyway, Mr. Speaker.

Now we've been reading a lot about butter consumption going down each year, and, Mr. Speaker, people that are using margarine don't use it because they want to use it; it's because they are forced to use it. On the money that they are earning today -- it was pointed out by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks in his speech today that in the City of Winnipeg, there are 25,650 people earning less than \$2,000 a year. Those people, Mr. Speaker, can't afford to pay for butter the price that is being asked. Now, I would go along with anyone, that we would even ban the manufacture of margarine if you would give everyone in this country an adequate income that they could afford to buy the superior product. They're not using it, Mr. Speaker, because they want to, because they're saving money; they haven't got it in the first place, and that is the reason, the one and only reason, that they use margarine. You could colour it black, they would still have to use it because they couldn't afford to pay for -- (Interjection) -- If you bring up the minimum wage to \$1.25, I'll go along that we colour it black.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are also in this province about 80,000 people in the old age group, that is 65 years of age or more, and these are the people that I am concerned about. I have talked to many of them and they don't have the money to buy butter. They have to use margarine and they like to have it coloured yellow, and it is usually the husband that has to do the colouring, and that's the ones that I've been talking to and they say, "Please can't you do something about it, my wife is getting after me and it's a pretty messy job." These are the people, Mr. Speaker, that I am concerned about; these people in the old age group. They deserve a little consideration. After all, they're the pioneers of this country -- just a minute, you'll have your chance, just sit down and watch yourself. You'll get your chance. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, these people in the old age group, they came to this country from over the seas; they built this country up -- (Interjection) -- Sure, so did the farmer, and if you want to know something, the farmers are using margarine too. And why are they using it? Not because they want to, because they have to; they haven't got the money to pay for butter. They're using it and if you want to know there are three main distributors of margarine in the City of Winnipeg, and we'll call them Company A, Company B and Company C, and of their total production of margarine, Company A sells 55 percent of their volume of margarine in the city, 45 percent outside the City of Winnipeg area; Company B sells 60 percent in the city, 40 percent on the outside; and Company C, 65 in the city and 35 percent in outside areas. So you see, Mr. Speaker, that it isn't just being used in the city, the farmers are using it too, and for the reason that I stated, Mr. Speaker. Not because they want to, but because they have to.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Could I ask the member a question?

MR. PETERS: Go ahead.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Are all these people outside the City of Winnipeg farmers?

MR. PETERS: I didn't say they were. I said they were outside the Winnipeg area. They might come from Swan River, maybe Dauphin -- (Interjection) -- Flin Flon. I sound like a stationmaster now reading out these. So, Mr. Speaker, it's not a matter of choice that they use margarine. It's forced on the majority of people to use this spread; it's cheaper. Butter is in the range of 70 cents a pound. There was an ad in the paper the other day, and I believe the Safeway Stores -- five pounds for 99 cents. Now certainly you don't expect a person on the old age pension, or a small pension, or the minimum wage, to be paying 70 cents for butter when they can buy margarine five pounds for a dollar. Mr. Speaker, I think I've said enough on this matter for the time being. Let's all settle down and get on with the vote.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I could almost guarantee that my few remarks will not change the minds of anyone in this House, but in fear that my grandchild will ask me "Where were you in this famous debate on margarine", I just want to be on record. In the first place margarine

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . . was forbidden entirely in this province. Finally, the province decided to allow the manufacturing and selling of margarine; but they protected themselves with the colour. I think once we allowed margarine to come in, the fight for the dairymen should have been held at that time. But the House at that time decided, rightly or wrongly, that margarine should be allowed to be manufactured . . . . . and sell over the counter. At that time, of course, margarine attracted, as my colleague said, on account of the price and the price only. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I've never tasted margarine. I've never had a pound of margarine in the house. I always use butter. I also fully realize the importance of the dairy industry, particularly for Winnipeg City. We need their milk, we need their cream, we need their other products, and we should not do anything to hurt them. But in my humble opinion -- that's only an opinion of one man, 'cause others have a different opinion; that's why they talk when I speak. -- (Interjection) -- that the dairy industry will not suffer because of margarine. -- (Interjection) -- How do I know? Because the dairy industry have not done anything to my knowledge, or very little, to sell butter, advertise butter. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, Oh yes, Oh yes -- the same as they do margarine. And the price is also a great factor. I have supported margarine every year it came up here. I'm going to support it this year, and for one more reason -- call it politically or not, it's immaterial, I've been accused of worse things than this. The City of Winnipeg, in a referendum, were in favour for economic reasons, to allow margarine to be manufactured and sold -- I've got to support the referendum. The majority of the people use margarine not because it's a better product, but because it's very, very much more economical, it is cheaper, and they realize even today with the unemployment situation, with the relief situation, with low wage situation, the high cost of living, people buy whenever they can get something for less. We realize that the chain stores, and the big supermarkets are not convenient to the average home, still they go down there. Why? Not to support the big interests. They go there because they feel that they could save a cent or two or three or five, on certain food commodities, instead of buying at the corner store, who are serving them all the time. They have to go. They don't go down there because it's better food. They buy the same thing. So my advice to the agriculturists and to the dairy industry particularly: Let them try to compete as much as possible with margarine, and once we have it, once it's allowed to sell, the other thing about colouring is just peanuts as far as their industry is concerned. It will not help them a bit, and if the consumer wants to have colouring I don't see any objection at all of allowing them to do it. Of course there's one thing that's got to be protected -- is that when a store sells margarine, the customer should not buy margarine for butter. In other words, the protection should be: Margarine should be margarine and butter should be butter; but the colouring, in my opinion, will not hurt the dairy industry. The dairy industry has to work for themselves, have to advertise, have to sell it. Nowadays you can't do a thing without selling it -- you can't win even an election without selling yourself -- particularly when it comes to products and food, so I am reluctantly, perhaps, but I'm still supporting the bill.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the bill just as I did last year, and I don't think that too much time should be taken in this House on this subject, unless some of the members have changed their mind, and it certainly would be interesting to hear from the new member. Having said this, I certainly will not subject this House to a long speech but, nevertheless, there are certain things that I should like to explain. I do not agree with most of the members supporting this bill for the reason why they are supporting this bill. I think that this question of the wage should go up and so on, that is why we are supporting margarine; that we're not getting the proper wages to afford butter. I don't support it for this at all. I think that that's an awful lot of malarkey. I don't think that this is true that it will change. The main thing is, will the margarine be available? Is it available now and will the colour make any change in the taste or in the price? And I can't see that it should. Therefore, I think that it is wrong for any product, the same as any man, to try to live on the reputation of somebody else. The last speaker spoke of the dairy industry not advertising enough, but now the people want this margarine coloured so they could take advantage of what has been done by the dairy industry. The next thing, I suppose, we won't have any vanilla ice cream; or the people eating balogna will ask to have a bone put in there and pretend that it's a T-bone steak. I think that that is wrong and I think that this is ridiculous what has been going on for a number of years. Now it might be, probably some will think I am ridiculous speaking like this and voting for it,

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . . but I will vote for it because I do believe in liberalism and nobody can tell me that it is right, or can convince me that it is right to bring in these restrictive legislations, or to say, "Well, this colour is only for a product", but I certainly don't like the idea of somebody or something living on the reputation of somebody else.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I am on the horns of a dilemma. I have a speech which, unlike most of the speeches here, is a coherent speech, but it's going to take a little time. If I start now I'll have to break out, so I make the move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, 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. 32. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I think that this is the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. WEIR (Minnedosa): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, that Bill No. 32, An Act to validate By-law No. 766 of the Town of Rapid City, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, anyone that has read the bill, I don't think would shout from the other side that it should be explained. In case the Honourable Leader of the Opposition doesn't get around to reading it, possibly I should mention the intent of the bill. It is a mutual agreement between the Town of Rapid City and the Rural Municipality of Saskatchewan, that three lots within the Town of Rapid City should be transferred to the Municipality of Saskatchewan for the purpose of building a municipal garage, with a view to relieving the taxation of the Municipality of Saskatchewan. The Act itself merely validates the mutual by-laws of the two towns.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 17. The Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not noted for my brevity, and I notice that it's nearly 5:30. I desire to speak to this and I am wondering if it would meet the convenience with the House if it was called 5:30 now and we start at 8:00 o'clock.

MR. ROBLIN: You can begin now.

MR. PAULLEY: No, it would just interrupt my trend of thought and I prefer it -- for the matter of six minutes.

MR. ROBLIN: I wouldn't quarrel with my honourable friend over six minutes, no more than any other things for that matter. I have no objection to this, Mr. Speaker, if you could read the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: I call it 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock this evening.