

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, Friday, March 17th, 1961.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: The Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their first report: The Honourable Mr. Lyon of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments presented his first report from which is read as follows: Your Committee met for organization and appointed Honourable Mr. Lyon as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that for the remaining of this session the quorum of this Committee shall consist of ten members. Your Committee has considered Bills No. 2, An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act; No. 3, An Act to facilitate Cornea Transplants from the Bodies of Deceased Persons to Living Persons; No. 10, An Act to amend The Marriage Act; No. 12, An Act to amend The Winnipeg Foundation Act 1943; No. 15, An Act respecting the Department of Welfare; No. 16, An Act respecting the Department of Health; No. 19, An Act to repeal the Health and Public Welfare Act and to amend Certain Other Acts; No. 24, An Act to amend The Business Development Fund Act; No. 33, An Act to amend The Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation; No. 35, An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act; No. 37, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Insurance Act; and has agreed to report the same without amendment. Your Committee has also considered Bill No. 28, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (1), and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notice of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

HON. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Public Welfare) (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 57, An Act to regulate and control funds provided by the Pre-arrangement of Funeral Services.

MR. LYON introduced Bill No. 59, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James) in the absence of the Honourable Member for River Heights, introduced Bill No. 41, An Act to incorporate Breezy Bend Country Club.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, a few days ago I asked the Honourable Minister of Health and Public Welfare to give us some information about the deaf and blind children in the province and the other provinces. I wonder whether he could get it because the motion is on the Order Paper today, and I'd like to speak on it. I'm just wondering whether we could get the information. I don't know whether it's the Minister of Health or the Minister of Education. They're two fine gentlemen; I cannot separate them.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to lay on the table of the House a Return of the Order No. 12 filed by the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to lay on the table of the House not a Return to an Order, but the argument on behalf of the Province of Manitoba to the Royal Commission on Transportation, Ottawa, February 1961. -- (Interjection) -- I did not. I have read it all and studied it all, and thank goodness I didn't have to say it at the time. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Address dated February 20th, 1961 in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa, having to do, I might add, with the Paton and Cox correspondence that my honourable friend asked for.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to introduce to you and the members a group of students in the two galleries on the right-hand side. I believe it's the largest contingent we've had this session, numbering 120 students from Morse Place Junior High accompanied by their principal, Mr. Mastin, and also the four teachers, Mrs. Campbell, Miss McLaren, Mr. Lysask and Mr. Stewart. This school, Mr. Speaker, is situated in a new part of my constituency, and I hope their visit with us will be enlightening and educational. I'm sure that you and the members would wish to extend to them a warm and cordial welcome.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day and with the leave and permission of the House, may I extend to the Honourable Minister of Public Works my sincere congratulations on the fact that the Honourable Member from Swan River is no longer an employee of his department. He's the worse clock-watcher I ever saw in my life.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, as the annual report of the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan will be distributed to the honourable members this afternoon, I thought I should tell them that I'd promised this within a few days of laying the actual report on the desk. This report is up until the end of December 31st, 1960, and it's such a current document that yearly I have a little trouble making the deadline for distribution by the end of February. However, we hope to improve on this in the future but the report will be distributed this afternoon.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF Party): Mr. Speaker, may I say that we appreciate very much the predicament that the Honourable Minister is in, but I would like to suggest to him that there be no hurry to call the Public Accounts Committee for consideration, as I note that there is a resolution before the House to have the question of hospital insurance be considered by the Public Works Committee. I'm sure we would appreciate the short period of time at least, to consider the report that the Minister is now giving to us.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Questions -- The Honourable Leader of the CCF Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the following questions be answered by the ministry: 1. The number of men at work for the Manitoba Power Commission, excluding clerical help or managerial staff, as of October 1, 1960. 2. The number of men at work for the Manitoba Power Commission, excluding clerical help or managerial staff, as of this date.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not sure that a motion is required here. The questions submitted by the Honourable Leader for the CCF Party: 1. The number of men at work for the Manitoba Power Commission, excluding clerical help or managerial staff, as of October 1, 1960. 2. The number of men at work for the Manitoba Power Commission, excluding clerical help or managerial staff, as of this date.

Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster, and the proposed amendment by the Honourable Member for Portage, and the proposed amendment to the amendment of the Honourable Member for Roblin. I might say that I took this motion under advisement and I see not very much wrong with it. The motion would read, if all the amendments were carried by the House, that this House request the government to petition the Federal Government for an increase for all old age and blind pensioners in the province from \$55.00 per month to that amount which is required to adequately meet their individual needs. I would declare the amendment to the amendment to be in order. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of speaking at any length on this amendment to the amendment. I feel that it is self-explanatory. It expresses my own personal principles, and that is that I feel that the main responsibility of government in the field of welfare is to look after those people who are actually in need, those people quite often who, through no fault of their own, find themselves in circumstances by which they can no longer look after themselves. I don't think there should be any further blanket increase at this time on the actual amount of Old Age Pension that is paid, but I do feel that we now find ourselves in a society whereby the responsibility of looking after people, particularly old people who are in need, is falling on the government, and I feel that we should ask the Federal Government to take a further share in this program.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): I would like to join with the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie, first of all in the tribute that he paid to the Honourable Member from Inkster. The Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie and I don't agree too often, but we certainly agree on the tribute that he paid to the gentleman that I just mentioned. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this is a red letter day, because the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie and I are in agreement twice, because I intend to support his amendment to the motion as corrected by the Honourable Member from Roblin.

Perhaps the Honourable Member from Inkster doesn't believe us, but I think that we all share in his concern for old age pensioners and blind pensioners who are in need, and that we differ only in our method of giving the relief to these people that he desires. The obvious intent of the honourable member's resolution is to try and meet cases of need by sufficiently high grant or overall across-the-board pension to everybody in order to meet the cases of need which he outlined. Taking, for example, the group over 70 years of age, there are approximately 53,000 of these in the province and it could be fairly safely estimated, I think, that at least one-third of these, and possibly more, do not have need; they do not have need of the \$55.00 pension, let alone the \$75.00 pension which he proposes. In 1952 when the Means Test pension went out of existence for those over 70, there were approximately 39,000 people in this group in the province. About 19,000 of these were in receipt of old age assistance. In other words, they qualified under the Means Test as it was at that time. We can say, therefore, that at that time about half of the age group over 70 were in need, and I would doubt whether this portion in need had increased more than the two-thirds of the group in the years since.

Secondly, as you know, Mr. Speaker, there has been a substantial development since that time in private pension plans. In simple English, quite a few million dollars as proposed in this resolution of expenditure are being proposed in order to meet need where there is no need, and in order to meet the need that does exist in some cases. I believe that the government recognizes that a major responsibility of theirs is to meet the needs of old age pensioners and blind pensioners who are over 65 years of age. This is why, Mr. Speaker, we now have the Social Allowances Act. The underlying principles of the Social Allowances Act is that the government is interested in increasing financial assistance only to those who are in need of such assistance. We are certainly not interested in making larger payments to old age pensioners or others where need does not exist. On these grounds, I do not think that this House should urge the Government of Canada to give every old age pensioner in the country a further \$20.00. Whatever monies that they and we might have available for this purpose, I think should be used to meet the needs of those who actually need it. We, as members of the Provincial House, might also well ask the Federal Government, at the same time, when we might expect some action on their proposed plan of contributory Old Age Pensions. Because when this becomes a fact I think that we can throw away and bury forever the Means and the Need Tests.

I have located some figures that give us some idea of the financial implications of the resolution that is being proposed by the Honourable Member from Inkster. In Manitoba we have approximately 53,000 people over 70 years of age; we have approximately 5,100 people in receipt of the Old Age Assistance. If pensions were raised to \$75.00, this would add a further 2,500 people. At present disability and blind pensioners amount to approximately 2,000 in number, and this increase is likely to add a further 1,000 to that, so that the likely total of those in the province that would receive the \$75.00 pension would amount to 63,600. This would make a further annual expenditure of 63,600 times \$240, which is the \$20.00 a month increase, for a total combined for the Federal and Provincial Governments of \$15,264,000, of which \$13,992,000 would be the Federal share and \$1,272,000 the Provincial share. And I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that if and when this amount of money becomes available to the Federal Government and to the Provincial Government, that it should be spent where it's needed the most and not used to give an across-the-board increase of \$20.00 a month to everybody in the category suggested by the Honourable Member from Inkster. Across-the-board increases in pensions, or increases in pensions that are tied to the cost of living, don't meet need. Many receive such increases but don't need them, and across-the-board increases in pensions can, in many cases, fall far short of meeting the needs of many people. We're forgetting too, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government is paying 50 percent, or sharing to the extent of 50 percent in our present Social Allowance program with the exception of health needs. In effect,

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) . . . . if need is shown and a supplementary allowance of say \$40 was given under our present Social Allowance Act, the recipients would in fact, after taking into account the federal share, be receiving \$75 per month, which is exactly what the Honourable Member from Inkster is asking. But in this case, they would be receiving it because they need it, not because it was part of a government give-away program. Nobody under our present set-up would receive more than \$55 unless they actually needed it, which is a far cry from dragging a \$20 increase across the board to everybody. It is also possible under our present Social Allowance program for a person in need to receive much more than \$75 a month, even from the Federal Government, if we take into consideration their 50 percent share of the cost of this program.

I would like to repeat, Mr. Speaker, very briefly, some of the remarks that I made previously on this resolution, and that is that we should keep in mind that old age pensioners in need in this province can be divided into three thoroughly distinct categories. Firstly, those who reach their older years destitute through no fault of their own. These people I think, Mr. Speaker, we must look after, because these people are the people that the Honourable Member from Inkster referred to as those who built this province in its early years. Society must give these people a reasonable standard of living and freedom from financial embarrassment, financial worries that they may incur through illness or through some other circumstances. But, society must give these people allowances based on need, not flat sums applicable to everybody whether they be in need or not. The second category of old age pensioners in this province, Mr. Speaker, are those who have reached the summit of their lives in the same circumstances as the first category. But the reason for them arriving at this point in the circumstances are quite different. These people are in these circumstances because during their productive lives they did not, in any way, try to provide for their later years. There are many people in the province, Mr. Speaker, in this category. We don't sympathize with them too much, but I think that we, as society, still have a responsibility to see that they get a fairly reasonable standard of living. The third class, Mr. Speaker, I have referred to before as the forgotten class, and these are our old age pensioners that have worked hard through even the lean years of the 30's, that have paid for small homes, and that are living on small incomes that are not really sufficient to meet all of their needs, but they are getting by; they're paying the taxes on their homes, and they're paying their hospital premiums, and whatever income they have from private sources is being supplemented by the present Old Age Pension that they receive from the Federal Government. I maintain that in any of our social legislation these people must not be discriminated against, and I think that if there is any weakness in our present Social Allowance program, it is in this respect, because there is a large group of these people in the province that are finding it very difficult to get along, and yet they have sufficient income, they have ownership in their own homes, and therefore are unable to qualify for social assistance.

The answer to the problems of these people, Mr. Speaker, I think must be the contributory Old Age Pension scheme that the Government of Canada is considering. And I think that the more that we can do as members of this House and as members of the Government to urge the Federal Government to proceed as quickly as possible with the implementation of this scheme, the more that we can do to fill the present void that there is with respect to these latter class of old age pensioners in our province. Many of these people are living, as I said, on Old Age Pensions supplemented by smaller pensions from their previous employment, and I think that we must be very careful in our social legislation not to discriminate against these people that have, during their productive years, done all that they could to make themselves self-dependent and less reliant on our state welfare programs. Let us then, Mr. Speaker, carry out the principles of the Social Allowances Act; let us look after the people in our province that are in need, but let us not have expensive give-away programs that would give across-the-board increases to many in our province who, at the present time, have no need even although they may be receiving the present \$55 pension. I think that approaching social legislation in this way will tend to discourage people from doing what they can to provide for their own security, and I think that we should do everything that we can to encourage people to provide for their own security and have the state step in only where people reach a state of need because of circumstances beyond their control.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GRAY: Please allow me a couple of minutes. I shall not be so bombastic as the other speakers but I shall try to add a few words to point out to them, if I can, that they are personally and politically wrong. In the first place the Social Allowance Bill, in my humble opinion, does not cover all the ills that we are asking for. They have helped out some under the means tests. I have spoken about these means tests to the House for many, many years, and I still feel this is the worst stigma on any respected individual to come to the bosses and say, "Mister I'm broke; I haven't got a cent; I need a little bit more money for myself, or probably for my husband or my children." And then they are taken on a cross-examination. They have to declare all their misery and all their problems and finally they give them a few dollars also under Means Test. If the Federal Government should in its wisdom accept all our recommendations and our requests, "Please consider giving the old age pensioners another \$20 a month", and if the government would accept, not us, then what will happen? They may, and they may not give them the \$20, but if they do. The expense of the Social Allowance Act which they are paying out now will not be touched; it will be saved, and at the same time protect the dignity, I say the dignity of an individual, and God knows, I know what Means Test means. I still remember well during the unemployment relief period in City Hall where the inspectors went actually to the homes, ransacked every drawer in order to find where there's a loaf of bread or an orange or an apple. The people who were on relief in those days were compelled to be; their allowance didn't matter a bit, whether they got two loaves of bread or five loaves of bread a day, and they were handing an amount in food, not in cash, which they do now after we suggested they should have it in cash. And then they left, and they may or they may not decide to give them another loaf of bread, but please make sure those on relief at that time were not beggars; were not choosers; were not criminals; men and women of high standing in public life; high standing in social life; men and women who had radios and carpets and pianos, but not a loaf of bread, so you can imagine their . . . . and that's the very same thing right here. Fifty-five dollars a month pension has been recognized by everybody as not sufficient, not sufficient, and I have outlined in this House many times the price the unemployed and the old age pensioner has to pay in a restaurant not for food to live, but for food not to starve. I pointed out many times here, and \$55, if they're paying \$25 rent -- and you cannot get it anywhere cheaper -- miserable rooms -- they haven't got a cent left for two or three days' food, and they haven't got a cent left for other essentials. So what are we doing here, for goodness' sake? We are asking the Government of Ottawa -- not a cent paid out of this province -- to consider whether it's necessary to pay \$75 a month, and why in this God's world -- I didn't want to say the devil -- why in this here world that many people get out and say, "It's enough, it's enough, it's enough . . . . . ." What have you got to lose here? Let this carry on, but please try and get something else so they would not have to . . . . . bend on their knees and lower their dignity before the investigators, tell them how poor they are, how sick they are, and everybody wants to get a certain amount of self-respect; tell them all about it and then what do they get? Nothing, if anything. So the request is so simple, so innocent, that I cannot see for the world of me why anyone should even dare to oppose it with other amendments, with other suggestions. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the old age pensioners in the rural districts don't suffer as much, because they have their little farms, they have their chickens, they have their eggs, they have everything to help them and because they do not, as a rule district members do not get those complaints, does not mean to say that they're not suffering, but they have something to over and above the Old Age Pensions. What are the city people to do? What are the single men in Winnipeg to do? They've got to go to restaurants; they have to go, and may I repeat again, a pot of porridge in the morning and a pot of coffee; a plate of soup at noon and a piece of toast, and a minimum meal of 60 cents at night, takes away more than the \$55 a month. A lot of people of those who have been happy, they had their families, they had their standing in the community, they worked hard, they don't want to go down to the Department of Health and say, "Please mister, give me a loaf of bread." They suffered enough all their lives, and the death rate, the large death rate may be -- I'm not saying it is -- may be due not to the lack of food, but maybe to the insult to the people who have raised families and did everything else in the world. So I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment should be withdrawn and be defeated, there's no expense on the province unless carry just maybe a

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . . pious resolution, maybe a pious resolution to tell the Federal Government in our opinion and in the opinion of those who have their fathers and mothers there, the opinion of those who have relatives and friends around them, that \$55 is not enough and let them increase all over Canada to \$20 a month. The question of money is ridiculous, absolutely ridiculous. First suppose it will save money to the province by not having to apply under the Social Allowances Act, but after all what is money, Sir? What is money against poverty and misery of the people? We spend millions of dollars sometimes to find a child who gets lost; we spend millions of dollars to find somebody who got stuck in a mine, and here we are trying to save pennies to give to the people who have built our existence, built our world, make our life so nice and comfortable, another dollar, and if we haven't got the money I still persist, and I have said it many times, our future generation has to pay for the comfort they get now when they were born and let's not worry about that. We have a problem right today, not tomorrow, not yesterday, let's solve it in the best way possible.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to rise at this time, but I felt that I should say a few words in view of what the Honourable Member from Inkster has said. Now I certainly share with the former speakers who spoke to this motion, the sincerity and the integrity and the objectives of our honourable friend from Inkster. For 17 years he has been fighting for greater benefits for the senior citizens of this province and we all admire his position. I think, Mr. Speaker, that what made me rise was that I don't feel that the Honourable Member from Inkster gets the true impact of the amendment as we intended to amend it anyway. What we are saying in our amendment is, that certainly the Federal Old Age Security Pension is a federal matter; it is a dividend which Canada pays to its senior citizens over the age of 70 years. This dividend is something which the federal authorities will have to decide in their wisdom and within the resources of the country as to how much and how great an Old Age Security Pension they can give. We, as a province, feel that our role, as the Honourable Member from Inkster has said, is to meet need. Now, we have to realize that there's a means test to everything we do in life. When I go to buy a tie, I often buy a \$1.50 tie rather than the good-looking three-fifty one. We try to live within our means. The Means Test is something that's always with us in that sense. But in the area of welfare, I think that across Canada the Social Allowances Act as designed by the Province of Manitoba is catching hold, as we see province after province copy it. I might share with this committee the newspaper article I read this morning, where the Minister of Welfare of the Province of Alberta talked of his legislation and his new Social Assistance Act, as a first in Canada. I would like the honourable members to look at that legislation; it is lifted right out of our Social Allowances Act. I think that we have to -- we in this province and this government are saying, by this amendment we are asking the federal people to share even more in the extension of assistance where it is needed above the \$55.

An example I want my honourable friend, the Member from Inkster, to realize, which is something which a straight \$20 across the board is not going to help: The case of an old age couple in their own home -- and this has occurred in my constituency -- where the husband was paralyzed, where the lady of the house had a heart attack, where only by putting a social worker out to that home, only by measuring the degree of disability they both had, were we able to determine the real need. The real need was that they had \$110 a month, they have their nice little home, and they wanted to continue to be together. We were able, through the Social Allowances Act, to obtain a housekeeper for which we pay through the Social Allowances Act, supplemented the \$110 income to around \$170, and were able to put a housekeeper into that home and keep the family unit together, and not by breaking them up into nursing homes where they would be less happy and at less expense. My honourable friends opposite filed a return asking how many social workers, how many bursaries do we give? Obviously we try to develop this staff to go and measure individual need. You have to measure that need. The money across the board does not in itself meet that need, and the Leader of the CCF Party has previously spoken of the "jungle" of means tests and needs and tests that he hears about. But it depends which side of the House you're on what's the interpretation of the means and needs test. I think it's clear. I think we're all talking about the same thing, and I think the sooner we all admit that there is a jungle existing -- I'm the first to admit it; heavens, I live with it -- there's a jungle in the future, the many categories have to be clearly cleared up and put on a



(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . . simpler basis.

In the meantime, as a province, we encourage the Federal Government to contribute more to our Social Allowances Act in that through this amendment we are asking for even greater participation than the present time. On two or three occasions I have written the Federal Government asking for sharing in administration of our program and in the sharing of health costs. This is no secret, Mr. Speaker. I've done that since the day I made the arrangements to get federal sharing under the Unemployment Assistance Agreement with the other sections of this Act. But I'm not here to make what I hoped was my introduction to my Social Allowances Act this year in my estimates. I'm saying this because I want the Honourable Member from Inkster to clearly understand that we have this same compassion for these people, and within the resources of the federal authorities we welcome more aid to our senior citizens. I think it's significant as I've read some of the proceedings of this Legislature, going back many years, when my Honourable Member from Inkster introduced such motions as a further \$5.00 a month for old age pensioners. And that's gone back for some time. But I think we all have to agree that the reason we train social workers, the reason we have a school of social work, is because the Canadian Welfare Council, the people in the federal field advising federal administrations, I think are becoming more and more to the philosophy that we should meet need. There's no challenge to giving people money across-the-board from the welfare office, but that, Mr. Speaker, will possibly not meet that need. That old couple may be satisfied, may have sufficient funds with their pension and their home, but should a catastrophe occur they would be impoverished. This is where we have to be ready with the legislation to move in and be of help. Just in closing, I just want to emphasize to the Member from Inkster that we are in no way trying to insult him or the spirit with which he brought in this resolution, but that we feel we must stay with the philosophy that we think is right and that we think, within the resources of this province, we should go out and do our best to meet that need where it exists, rather than in across-the-board allowances.

MR. GRAY: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. JOHNSON (G1ml): Yes.

MR. GRAY: What harm will it do to you personally, to your department and to the government, if the motion, original motion is passed?

MR. JOHNSON (G1ml): Mr. Speaker, because it's not up to -- I think we are trying to promote a Social Allowances Act. We are not too happy with the many categories at the federal level at this time. We think that this whole basis will eventually come down to a basis of need. I think it's up to the federal authorities to decide what the base line should be, \$55, \$65, or \$75, but if we want to give \$95, why shouldn't we be allowed to if that's what it takes to meet the need? Why not frame it our way and get a little bit extra if we can get it?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to take part in this debate until my honourable friend just gave us the propaganda speech. He explains to us that he gave it to us at this time rather than when he's dealing with his estimates -- at least that was my inference. I expect however -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I was just going to say that, Mr. Speaker. I fully anticipate and will be terribly disappointed in the Minister of Health and Welfare, and possibly Health and Welfare for the last time due to the split of the department, I was going to say that I would be terribly disappointed if I didn't hear from my honourable friend the Minister give us another oration of the basic differences between needs and means. I must disappoint him in advance to his estimates that he still hasn't convinced me that there is any difference basically between means and needs. But, I suggest -- yes, it does take time -- I suggest to my honourable friend, however, that we will leave that part of the argument until we reach the estimates of his department.

Now, I was rather intrigued with some of the remarks of my honourable friend when he was -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? Yes, but -- no, there was one new one in here today, and it may have been inadvertently said -- but to me, Mr. Speaker, in one of the sentences which I thought I heard my honourable friend say, amazed me when he was rejecting my colleague's main motion and supporting the amendment to the amendment. Because if I recall my honourable friend correctly, and I'm subject to correction as ever, I thought that he said that as far as he was concerned there was no challenge as far as he was concerned to have the federal authorities set the base amount of the pension whether it was \$55, \$60, \$75.00. Now I

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . might suggest to my honourable friend that he check with me on Hansard after we receive it on Monday, because I wrote down the words of my honourable friend in my shorthand, that he said that there was no challenge to giving across-the-board amounts of monies of any amount at the federal level.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I don't -- that may be the way it came out . . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, well, that's all I have to go by.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): . . . . . but the way I wanted to say it was, there's no trick in adding another \$5.00 to the Old Age Assistance or sending out \$5.00 on a Means Test, no problem at all, is it? It's just a matter of -- there's no administration but it doesn't necessarily meet needs.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I don't know, and of course, Mr. Speaker, I can't say how the Minister intended it to come out; all I can go by is how it came out. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, now, I don't know now because of the fact that I still have written down what the honourable member said. However, Mr. Speaker, I want to reject the arguments of my honourable friend, the Minister of Health and Welfare. I can appreciate the fact that he takes a considerable amount of pride in the role that he has played and the government has played, in having a needs-means test in respect of those who are not receiving sufficient either Old Age Security, or under our Old Age Assistance Act. The very point that my honourable colleague and friend from Inkster is attempting to put across, which apparently is not falling on very fruitful ground across the way, is that there are a considerable number of people who would and do require, not for basic needs entirely, but for self well-being, an increase over the basic amount of the \$55.00 pension which is forthcoming from the Federal Treasury at the present time. My honourable friend the Minister of Health and Welfare in speaking mentioned that this \$55.00, or this Old Age Security Pension was a dividend to people over 70 from the Federal Treasury. I don't know whether he exactly means the word "dividend" in its normal accepted sense. We are contesting the adequacy of the \$55.00 a month pension, and suggesting that the pension not be considered as a dividend but that it should be considered as something by the rights of the individual within the Dominion of Canada for in their old age, to have sufficient without necessity of means or trial, to have a reasonable amount of money for their old age. Now just the other day, Mr. Speaker, when we were discussing the question of the minimum wages which is under debate at the present time, my honourable friend, the Minister of Labour, listed for our consideration and information the requirements of a single girl for a year, and he told us that particular time that the question of the minimum wage and the directive to the Minimum Wage Board was to provide a minimum in respect of wages based on the necessities of life. And he arrived, or the Board arrived at a figure somewhere in the nature of \$1,500 a year in respect of a single girl in employment. My colleague, the Member for Inkster, is suggesting a reasonable increase in the basic pension to still aid in the achievement of basic necessities for so many people that require it.

It's been a long time since Old Age Pensions were first introduced into Canada, and it has been a continuing process to have recognition made for adequate pensions. I might say to the Minister of Health and Welfare I don't quite agree with my honourable colleague when he says that it doesn't affect you, Sir, because of the fact that it would be coming out of the Federal Treasury and not yours, because that would be -- if I did agree with him, it would be a little different than what I mentioned the other day in respect of floodways, because it does come out of the public treasury in either place. But I do say this -- I do say this, that it matters not as far as the principle is concerned of my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Welfare after the application of needs. I think the application of needs can be taken care of at \$75 a month basic pension, and there will be cases, there will be cases on the basis of needs at \$75 a month if we do increase the pensions to \$75 a month. We'll have these cases of need. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we'll have them, or could conceivably have them at a pension of \$100, that there will be cases where that is not adequate. But what my honourable friend the Member for Inkster is trying to draw to the attention of this House, and I'm sorry that it appears as though it's going to be rejected, it's not a question of dollars and cents on the basis of need. Now my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Welfare -- and I wouldn't be a bit surprised if I want to make a comment or two when we're dealing with his

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . estimates on this fact, but I just want to draw this to his attention -- has not seen fit to bring in by way of regulations all of the fields permissible under the Social Allowances Act, that we still have as the base for a single person in the Province of Manitoba for benefits of, say, exemption from hospital premiums and Medicare cards, a base of \$960 a year. There are still many that on the basis of need cannot make application under the Social Allowances Act here in the Province of Manitoba, because of the fact that the regulations have not been proclaimed as yet. But I will be speaking on those, I say, to the Minister during consideration of his estimates.

But again, and I repeat, as my honourable colleague the Member for Inkster who introduced the original motion, we cannot accept the amendment to the amendment to the amendment because it violates the principle which has been established. As the member for St. Vital said since 1952, that the old age security pension in Canada is on a basis apart from that of need. It's been established that it is a pension of right, and I respectfully suggest to my honourable friends opposite that if they do not, if they do not accept the contention of my colleague from Inkster that the figure of \$75 or any figure over and above the \$55 is correct, for goodness sake don't indicate that as far as you are concerned, as far as this House in Manitoba is concerned, that you want to go back to a means test or even have coupled, or even have coupled with the old age security pension, any question of needs. If my honourable friend, the Minister of Health and Welfare, wants a share and can get a share first of all with Ottawa as the needs that are supplied to those whose pension is not sufficient, well and good to him. If my honourable friend wants to suggest to Ottawa, and I made this suggestion to him, if he wants to suggest to Ottawa that all of those who are on Old Age Security and only receiving the established pension and require more means, then I would suggest to him that he negotiate directly with Ottawa, that for every person over the age of 70 in Manitoba who, on basis of needs, is paid for those needs out of the Provincial Treasury, that the federal authorities then pay the province back the 100 percent. But for goodness sake -- (Interjection) -- no, it's not the same thing, it's not the same thing at all, may I suggest, honourable Sir, because here by a resolution of this House, you're establishing or attempting to establish a principle which has been eradicated in respect of the Old Age Security Pension in the Dominion of Canada now. Let's not go back. It was a fight and a fight for years to place our Old Age Security Pension on a universal basis for everyone. It may be, as I mentioned the other day, that a number of people will be receiving the pension who don't require it. I made the suggestion the other day that if we require more money for Old Age Security Pension and offset the fact that some are getting it that don't require it, let's raise the base of the taxable income above the \$3,000 level so that those that are in receipt of higher incomes are making a greater contribution. Let's do it that way if we want to make sure that those who are in receipt of the income are paying for it. But for goodness sake, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to this House not, from the Province of Manitoba, in our deference to the admirable objectives of our honourable friend the Minister of Health and Welfare, to attempt to clutter up the Old Age Security Pension in Canada by a needs test of any description at all.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'll be very short. Nevertheless, I'd like to say that I, for one, will certainly support this amendment. I say that in the past, in the very short time that I've been here, I've seen -- it looks like coalition between the members of the government and the members of the CCF. But now I think that it might be time that we have some kind of coalition between the people that want sound and reasonable legislation, because we are at a very difficult time in this nation's history. We are facing the ever-increasing danger of this creeping socialism. And I think that it is a danger, because what they are advocating is always popular, especially the way it comes out in the newspapers -- give, give, give and give. Everybody wants something for nothing. There's no doubt about that. And it's time that we decided we have enough backbone to do something about that. Let's remember this. By giving, by giving the way the Socialists want, we are taking something away from the individual, something that is much more important than we are giving; the self-respect, the independence. Pretty soon if the state keeps on giving everything and taking care of everything, the individual will not have the right to think for himself. That is exactly where we are going, and it's time that we stand on our own two feet and realize that there is a danger, a danger of this socialism creeping on us all the time.

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . .

Now first of all we have all kinds of pensions, now maybe not the older people, the older generation, but it is coming. There's pension in every field, practically every company has a kind of pension scheme for the employees, and that is good. Now this idea of Old Age Pension was created to help the people, to supplement, not to say, "All right, you have no more responsibility; we're going to take care of you." What kind of citizen will that create? "You don't have to worry, the state will take care of you." Where is the pride? Where is the initiative and the ambition? This will be all taken away from the individual the way we're going now. Now it makes good reading. A reporter will go out with \$55 and try to live on it. No, he can't live on it. Now, it is also a danger because every time we say something like this it looks like we're not interested in the welfare -- (Interjection) -- That's right, that's true, some people on my left, that's the way they think. They are the saviour of humanity; they are the ones that are going to do everything for the people. Everybody else are enemies. That's the way it is. Sure. Give, promise -- that's easy. That's what they've been doing and that's what they want to do. Now there is the danger that the other parties will enter this race of promising, promising. Well, I'd much sooner be on Opposition all my life, or be out of here and still respect my conscience than go and promise and promise just for the sake of being in power, and I think that's wrong.

Now, we are also interested in the welfare of the people. We believe that everybody should live as free individuals and those who cannot afford it, therefore they are not living as free individuals, and we want that 20 percent or 25 percent -- we have their interest at heart very much, and this is those people who need to be helped, not just on one end a bunch of people here in Manitoba or in Ottawa signing cheques to send to every single person, even the Premier and the president of any large corporation, and another group sending out bills to send it back. That's what we're doing now. It's ridiculous. We're just taking away something very, very vital for the welfare of this country. I mean, we want to be free men, we want to be proud men. We don't want to have the state do our thinking and dictate everything for us, and this is exactly what's going to happen. So please let us stand on our own feet, and we're not afraid of what the CCF are going to say, or the papers are going to say. The newspaper in reporting that, sure, some of us might be defeated, but at least we'll be accomplishing our duties, not just waving something, waving a promise to get back in here.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question? I won't be hard on him. I just want to ask him whether he would be agreeable to have the Old Age Security Pension go back to a straight means test at any amount of money whatsoever.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm not advocating that at all. I'm not a great administrator. I'm just saying that this stuff of promising and giving everybody the same thing -- I want to see the people that need it, get it. That's what I want, and I want the people to realize that we're not just giving this to everybody as a promise for election and so on. This is something to help the people with their pension, not say "We're taking care of you now. Spend your money, no ambition, go ahead."

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . Honest John . . . . .

MR. DESJARDIN: I'm not very interested in Honest John.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would, too, just like to refute the implication, or the statement of the Leader of the CCF when he says that because we are in favour of this resolution that we want to go back to the day when you got no Old Age Pension unless you had need for it. Just because we approve of the idea that now we have sort of a minimum pension, a minimum sort of standard, not really a standard but a minimum pension for everyone over 70, and that is what we have, but when it comes to paying more than what we have got now, that is the time we think that it should be to those who need it. And I think that is sensible, and I think the people on the whole would agree with the idea of that being a sensible course. And I think we should also think of this. If we paid an increase to everyone above the \$55, paid that out to everyone, then we would require additional taxes to pay it, and it would be quite a large sum, and we would be paying it to many who don't need it, and in raising those additional taxes, whether it be by income tax or by sales tax or some other ways, we would be taking it away from many, many people who couldn't afford to pay the additional taxes. People with low incomes, people with growing families who are not making very much,

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.). . . . they would all have to pay additional taxes. You may add it on to sales tax; it comes out of them, it comes out of everybody. You add it on to corporation taxes, it increases the cost of operating the corporation, it increases the prices of goods that people have to sell, or if you add it on to income tax, you take it directly from them. And so when we are saying you should pay it to everybody -- somebody said Louis St. Laurent or whoever it might be -- we are saying we want the taxes increased, and many people who will have to pay that increase are unable to pay it compared with many people who would get the increased pension.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the last speaker a question? Why has he agreed to raise -- whether he agreed here or by his heart -- to raise the pension from \$20 a month to \$55, and how does he know that \$55 is enough, so why object to \$75.00?

MR. COWAN: I didn't say it was enough. I simply said that if we're going to have an increase above that \$55, let it be given to those that need it and not to everybody.

MR. GRAY: . . . . \$75 haven't you?

MR. COWAN: No.

MR. GRAY: You have agreed that \$55 is necessary while it was \$20.00. Why have you agreed to \$55.00?

MR. COWAN: \$55 is what we've got and it's agreeable. I don't say that \$55 is necessary for everybody but it is a reasonable amount. We help those that need it, that need more than \$55.00.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak in the first instance. However, since we're debating this question quite fully I thought I'd make a few comments. First of all, I agree to the principles on the basis of needs. I think this is one thing we cannot overlook. We should make sure that those people who are in need should be provided adequately. However, I'm not so sure whether we're right in starting from the basis from where we are starting, the \$55 a month. Personally I think it's low. It's too low, because I find that older people living in the homes for the aged find it very difficult. They use up all their money they get from pensions just to pay for the costs per month that these homes charge them. That does not leave them with any money which they might need in addition to that. Therefore, the basic amount should be increased in order to provide for this supplemental amount that is needed. Further, I'm also wondering just how many of our aged people we are exporting to the western provinces because of the low pension that we have in Manitoba. Both the two western provinces are paying higher pensions, and I'm sure that the people there appreciate it, and that we have people moving out of Manitoba and getting higher pensions in B. C. and Alberta. Another thing, if we pay these aged people higher pensions that money certainly wouldn't be lost. It would add to the purchasing power to the people in Canada, and the result would be that more money would be spent for essential debts in order to have the people in Canada to produce more and be able to sell them. The matter of taxes was raised by the Member for St. Boniface. I agree there's a limit to what we can tax our people, and that this thing will have to be looked at from all sides, but still I maintain that I think it's time that we re-examined the basis from where we start, \$55 a month. I think that should be increased.

Mr. Speaker put the question, and declared the motion carried.

MR. PAULLEY: The Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Roblin which reads as follows: By deleting all after the word "month" in the last line and adding - "to that amount which is required to adequately meet their individual needs".

A standing vote was taken, the result being:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Batzley, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Corbett, Cowan, Desjardins, Dow, Evans, Froese, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assinibola), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McLean, Martin, Molgat, Prefontaine, Roberts, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Tanchak, Thompson, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Gray, Harris, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Wagner, Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas - 36; Nays - 7.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The question before the House is the amendment to the main motion as amended by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster as amended. Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate . . . .

MR. GRAY: On a point of privilege, now I know the difference between the Liberals and Conservatives. The difference is, one sits on your left, the other one on your right.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, I would ask the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand. However, if there's any member of the House wishes to speak on this resolution may I respectfully suggest that they speak and then the adjournment -- go back to my honourable colleague.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand? Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, speaking on our resolution in regard to the minimum wage, it is interesting to note the various interpretations given to it. The Honourable Member for St. James said there were two parts to it and the Honourable Member for St. Vital referred to the four parts. To me there is only one resolve and I wish to read it, Mr. Speaker. Therefore be it resolved that this House wishes the government to give consideration to the advisability of taking the initiative and proposing to the Federal Government that in conjunction with all the provinces, steps should be taken without delay to institute a minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour for all workers in Canada. That is the resolved, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member from St. James interprets our resolution as asking, first, the Provincial Government to increase the minimum wage to \$1.25; and secondly, to ask the Federal Government to have this done across the country. And that was not the intent of our resolution. My colleague, the Honourable Member for St. John's, fairly clearly pointed out that although one province could raise its minimum wage rate above the others, and he referred to the Province of Alberta where they now enjoy a minimum wage of 85 cents an hour as compared to our 66 cents, he pointed out that it's not the best thing for a province like ours because we are not a leader in economic development. The President of the United States has not proposed a national minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour because he wants to win an election. He has been advised by his economic advisers that this is a necessary step in planning for the economic future stability of that country. It's interesting to note that the Honourable Member for St. James suggests, and I quote, Mr. Speaker: "The real cure, 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." Reduce the cost of living by reducing wages, and yet not a word about the high profits of many of our large corporations. Why is it that such a resolution draws such quick fire from this so-called progressive government of ours? I think that by keeping our minimum wage at 66 cents an hour we are encouraging people to become wards of the state. The Honourable Member for St. Vital did a fine job in showing where a married man with a wife and a two-year old child would get \$121.94 a month in Winnipeg on Social Welfare and \$116.16 on the minimum wage. Is this situation likely to encourage people to stay off our relief role?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour) (The Pas): I just wonder on a point of privilege, the minimum wage does not work out to \$116 a month. It works out to a little over \$125.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this was on a 44-hour week. Does the Minister suggest that there are more than 44 hours to a working week? If he does, and I accept his figure, but it's still below that of the figure of \$121.94 for welfare in Winnipeg. But the leather medal, I think, should go to the Honourable Member for Morris when he ridicules a New Party, and he said, and I quote: "Now, I am not saying organized labour is wrong in Canada, but what I am trying to say, organized labour is wrong in Canada when they allow the gangsters in United States to lead them. That's just my feeling. I say it's a fact: it's a fact and you can't get away from it. If it wasn't a fact you wouldn't be trying to cover up. It's just a policy that

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) . . . . comes from the human heart, this trying to help his mankind." This criticism; Mr. Speaker, of Canadian labour unions is most unfair. There have been cases of improper practices; the Teamster's Union was found guilty of improper practices and rejected by both the AF of L and the CIO, and there have also been cases of lawyers sent to prison for various reasons, but should this blind us to the fine job that's being done by the Manitoba Bar Association, the Union of the Legal Profession, in creating a fund to protect innocent victims of unscrupulous barristers? Not only that but they also disbar the guilty person. Big business could well emulate these ethics, and I doubt whether the large corporations who were recently fined and had some of their executives sent to gaol, will be expelled from the Manufacturers Association.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Journal of February, 1960, and they have there an article by Senator Hubert Humphrey, and it's entitled: What's Right With Labour? There are so many things being said about labour that he certainly has a timely article in this magazine. "I do not want to be misunderstood. I think --" -- excuse me, Mr. Speaker -- "I rise today to discuss what's right with the American labour movement. If there is any area of human behaviour where the dog bites man formula is true it's the area of labour relations. How often do we read articles about labour peace? How often are editorials written about honest labour leaders? Isn't it true that a \$10,000 union contribution to a worthy charity is less newsworthy than a \$100 bribe to a cheap crook? How often does a national magazine do a feature story on building tradesmen contributing their week-ends to the rebuilding of a school or a hospital destroyed by fire? But there seems never to be a shortage of front page space or editorial space when a strike is called, or when some violence flares, or when a union official is called before an investigating commission." I would like to read this article, Mr. Speaker, because it's very timely, but I'll finish it by saying that Senator Humphrey said that "Labour asks that the federal minimum wage be increased, that its coverage be expanded. Very few union members need a federal minimum wage to protect them. Is this narrow self-interest legislation?"

Mr. Speaker, we have repeatedly tried to make the point whether it be education, health, working conditions or wages, that our primary concern is for people in the lower income group and if we could get members of the old line party to share some of this concern we could keep many people from "throwing in the sponge" as they say in boxing; keep them from the indignity of having to accept social assistance in many cases. Now the Honourable Member for St. Vital had us sitting on the edge of our chairs when he said and I quote: "Now let's consider proposing an amendment to this resolution that would in effect convert it to a resolution urging the Provincial Government to establish a minimum wage in Manitoba of over \$1.00 an hour. I have even considered voting for this resolution as a protest against the level of minimum wages that we have in this province even though I think that the \$1.25 the honourable member is asking in his resolution is too high as a start, but much closer to what I would like to see than we have at the present time. I think I have made clear my reluctance to do the latter and with respect to amending his resolution there are two reasons why I hesitate to do this. One is that if such an amendment were carried it would destroy the intention of the mover of getting this House's opinion on the establishment of a national minimum wage of \$1.25 and this I don't think he should be deprived of. And secondly, it would in essence mean the urging upon the government of the abandonment of the Minimum Wage Board." The honourable member knows very well the fate about to be suffered by our resolution. I think I don't have to remind him about that, and he expresses concern about the possibility of the abandonment of the Minimum Wage Board. Then a little farther on he suggests, and I quote him again: "Having management and organized labour on this Board is like -- and I'm quoting from an article dealing with another subject that I took from a magazine -- having management and organized labour on this Board is like having a Jehovah's Witness as a chairman of a Red Cross Blood Bank or having a Doukebour as president of Tip Top Tailors, that's how silly it is." He thinks it's silly, Mr. Speaker, but I think he's shedding crocodile tears over this matter of a standard minimum wage in Canada, because if he really thinks our resolution calling for \$1.25 an hour is too high but that \$1.00 an hour would be acceptable, why does he not propose an amendment to it? I would like to read further on and I quote again, Mr. Speaker: "Our present minimum wage is ridiculous too, because in many cases a man can do better dollar-wise by going on municipal relief particularly

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) . . . . If he has a large family." Now I have -- I shouldn't say with the co-operation -- but I have asked the welfare department, St. Vital and welfare department for Winnipeg for certain figures, Mr. Speaker, which I don't care to enlarge upon. The Honourable Member for St. Vital has from time to time referred to our plous resolutions. I think he should look up the meaning of the word plous and he will get quite a shock, because I think we should be very happy that he calls them plous resolutions. Mr. Speaker, I believe a uniform national minimum wage is a very necessary thing for our economy, for it is a fact that we have many of our people who are unemployable -- we know that in this modern day of technological advances, we know that there are many people who will never be employed again -- but our job is to put people to work who are able to work, and we have far too many of these people who are able to work feeling that they're not needed, that society has no place for them. We would like to make them feel that they too can make a contribution to the future of our country. One leading economist has said that the welfare state is here to stay and that such things as old age pensions, unemployment insurance and family allowances is now a very important part of our economic machinery, and certainly a very important cog in the gears of our economic machinery. Let us not force many of our people to apply for social assistance because of a law which recognizes a minimum wage of 66 cents an hour in our province.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wants to speak, I'm prepared to adjourn the debate and the next time I'll be speaking I'll be closing the debate. But if anyone else wishes to speak it's okay with me.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, can anyone speak twice on the same motion? I have already spoken.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I'm afraid not! No, we couldn't allow you to speak twice on the same motion.

A MEMBER: You ought to know better, Morris.

MR. GRAY: I've been accused so much of breaking the rules that I have to be very, very careful.

MR. SPEAKER: No, the honourable member, if he's spoken on the resolution may not speak again. Well, you may not speak again.

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

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

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

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this matter be allowed to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand? Stand. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Motion stand? Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, this resolution asks that the Fair Wage Act be extended to apply to cover all construction workers within the Province of Manitoba, and I think it is only fair that before we consider the question of extending the coverage of this Act that we certainly give some examination to the Bill itself, the Act. The Fair Wage Act, to my recollection, was enacted somewhere around the year, 1913 -- I didn't take the trouble to look up the exact year but I think you'll find that's about the era -- and at present, I believe there's only about one province in Canada that has a similar act, that of B. C. But the conditions of the application are quite considerably different in B. C. than here and which I will enlarge upon as I proceed. Now, the original intent of the Act was to ensure that workers on public construction work and later large private construction jobs receive a minimum fair wage, and the wage in the original intent of the Act was regarded always as a minimum fair wage, and quite different from the Minimum Wage Act that we've been speaking about in this previous resolution. The reason for it, Mr. Speaker -- and I'm only using my common sense conclusions having been brought up in the building industry -- to have this special act cover the building fields was most



(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd.) . . . . likely for these purposes. I can recall we had quite a number of Old Country tradesmen working for us, highly skilled carpenters who had served their apprenticeship in the Old Country, but I can also recall that those same men were unemployed over the winter for from three to four months as a quite normal thing; it was rather exceptional if they were employed during the winter. Now also, during the summer they ran into -- they were exposed to the elements and they had periodic lay-offs -- so that the going wage at that time within the building industry was always higher than for instance a man doing the same work in a factory, because it took appreciation of the fact that he was working out of doors and was exposed to the elements and would have certainly lost time and certainly would lose a lot of time in the winter whereas the factory worker would have steadier employment during the winter. The wage of the trade accepted that fact and paid a higher rate than the same employment to a man who was indoors. When this Act was enacted originally it was simply to assure that the wage was fair in the light of those conditions, but also on the minimum side.

Now during the years of the last war and post-war years this Act changed in character to my recollection. It left the premise of its original intent of providing a minimum wage in the industry, and the going or negotiated wage became the wage set forth in the schedule. This, I think, is where the Act went wrong, because in my opinion there are two or three things wrong with the Act and the reason that I'm going over this past history of the Act is to familiarize members with the Fair Wage Act and what, in my opinion, is good about it and what is bad, so that members who have not been here in years previous and enjoyed the experience we have gained, particularly in the Industrial Relations Committee when it was formed the first year or two and discussed this Act, and of course other acts very thoroughly, will be brought at least a bit up-to-date. In my opinion the Act went wrong when it accepted the negotiated or going wage and for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, the acceptance of these negotiations was set at the highest level, the most lucrative end of the building trade in the Province of Manitoba -- those negotiations between the Winnipeg Builders' Exchange and the trade unions in Winnipeg. Now, if we across the province at large had the complete full resource of skilled manpower that the Winnipeg Builders' Exchange enjoys in here on this particular point I could probably not differ as strongly, but we do have in Winnipeg this highly concentrated skilled workers' pool which is available to the members who belong to the Winnipeg Builders' Exchange. But also the fact we must remember is that this represents the most lucrative end of the trade; these are the builders who build the large government buildings, the large buildings for business, industry and so on; so that, once again, I say it is the most lucrative end of the trade.

During the year that this Act was in question before the Industrial Relations Committee, there were several objections voiced to the Act -- I can't recall the group in Winnipeg but they were similar to the Builders' Exchange only they were engaged in housing construction. They voiced objections to it; they tried to get around it in having a scale between a carpenter and a labourer -- a special category set up which would permit the employment of men who could do certain classes of carpentry without being classed as carpenters. Because in the Act it sets forth that a carpenter is a man who literally picks up and uses a hammer and saw. Now, honourable members will appreciate that there are literally hundreds of jobs around a building that can be done with a man who can only handle a hammer and saw and he certainly need not have the qualifications of a carpenter. This is one way in which it's costing the people of Manitoba more for their buildings because of the very inelasticity of the Act in setting forth that all men who pick up a hammer and saw and work must be classed as carpenters and paid according to this high schedule. Now, in all fairness I must admit this, that the wages which are negotiated and set as going in Winnipeg do, as they go out across the province, there is a differential which reduces them in effect. For example, a carpenter in the A Zone, such as Winnipeg \$2.50, and in the B Zone, which encompasses towns of over 2,000 across the province, \$2.15. There is a differential there, but still because of this rigid demand that every man who picks up a hammer and saw be classified as a carpenter and insist that he be paid this wage, it does mean that the cost of building, particularly frame buildings and so on, are higher than they need be. It certainly results in higher costs of home construction.

Then, there is another objection in my mind in that once the figure is set forth in the Act, and there is penalties if either the man works for less or the boss pays him less, there is the -- and I think a dangerous situation in being so inelastic, in that, for instance I think it would

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd.) . . . . be quite a stimulant to winter construction if men could agree with their employer in the common interests of both. I want members to my right, members of the CCF Party to believe me when I'm fully and consciously saying this, not to believe that I believe that men should work for very low wages. I do not believe that. I believe that certain work should be tied with production so that you have economic production, but if employers and employees could get together during the winter and offer to the public a reduced scale of price work during the winter then certainly that would be an inducement to winter work. Because honourable members will realize, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases it's inconvenient to do a lot of these little repair jobs which could provide so much employment in the winter. For instance take even painting, you don't want to paint and decorate in a house during the winter because you have the smell of paint; you can't get out on the lawn and eat your meals and so on like you can in summer. And in many ways it is difficult, there is a resistance to winter work just because of the inconvenience that it causes in so many cases. So that the Act is too inelastic. Then a further point -- I mentioned the pool of skilled workers within the Winnipeg area. If I may diverge, Mr. Speaker, for a moment and give an example of how this causes in itself, the fact we haven't that pool of skilled workers at other points of the province, causes increased costs, I hope you will pardon me. I had a fairly large building to build a few years ago and as members will remember we've had quite a building boom and all of the good skilled carpenters in our locality were certainly employed. Due to the fact that I was waiting on some glue land presses which had to come from Seattle, I was forced to do other work which actually was a hazard and too much of a chance. I had to build parts of the building and brace them up and start brick veneering when I shouldn't have and in danger of windstorm and so on. But the point I must get to is that, and here comes the old saying, "It's an ill wind that blows no one good". At that time we had a hallstorm sweep through the southwestern part of the province and I was able to get men who could do carpentry work reasonably well. I think the schedule at that time called for \$1.85 for a carpenter. These men had been hailed out in the country and came into town to start work, and they were reasonably good carpenters, but because of lack of practise and skill they certainly weren't worth \$1.85 which was the schedule at that time; they were probably worth anywhere from \$1.25 to \$1.50 maybe, but according to the Act they were paid the required wage. Now that was a contract and I had to have them to get my job closed in before fall so it came out of me. But in the case of an instance of cost plus work for a customer it would have to come out of the customer -- it would have resulted in a higher cost to the customer. There again I say that this Act does not work for the best of all the people in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

There's another objection that I would have to this Act, and I wonder if it's a valid one in view of the fact that everyone now recognizes the need of overtime wages. I feel at times that overtime wages impose a penalty upon people, and I think I recall citing this instance in committee several years ago, that where a customer -- and it's certainly in the interests of the workmen as well as the employer to oblige and service his customers -- where a customer, for instance a storekeeper down-town, has suffered wind damage and he's lost a plate glass window during the night, and you have to rush men up and temporarily close up. If it wasn't for the complete inelasticity of the Act, the men and the employer in the interests of getting further work, would rush down, close this man up and be quite happy to work at normal rates, because that's a service, and despite what may prevail in the larger cities, in the smaller centres there still is that idea of giving service. But this is defeated, the storekeeper has not only suffered the damage of having a window broken, a second damage is inflicted upon him in the way of a penalty to pay for this work just simply because it occurred after the regular hours.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing whatever against worker and employee getting together to negotiate the conditions of work, the hours for work and so on, but I do believe it's entirely wrong when the government steps in, particularly in one industry in the province, and sets rigid rules clean across the province. In my opinion it's not in the best interests of the people of the province. That's why I have gone back through this rambling bit of history, Mr. Speaker, to acquaint members with just what this Act means.

Now I mentioned earlier that the Act in B. C. is applied a little differently than ours and I think the difference is this, that it still keeps the original intent of our Act. Rather than set the negotiated or going wage clean across the board the wage set out in their schedule is

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd.) . . . . somewhere in the neighbourhood of 70 percent or so, I believe. Now this gives it some flexibility. This gives the protection to the workman that we would all not quarrel with, but it still allows the building outfits to have that freedom which a free enterprise corporation, and the workers for a free enterprise corporation, should prize and that is so that they have the ability to come down a little bit if the market requires it, then bring the wages back by negotiation during good times. I rather suspect -- heaven knows, Mr. Speaker, none of us want to see a depression -- but I rather suspect that this Act will make a lot of criminals in the Province of Manitoba if we run into a depression because if anyone agrees to work for less -- any builder who employs men for less than set forth in the schedule will be breaking the law. It's entirely too rigid in my opinion; and because of this rigidity and the penalty on overtime I must object to this particular resolution because here we wish to extend this Act to cover construction workers all over Manitoba, and here means that men up in the north, men in remote conditions, men working in rustic conditions where there's very little entertainment at night must be held down to union type hours; can only work after hours at time and a half, which is ridiculous, and unless men have changed since my day -- I know that when we worked in the country we preferred to work 12, 14 hours a day -- the nice cool of the evening was a beautiful time to work. The men want to work, and the idea of inflicting a penalty and running up costs to gain those extra hours in my opinion is wrong. The men are making their fair wage rate just the same for those extra hours and so they are able to take home more money, but why we should agree that they can charge them a penalty -- place a penalty upon those extra working hours when actually it prevents their own boredom sitting around in work camps in the north country. This in my opinion is entirely ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot support the resolution. I believe that the Act should be amended to allow a little more give and take. It's entirely too rigid. But this particular resolution because of this penalty idea for overtime work which would further increase the costs in various areas of the province in construction, I must oppose I believe in the best interests of Manitoba.

. . . . . Continued next page.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I know the Honourable Member from Brandon for many years and I always admired his sincerity, his straight-forwardness, his arguments, and his justice of those who need justice. But today he reminds me of a man who heard a voice at the door saying, "I'm frozen in the middle of the winter; I'm hungry; please let me in." So he tells his servant, "Go and open the door and let him in. My heart will not stand to see him suffer." That's identically the same thing. He's opposed for the minimum wage. Well it's his privilege, but to tell us that the minimum wage, at least as pitted with the building industry, I cannot subscribe. He may be right but I cannot subscribe, because when he puts up a building, the rent is set at the beginning of construction of the building and the rent is being paid by tenants and not by the builder or the owner. So if he has to pay a few cents more for the minimum wage I don't think, personally, that this will affect his adjustments with the tenants. After all, he's building big buildings or a factory or an apartment house, or even a hotel. These people nowadays who build big buildings, apartment houses, factories, hotels, they are not worrying so much of the cost of construction; and particularly they don't want to take anything out of the man that works and builds these buildings -- absolutely not. I've met many hotelmen. What they do later, and it's their business, they say the hotel room was \$7.00 before, but I am going to charge \$7.50 because the contractor paid a fair wage. So what's wrong about it? Why exploit the man who has to make a living? I'm not worrying whether the man has had ten years' experience or five years' experience. You have to have different kinds of employees to construct a building. Surely to goodness everyone is entitled to do it, and the matter is so small -- I say so small, that I'm rather surprised at my friend from Brandon should even take advantage of it.

It seems to me almost a disease in this House I think, that if I should present a motion to give every member a \$10,000 bonus to go out and have a holiday in Hawaii or Israel or anywhere else, they would oppose it because it comes from me. I could assure them that if they move such a motion to send me to Israel, I'll definitely accept it. But with them it is something -- a disease, I would say. The very thing that comes from here, throw it out before they even hear it or listen to it. Take the Old Age Pension bill that just passed a little while ago. We told the condemnation and we told the accusation of the Official Opposition against the government -- here's a motion that came from the CCF, oh, kill it; and they would have -- and then they tell us that they are opposed to the government. You're not opposed to the government, absolutely not. I don't believe anything -- (Interjection) -- well, it's a strong statement. I don't subscribe to any accusation or condemnation you give to the government because I found differently when it comes to something which is against labour. When it comes to something which is in progress for the world, progress for the province, progress for the people, oh yes, they get together and they form a club. So I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this motion is absolutely a good one. It doesn't hurt anybody; it does not attack anything. It just creates equality, and I'm sure our Minister of Labour is in favour of equality and in favour of non-exploitations; in favour of giving everybody an equal chance; and I do hope, in spite of our honourable members on the right, the government will support it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the other night I adjourned this debate for my colleague the Honourable Member from Brokenhead. Now I would suggest to the House that if anybody wishes to speak on this particular resolution that they should do so because, as the sponsor of the resolution, he would be closing the debate if he spoke now.

MR. SPEAKER: Does anyone wish to speak? The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I perhaps should offer at the outset to have anyone who wishes to speak, to have it stand -- I'm not sure whether this is being done in the right way. Well in any case, Mr. Speaker, upon proposing this resolution I realize, of course, that there would be imperfections in it and, according to the member for Portage la Prairie and the member for Selkirk, it seems to be the kind of resolution which might bring a great deal more difficulty to the municipal taxation picture than already exists. I have no

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.).....reason to question the judgment of either of the two honourable gentlemen in this regard but I introduced the resolution, and I'm speaking to it now simply to point out to members of this House that there exists among a good many smaller farmers and a good many market gardeners in this province, particularly around Greater Winnipeg, this problem which has existed for many years. I, quite frankly, if this resolution is defeated, if no action is forthcoming, I fail to see that we are going to bring any justice, taxation-wise, to these people.

What are the reasons for opposing this resolution, Mr. Speaker? Well apparently members, those who have spoken to it, feel that if it's effected into law, in due course that it would cause the mushrooming of small villages in which farmers and market gardeners might be availing themselves of the benefits of living in village surroundings and yet escaping any type of taxation on their buildings. Well I'm sure that if this is the only fear they have, certainly some effective amendment could have been made to this resolution. I only wish that I could offer one myself, however, I take in good faith the promise or the pledge from benches opposite that the enquiry commission is looking at this and will recommend a certain line of action in this regard, and that then they will consider taking certain measures.

Now along the Red River there are ever so many people affected by the present municipal taxation setup and I'm sure that we're justified or I, as their representative, would be justified if I were to sit quietly here and not keep reintroducing this resolution. Is it any fault of theirs that, although they're bona fide farmers or market gardeners, the land as they inherited it from their parents or as they bought it from some previous owner, that the land pattern was such that contiguity of land over and above 4 acres or 40 acres was simply impossible to acquire? I'm sure members here are familiar with the pattern of land settlement, now river lots. Down through the years these properties have been bequeathed to the children, the sons, and, as a result, the land is being whittled away into smaller and smaller slivers, narrower, smaller and so on; yet the people they live there, they make their living by farming or by growing vegetables. They may have 30, 40, 50, 100 acres, but only 3.6 acres or 3.9 acres where their actual farmyard is. Because of the provisions of the Municipal Act, as now existing, bona fide farmers though they are, they are compelled to pay taxes on their buildings while their counterparts, having no more land but having it in one block, are exempt. I simply fail to see the logic of this, and something must be done. We waited last year because the amendment brought in said that we would wait for the report from the Enquiry Commission. Now how long are we going to wait, Mr. Speaker? There's the Advisory Board -- I'm sure that they are occasionally advising the Minister as to certain needs and certain requirements as regard the Municipal Act. Surely they must have given the Minister the benefit of their thoughts on this. I'm sure it must have been discussed and, if it wasn't, it should have been, Mr. Speaker, because it's a bigger problem than some members here seem to think.

Now then, I have before me a copy of Hansard, in which the Member from Selkirk was speaking, and he made reference to making a certain change to the act so that people whose income from old age pension or old age assistance might be greater than off-the-farm income, these people should, in fact, be allowed to continue receiving the benefit of exemption; and I certainly would reiterate that for emphasis. The member should note that it's in the resolution, although no doubt that's not the reason why he indicated non-support. So there is another point which I wish to make, and I anticipate some remedial action on that regard as well.

One other point, Mr. Speaker, which the member for Selkirk made and which I wish to point out once again, is the fact that these people living in these smaller parcels of land are very much affected by any public work that might be undertaken that will go through their properties. Now is it the intention, for example in this floodway expropriation, is it the intention to take or lift the tax exemption on the buildings from those people who, because of the floodway, lose sufficient acreage to bring them under the 40 acre limit or under the 4 acre limit? If that's the case, then I suggest that the Ministers responsible better get busy and think of some adequate legislation to take care of this. I can tell them now that the people out there are incensed enough about the expropriation of their property, and if it brings them into a position where they're going to have to pay tax on their buildings as a result of that floodway, they might have a small scale insurrection on their hands. Well perhaps I'm exaggerating the case, but those people certainly will be incensed and I wouldn't blame them. Now I'm not an

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . . agitator and I certainly don't agitate trouble, but if the people do organize to oppose this particular aspect of it, I'm certainly not going to stand in their way. If anything I'll help them, because I consider this grossly unfair.

Now still, and this perhaps may be somewhat of a digression from the resolution proper, but I think, too, that I should point out to the Ministers and to all members the fact that this floodway, as it will be excavated north of the city through the Municipalities of East St. Paul and St. Clements, it's going to take away a considerable number of acres of land from the property holders, of course, and also from the municipality in a taxation sense. Now I've calculated that the Municipality of St. Clements, for example, will lose about 1200 to 1500 acres as a result of the floodway; 1200 to 1500 acres of land which were, up until now, taxable and from which land taxation was raised for the general purse or revenue of the municipality. If this land is going to be lost, it means a tax loss in dollars and cents of \$5,000 to \$6,000 a year, which tax will have to be raised, consequently, by a higher levy on the people whose land still remains. Now if anybody in this House should bring up or raise a resolution of this nature I believe it could be, or it should be myself, because I represent a constituency that is so greatly affected by the present, not inefficiency, but by the present inequality and the present unfairness of the existing legislation with respect to the Municipal Act. Section 1011 needs revision if we are ever going to bring any kind of fairness back to real property taxation among the rural people of this province. For lack of anything else to say, Mr. Speaker, because I see that it's obviously going to be voted down, I will say, in closing, that I hope that when we sit here next year we're not going to get the same song and dance again that the Enquiry Commission is considering it. I think, Mr. Speaker, that with those words I may conclude.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

YEAS: Messrs. Froese, Gray, Harris, Hawryluk, Klym, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Schreyer, Wagner and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Corbett, Cowan, Desjardins, Dow, Evans, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Lissaman, Lyon, McLean, Martin, Molgat, Prefontaine, Roberts, Seaborn, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Tanchak, Thompson, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 11; Nays 35.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, could this be allowed to stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. EVANS: May the Order stand with the indulgency of the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. PAULLEY: The honourable member is inadvertently absent this afternoon and I ask that this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I am not absent; I am here but I just got some information this afternoon and I have not even read it. I beg the House to allow this to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that whereas the responsibility of provincial governments, including Manitoba, in such fields as health, welfare, education, housing, etcetera, continues to grow from year to year; and whereas the expenditures by the provincial governments are certain to continue this rise in costs over the next generation; therefore be it resolved that this House requests

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)....the Government of Canada to arrange for early renegotiation with the provinces on a new Tax-Rental Agreement which will renew and extend the basic principles of the present agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret to inform the House that I am unable to accept this resolution on the grounds of anticipation. It contravenes our Rule No. 31.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to challenge your decision on this. I think that, on reflection, that your ruling is a correct one. After I had placed the resolution before the House for its consideration or given notice of my resolution, I reread the Throne Speech and I wonder if possibly, Sir, whether or not you might have done likewise. Apparently you have, and there is sufficient in the Throne Speech to make your ruling a perfectly proper one and I accept it and thank you for it.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I don't think I'll watch the clock, Mr. Speaker--(Interjection)-- The only reason why I'm wearing a green tie today is to show my appreciation to the Irish for having given the Scotch the bagpipes.

Mr. Speaker, when I first saw this resolution on the Order Paper, and that was before the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell spoke, I kind of thought he was flying a kite for the Minister of Justice at Ottawa. After the honourable gentleman spoke and divulged to this house what his motives were, according to the rules of the House I must accept them without challenge, although I can think what I want. Now as far as I'm concerned, the legalizing of lotteries would be a degenerative political action subscribing to the worst ethics and morals of our society, and contradicting the best. It would be contrary to the considered views of the wisest statesmen and legislators throughout the world.

Now this question of lotteries is not a new question. This question of lotteries has been in public prominence for many years. As a matter of fact, lotteries were legal in England for a period of 250 years, but in the year 1808, a Royal Commission was appointed in England to study the effect of lotteries, and I'm reading here from a quotation from the report of that Royal Commission and this is what they say: "The pecuniary advantage from a state lottery is much greater in appearance than in reality. No mode of raising money appears to your committee so burdensome, so pernicious and so unproductive. There is no specie of adventure known where the chances are so great against the adventurer; none where the infatuation is more powerful, lasting and destructive. Your committee finds that, by the effects of the lottery, idleness, dissipation and poverty are increased. The most sacred and confidential trusts are betrayed, crimes are committed, and even suicide is produced. Such have been the constant and fatal attendance upon state lotteries and such. Your committee have too good ground to believe will be their invariable attendance so long as they are suffered under whatever checks and regulations exist." In 1823 lotteries were abolished in England. Now in 1931 there was another Royal Commission appointed in England to consider the question of state lotteries, and this commission found that lotteries lend themselves very easily to exploitation and fraud, allowing great scope for the running up of fictitious bills for expenses and the payment of salaries and commissions on a lavish scale. There are also many opportunities for direct fraud. When a ticket is sold, all that the purchaser gets is a numbered counterfoil, and it is impossible for him to tell that the corresponding ticket will be put in the drum from which at length the winning tickets are drawn. Now this committee further found that, in the Irish Sweepstakes, the chances of drawing a winning horse were one in 390,000; and the chances of winning the lowest prize in the lottery was one in 4,000. Now again in 1951 the question of lotteries reared its ugly head in England and another Royal Commission was appointed. This commission stated: "There is no important advantage to be gained by the establishment of a national lottery. There is no reason to depart from the general principle that it is undesirable for the state to make itself responsible for the provision of gambling facilities." Now as the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce said yesterday evening, there have been many other commissions set up to investigate gambling and lotteries. I'm quite satisfied that there's ample documentary evidence to be obtained from these commissions to support the submission that I have made so far.

Now J.A. Hobson, an eminent English political scientist and economist, describes gambling

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.) . . . . as the organized rejection of reason and as an unethical attempt to obtain property without effort. Now lotteries for charity undermine the charitable attitudes of the people until, at last, the institutions supported by such lotteries lose all voluntary charitable support. Now this has been the experience of the Irish hospitals. The Irish lottery was originally instituted to obtain the necessary capital for the purpose of building hospitals and today, in Ireland, the hospitals in Ireland have even to depend upon the monies derived from lotteries to cover current expenses. Now in 1952, out of 6,846,000 pounds spent on the purchase of Irish Sweepstake tickets, the Irish hospitals received less than 20 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that lotteries are downright dishonest. They're economically immoral, promising what they cannot perform. In 1954, the Government of Canada spent on hospitals and other welfare services, the total amount of \$27,333,965. In order to raise that money by way of a lottery or sweepstake ticket, do you know how much money we would have to raise in Canada for that purpose? We would have to raise \$218,671,720. Assuming that the tickets were sold at \$2.00 a piece, we would have to sell 109,335,825 tickets. If you translate these figures into the population of Canada as it existed in 1954, it would mean that every man, woman and child in Canada would have to buy seven tickets. Now I think these facts and figures should be sufficient to convince the House that, as far as lotteries are concerned, they do not produce what the promoters promise they will produce; and that is true whether the lottery is conducted on a small scale or a large scale. As the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce stated yesterday evening, legalized gambling in any form is a front for organized crime, and I think the history of crime in the United States will clearly prove that statement to be true.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to state, that, in my opinion, it is the duty of the state to protect the misguided against bad leadership; and the poor and the needy against the exploitation of their needs and their property. Manitoba is a growing province. Manitoba is a province which has a proud future and I hope that this House will build that future on the same solid grounds as our past was built, and not by introducing into this Legislature and approving in this Legislature something which in itself, in my opinion, would be immoral, even though we do gain a certain amount of money from it. The statement has been made in the House that, "Oh well, we do buy the odd sweepstake ticket -- this small minority of the people in Manitoba they gamble, they like to take a chance." To that argument, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the cure is to be found in legalizing that practice, because if a cure is to be found in legalizing that practice, there is one illegal trade that is carried on throughout the world and every effort has been made to stop it, without avail, and that is prostitution. Now would any member in this House say that by legalizing prostitution it would make moral an act which is immoral? My contention is that by legalizing lotteries, you would not make moral something which is immoral.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I cannot restrain myself from joining in this condemnation of this resolution which has, as its purpose, the inauguration of legalized lottery in Manitoba. Now, Sir, I've been studying the reports of the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons which diligently studied this matter, for perhaps a far longer period than our Honourable Friend from Birtle-Russell, and certainly endeavoured to obtain more concrete facts than he did. For a man who has been considering this matter for over a year, his theories were very highly speculative. I'm going to borrow heavily from this federal report, because if anyone wishes to be persuaded that this resolution is wrong, he need only thumb over the detailed evidence placed before this committee. The Honourable Member from Selkirk has given us firm grounds to refute the supporting arguments of this resolution, and I hope to add to his arguments by the facts that I have accumulated on this matter from the sources available to me.

One gentleman who has contributed invaluable information was Mr. Virgil W. Peterson, the Operating Director of the Chicago Crime Commission and a former member of Federal Bureau of Investigation. He traced lottery through the early days of American history, giving facts and figures, and pointed out that in 1776 the Continental Congress proposed a national lottery that had the endorsement of Thomas Jefferson and other statesmen of the period. A year later, in 1777, the Rhode Island Assembly had to pass a law designed to prevent fraud in connection with this proposed lottery, and any person convicted of counterfeiting and forging



(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.)....these lottery tickets could be subjected to suffer: "The pains of death without benefit of clergy and his personal and real property confiscated for the use of the State." Mr. Peterson traced lotteries up to the year 1830, when sentiment was growing everywhere for laws which would prohibit lotteries because of disastrous consequences connected with them. A Grand Jury in New York, on November 12th of that year, described lotteries as a system of cold, calculated, rascally swindling. They had become a vile tax on the needy and ignorant. The fact is that the ruinous consequences of government authorized lotteries made it imperative for the citizens to take action; and each state, one by one, enacted laws to abolish lotteries. The evils flowing from state authorized lotteries had become so intolerable that, not only were laws passed making lotteries illegal, but they inserted provisions in the constitution of various states designed to prohibit their legislatures from ever again authorizing a lottery. Now time will not permit me describing the experience resulting from the Louisiana Lottery Company which came into existence in 1869. It was corrupt to the extreme and had become, 25 years later, one of the most insidious institutions in the history of the American people. In the state contest of 1892, the lottery became the sole issue in the contest for Governor of Louisiana, and the electorate voted it out of business.

Then the committee was presented with a history of lottery in England commencing away back in 1566 to the year 1823. It was the experience in England that state lotteries encouraged the spirit of gambling injurious to the welfare of the people. The habits of industry were weakened and the permanent sources of public revenue were hereby diminished. The lotteries gave rise to other systems of gambling that were even more vicious and dishonest, and the repression of which became increasingly difficult. As a result, in the Lottery Act of 1823, Parliament provided for the discontinuance of state lotteries. As the Honourable Member from Selkirk pointed out, about 100 years later there was again some considerable agitation to legalize lotteries in England, so the National Government appointed a Royal Commission in 1932 to make a study of existing laws relating to lotteries, betting and gambling. At the beginning, it was admitted that the commission had a strong feeling that the law should be changed to permit legal lotteries. The report stated: "So vociferous have been the agitation on the part of certain groups in the House of Commons, as well as elsewhere, that the commission approached their examination of this phase of the question feeling that some legislation would be necessary; but so conclusive and overwhelming was the evidence, that the commission unanimously concluded that public lotteries are most undesirable and ought not to be legalized." The Royal Commission of 1932 aptly pointed out something that the Member from Birtle-Russell seems to have forgotten, that the acts prohibiting lotteries grew out of the ills that arose when they were legal.

About 20 years later, another Royal Commission took a more lenient view with reference to football pools and similar forms of gambling, and these have been legalized for quite a number of years. Despite what has been said about these football pools and off the course book-making, it seems that quite a number of evils have come as a result of this. A report from Britain, which appeared in Forbes Magazine of Business on August 1st, 1950, states: "gambling is unbelievably rampant, particularly among the working classes. They have developed gambling on football into a big business." The article concludes by saying that these conditions have affected the welfare of Britain materially, financially and spiritually. Two years later, another report from London reported that: "Britain is spending \$1.8 billion a year on gambling, and the civic leaders were warning that a danger point had been reached because of the tremendous place gambling had taken in their lives."

The Member from Birtle-Russell referred to the Irish Hospital Sweepstakes. Figures available intimate only about seven or eight percent of the tickets are sold in Ireland. A few years after it was started, in 1930, a committee of the Irish Parliament declared: "The gambling craze has affected all classes and the total results are demoralizing, uneconomic, thriftless." The Dublin Mercantile Association complained of the amount of gambling in the Free State which diverts both energy and money from industry and commerce and causes great disturbances to the public mind. The Catholic Herald commented that the Irish Free State from end to end had become a sordid gambling den. The hospital sweeps have given enormous impetus to this accursed business.

The Lottery Nationale of France was established in 1933 during the depression when the French Treasury was in straitened circumstances. Tickets were sold monthly for 100 francs

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) . . . each and the grand prize was 3 million francs. In 1938 the French Government abolished its national lottery after a five-year period. The lottery had been authorized to lighten the tax burdens of the people. The French Government did away with its national lottery because they said: "Its contribution to the national revenue was small and, independently of this, it raises grave moral dangers. Economic recovery presupposes as a first condition that the taste for work and economy should resume its real place and that improvement in personal situations should not be a matter of hazard alone." It was later re-established after the Second World War that the moral disintegration in that country is directly attributed to this evil. An article in 1948 stated that it causes more arguments than politics; attracts bigger and more demonstrative crowds than prize fights and horse races; and is the nation's chief home-wrecker.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I sought for information on the state lotteries operating in Australia. I found that in 1948 four of the six Australian states derive some government revenue from lotteries. The exceptions were South Australia and Victoria. In only two of the states are the lotteries conducted by government authority. These are the states of New South Wales and Queensland. The Queensland lottery was established in 1916 to provide funds for patriotic purposes. In June, 1920, an act required that the net proceeds be paid into a government fund for motherhood and child welfare, hospitals and patriotic purposes such as the Red Cross. The New South Wales state lottery was established in 1931. It is basically the same as the one in Queensland. Net proceeds are paid into an account called the State Hospitals Commission Fund. In both states the lottery proceeds provide only a small portion of the annual state expenditure on hospital maintenance. In 1946 Queensland, out of gross expenditure on lotteries of approximately 3 million pounds, had approximately 700,000 pounds for its hospital fund. In dollars this would provide \$2.10 per capita of population towards the annual hospital expenses. In 1947, New South Wales reported its net revenue from lotteries of 2 million pounds. This represents \$2.15 per capita for annual hospital expenses. The hospitals in both states expressed the opinion that voluntary financial support for hospitals and charitable funds showed a serious falling-off where lotteries were in operation, and even in the other states in Australia, the people were no longer content to give to a cause but wanted a chance to get something in return.

During the investigation in Ottawa, an economist was asked the question: "From the economic viewpoint, would you think that lotteries, or any kind of gambling which could be regimented by law, would help either the state or society as a whole?" The economist answered: "I think it works the other way. From an economic standpoint, in my opinion, lotteries or other gambling enterprises are the most expensive methods of raising revenue and the most costly way from the standpoint of the individual. The old Select Committee both in England and America said lotteries were a vile tax on the individual. I would say there was a lot of truth in that observation. Look at it from the revenue standpoint. In order to attract people you have to pay out big prizes. People will not be attracted if there is only a small prize, so you have to collect a tremendous sum of money in order to gain a relatively small amount of revenue. I think it is totally uneconomic and I would not conceive of any economist stating that it was a sound way in which to raise finances." Senator Farris tried to argue that we were sending our money over to the Irish Sweepstake, so why not try to keep it here in Canada if we do not want to let that money go out of the country? The economist answered by saying: "If you legitimize it here you would not be reducing the amount of money you would be sending to Ireland because people would buy both kinds of tickets."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to show this House the perils involved in this resolution. The only gambling that takes place in many sections of Canada is, as the Member from Birtle-Russell pointed out, in direct violation of our laws. Many character-building groups, patriotic organizations and churches resort to illegal gambling enterprise to raise money. They justify the law of violation on the ground that gambling is not immoral, a type of rationalization that will permit an evasion of most laws. The real motive, however, for disregarding the gambling statute is the easy money. A well known columnist, Herb Graffiths of the Chicago Times, once wrote: "Churches and charitable organizations run illegal gambling because that's the sure way of getting money for holy causes from people who wouldn't contribute if the Almighty pushed a "45" at them." When it comes to other violations, you observe that the attitude is usually expressed somewhat as follows: "Those reds, they ought to be run out of

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.)....the country. They've got no respect for our laws."

Now Sir, I do not want to get on the subject of bingo games but I would say this, that people who have only this experience to guide them are often prepared to support the extension of legal gambling. However, I would warn that experience where large scale gambling exists is entirely different than the social evils that accompany such gambling, and can be very serious indeed. Often the people who engage in gambling are those who can least afford it. Even a few dollars a night lost in a bingo game can represent a serious strain on the family budget of low income groups. It must always be kept in mind that games of chance are conducted for the profit of the promoters, and although individual players may win, the players as a group must lose.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I have traced the history of lotteries and their consequences to the best of my ability. I have endeavoured to present the verdicts of the committees in Ireland, Britain, United States and France, on the evils associated with legalized gambling. Again I would remind the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell that our laws grow out of serious ills connected with lotteries; and the inter-parliamentary committee, which met in Ottawa for almost three years, produced a report which recommended that no national lotteries ever be held in Canada. This report was no doubt influenced by the sweeping indictments proven and laid at the door of gambling interests in former Royal Commissions, Crime Committees and Vice Probes on both sides of the Atlantic. Let us beware before we fall into the snare and the delusion that this sort of thing will solve our problem. It will not, but it will bring with it a moral disintegration that will affect everyone of us, and I would urge everyone of you to vote against this insidious resolution. We cannot solve one evil by introducing another, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our difficulties arise from a socialistic quality surrounding our Hospital Services Plan. I would like to see our government take a serious look at the whole subject and see if there's not a possibility of having free enterprise enter this field. I would like to see our government restore the right of each individual to choose a plan according to his own requirements, and remove this distasteful element of compulsion that degrades the society of free men.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Chairman, at the risk of being called a very immoral person, I rise to support the motion that is before us at this time. I haven't made the profound studies that certain other gentlemen have made, especially the last speaker and my friend from Selkirk, but I have profound convictions also and I do not hesitate in placing them before this House. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there are too many restrictions against the freedom of the individual. Certain things are fundamentally and intrinsically wrong. Prostitution has been mentioned, stealing, killing; these should not be condoned. There are things that are indifferent like gambling, drinking, and many other things like that. Why should we restrict the freedom of individuals? It is when these things are done in an excess that they are bad. Too much drinking is bad, I agree -- maybe too much gambling. When a man gambles his day's work possibly, the livelihood of his family -- when it makes it difficult for him to pay his debts; he's gambling with some body else's money; that's bad. It's up to the individual not to do these things. I, for one, do not think that by passing such kind of laws, they call them blue laws, that you can make people better. I do not think so, Mr. Speaker. I think people should be educated in their homes, in their churches, in their schools; that character should be formed and trained so that they might be able to handle their freedom when they get older.

The Honourable the Leader of the House told us yesterday that he's against this because of his children. I would like to suggest that he should train his children in the home; prepare them to face the responsibilities of life; without having to have laws to make it impossible for them to go wrong. Let us believe that we're human beings; that the Lord has given us freedom. Our parents in the Garden of Eden had freedom to do this or to do that, and they did something wrong. The Lord has stated that if we do something wrong, we'll be punished; if we do something right, we'll be rewarded. Let us not forget these fundamentals, Mr. Speaker. I think that to spend \$2.00 on a sweepstake is nothing morally wrong. I can't see it -- I just can't see it. Just like taking a drink socially. It's up to the individual to stop when the time comes, not to overindulge in these things. Even in golfing a man can go out and bet a dollar a hole possibly and lose \$10.00. Maybe for a certain person that would be too much. Maybe he won't be able to buy bread and butter for his family. Well it's morally wrong, maybe, for him -- he goes too

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.).....far. But we shouldn't pass laws to prevent a man going to play a game of golf and betting a dollar a hole — I don't think we should. I think we should have confidence in the people — confidence. After all, we were put on earth to use our brains. We were given brains, I suppose most of us I hope, and as far as discussion goes I'm not so sure that some have.

One of the main reasons that I have to support this motion is because I have with me a motion exactly similar that was passed at a very important meeting that was held in the City of Winnipeg four years ago. It reflects possibly, according to the Member for Portage la Prairie and I'm sorry to see he's not here, the Member for Portage la Prairie yesterday said this -- or the day before yesterday -- "But it certainly seems to me to be very poor comment on the thinking, on the moral thinking if you like, of the times, that a resolution like this should come before this Legislature." Well, I have here a resolution that was brought in at the famous convention on the 17th and 18th of June, 1954, at the Royal Alexandra Hotel. That's when the present First Minister was chosen the Leader of this new party and that they were working a little bit on a platform -- although I have something else to tell you on some other occasion about that famous platform -- but they nailed a plank on that platform and the Free Press of the 17th has this to say in big headlines: "PC's Favour Legalized Sweeps" -- a big headline. The second headline: "Support Plans for Raising Hospital Funds". Oh-ho! And then the story. It's so interesting I think I should read it just about all -- (Interjection)-- All right then. "The Manitoba Progressive Conservative Association Thursday went on record as favouring legal sweepstakes to raise money for Manitoba hospitals. Brought forward late in the morning, the move carried on a show of hands at a convention in the Royal Alexandra Hotel with practically no opposition." Well! Well! Can you believe that, after you heard the speech made by the Leader of the House yesterday? According to the press he was present -- many others were present. This was a plank of the Conservative platform, and apparently this party doesn't change its mind, because it chides us all the time on this side because we supposedly have changed our minds on the floodway or things like that. I don't know but this should have been brought in as government policy, because it was approved by the Conservative convention.

MR. EVANS: As the honourable gentleman has referred to me and my views, I assure him my views were the same in those days as they are now.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Well this was passed practically with no opposition -- with no opposition. It's very interesting, but it's getting close to the hour and maybe I shouldn't press it.

MR. LYON: Is that the old Conservative policy or the new Conservative policy?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Well, I don't know. It was passed at that convention. They were starting to work on a policy but the Leader said we will not announce a policy now, we'll wait for the election.

MR. LYON: Would the honourable member permit a question, Mr. Speaker? Which party did he belong to at that time? I just forget.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Who are you speaking to? Myself? Well, I'm an old Conservative at heart I guess, but the Conservatives have changed so much in the last four years and have gone so far to the left that I can't follow them any more. But I agree with this bright young member for Birtle-Russell who brought this resolution in.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): 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 following a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: I now call it 5:30 and I'll return to the Chair at 8 o'clock this evening.