

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	Holmfild, 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 3rd, 1961.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.
Reading and Receiving Petitions.
Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.
Notice of Motion.
Introduction of Bills.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 35, An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act.

MR. GEO. W. JOHNSON (Assiniboia) introduced Bill No. 34, An Act to incorporate the Association of Assessing Officers of Manitoba.

MR. R.O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) introduced Bill No. 25, An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Brandon College Incorporated.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital) introduced Bill No. 14, An Act respecting The Royal Trust Company Mortgage Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I think that the attention of the House should be brought to a notable sporting engagement that was held at 12:00 o'clock noon today in the Granite Curling Rink. There was a challenge match between the official opposition and the government. I am pleased to inform you, Sir, that the government has maintained the record that they have maintained throughout the Province of Manitoba and in this House. They defeated the official opposition by a score of -- I believe it was 13 to 6 and we hereby throw ourselves open to challenges from any members of the opposition who feel that they have four men that can beat the captors of the sporting event that was started this afternoon. We must say, however, that they will have to acknowledge the fact that there is a small penalty to the loser in the case of each one of these games. Thank you.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to in any way belittle the fine win that was taken over today by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and his three colleagues. We admit that they won this particular event but I am asked to advise the House by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that they were playing the No. 2 team.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, if I may in connection with this curling challenge? I think it was amply demonstrated in this House last event and yesterday that we of the CCF reign supreme, despite my honourable friend across the ways statement, that we reign supreme in the political field, and I, on behalf of my group accept the challenge and I think that we can prove that we reign supreme on the Granite ice.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to the House that I had the distinct pleasure of a ringside seat at this particular engagement and, a completely unprejudiced and objective view would lead me to conclude that the rink that my honourable friends representing the government defeated today would be the only four members of this House that they could beat.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct the attention of the House to the gallery opposite me where we have visiting with us some 60 students from St. John's High School. They are there with one of their teachers, Mr. Vause. Their other teacher is the Honourable Member from Brokenhead who is here with us down here. The St. John's School is in the Inkster constituency and ordinarily the Honourable Member for Inkster would be saying these few words, but he is not here. I speak for him, partly because I myself attended that school -- I still think it's one of the best high schools in the province -- and partly because although it's in his constituency it's just across the street from my constituency. I hope that the students will have an opportunity to listen to the debate and to observe how the legislature functions, and I hope that they will go back with a renewed and heightened interest in our democratic way of functioning.

MR. E.R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, last year you heard me introduce one of the best classes in the country and this year I would like to associate the words of the Honourable Member from St. John's when I say that we have here today one of the best classes

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.)....in the city, and I would like to welcome them here and hope that they may be able to pick up information and acquire knowledge regarding parliamentary procedure which they might not otherwise have received from my deficient teaching.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C., (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like, Sir, as well to call to your attention and to the attention of the members of this House, the presence in the Speaker's gallery and in the gallery immediately next to it, of 60 students from grades VIII and XI from the St. Norbert School. They are here with their principal, Mr. Rene Deleurme and with Sister Richard. They are paying a visit to this Chamber to see how we function here and I'm sure, Sir, that they will leave here somewhat wiser in the ways of the functioning of the Legislature of Manitoba, and I hope, Sir, by the time they leave they will see that their member at least plays some part in the activities of this House and that they won't think too ill of him. If I may say a very short word to them, Mr. Speaker, in the tongue which they -- the language, the second great language of this country which they use in their school.

Mr. Lyon spoke in French, will appear in later Hansard.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Honourable the Attorney-General for using, just for a sentence, the second official language in this House, not only in Canada but in this here Legislature, because we have here, up to date, the largest group of students I believe that we have had since the House was opened.

Mr. Prefontaine spoke in French, will appear in later Hansard.

Mr. Schreyer spoke in French, will appear in later Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. LYON: Again before the Orders of the Day, I should like to call your attention to the presence in the gallery of another large group of students, namely 65 students from Dieppe School in the Rural Municipality of Charleswood. These students are here today with their teachers, Mr. John Whenett and Mr. A. M. Stonge, and I'm sure that you Sir, and the House would wish to extend the same warm welcome to these youngsters from that wonderful Rural Municipality of Charleswood, and to hope that they too will garner some learning from what they observe in the House here today and that they will leave here somewhat wiser in the ways of the functioning of our democratic form of government.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health & Public Welfare) (Gimli): Before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan for the year ending December 31st, 1960, and to inform members of the House that copies should be available in a few days for all members -- it has gone to the Queen's Printer.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to ask of the Ministry when we may anticipate the answers to the questions which were printed some few days ago.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, there was a wide variety of questions and my colleagues are now busy scurrying around to find the information that was asked for. Some of them may take some time because as my honourable friend will recognize, a great deal of factual data may be required of some, others of course will take less time. Just as soon as they're ready we'll print them in the Votes and Proceedings, as they're ready without waiting for the complete compilation.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Questions. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General.

1. How many adult offenders had psychiatric examinations before being tried by court? 2. Of this number, how many, if any, had psychiatric treatment?

MR. SPEAKER: Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's that an humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor for a return of all correspondence between the Government of the Province of Manitoba and the Atomic Energy Commission Limited regarding the atomic reactor plant to be located in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to this address for papers except that it's subject to the usual reservation that it requires the agreement or permission of the Dominion of Canada -- the Government of Canada because the Atomic Energy is an emanation of the Crown.

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

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: (1) which incorporated or unincorporated hamlets, villages and towns had access roads built at 100 percent government cost under the access road policy, (a) in the fiscal year 1959, (b) in the fiscal year 1960; (2) which access roads were hard-surfaced in the same two periods; (3) which access roads are over five miles in length; (4) which access roads provide two separate entrances.

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

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

MR. L. HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, throughout the ages man has faced new challenges and has overcome most by hard work and a real determination to master his own destination. Today, in this rich country of ours society faces a new problem: the problem of the forgotten Canadian. From ancient times the average duration of life has progressively increased, but it has increased more in the past century than in all the prior centuries since the dawn of civilization. The average life span of prehistoric man was perhaps 18 years. In Roman Egypt -- 22 years; in middle ages 35 years; the nineteenth century 40 years. Today, life expectancy -- that is the duration of life to be expected by the new-born infants is 67.8 for males and 73.6 for females.

There is no arbitrary boundary between senility and old age. Many people at 65 are still vigorously and gainfully employed, while others are showing signs of aging. For convenience, however, the term "old" may be associated with those who have obtained their 65th birthday; so what is there for us at 65. After a lifetime of hard work we should provide for our senior citizens, a life of relaxation, free from constant worry and wondering how to make ends meet. Is this the case today? Since the furor over old age pensions three years ago, the plight of Canada's old age pensioners has received little public attention. Perhaps other problems have pushed old age security from the centre stage. Perhaps the \$9 increase passed by Parliament in '57 has pushed the problem of aged from our consciences. Whatever the excuse the public seems to have forgotten; forgotten is the fact that hundreds of thousands of Canadians have to live on \$55 a month. Forgotten, too, is the fact that rents are now higher than they were in 1957; that the food prices have gone up; that living costs have risen. Forgotten are the election speeches of 1958 which promised a new day for Canada's old age pensioners. In the distant memory are the decisive votes of elderly Canadians who believed these promises.

The problem of economic security in old age is the result of the development of modern industrialism. Years ago the family looked after the needs of the sick and the old and the land provided the family's needs. Today the once simple task of finding shelter eats a large share of the wage earner's income. The demands created by advertising and hidden persuaders place most families in a precarious financial position and there is no room, no money left to care for the elderly. And so society now wills it that those who have worked hard all their lives must live out their retirement in poverty, in squalid rooming houses, in bewilderment and pain. What should be done? The answers generally fall into two categories. One set of answers deal with the problem of raising the economic standards of the aged. Included here are: an increase of the flat-rate pension; a government sponsored wage related plan similar to the United States system; more free or low cost services in health and housing fields and portable industrial pensions. The other category concerns the problem of morale among our elder citizens. Nothing can destroy a man's soul more quickly than the feeling of uselessness, the feeling that he isn't needed or wanted. We seem bent in Canada on destroying the self-respect of the old age pensioner. The Canadian Welfare Council has contributed much thought to this aspect of the situation. The Council provides a forum for a discussion of all these issues and

(Mr. Harris, cont'd.)...most of the answers call for more "old people's clubs," recreational centres and subsidized housing designed for old age pensioners. But all the welfare council can do is to agitate, educate and encourage, and if it can even fulfill these important functions effectively, the private desire of individuals, service clubs, unions and churches to help out is to no avail unless government gives leadership.

The National Housing Act has ample provision for old age housing yet because governments, provincial, federal and municipal offer no leadership, NHA money for this type of work remains virtually untouched. The Federal Government should immediately set up a branch or a division of the Department of Health and Welfare to push these morale building programs. Field representatives in the department would be encouraging service clubs, churches and unions to invest time and money in building recreational centres and low-rental housing for the aged. Information for prospective investors should be readily available, and in consultation with such national organizations as the Canadian Labour Congress and the Canadian Welfare Council, the department should develop a nation-wide program that is the product of Canada's best minds and imagination. Provincial and municipal governments can do much the same although on a more limited and therefore less effective scale. A few scattered projects have been started in Saskatchewan and elsewhere. These should be studied for future information.

In the economic front the Federal Government is the only agency that can tackle the problem in a comprehensive way. The present government won a clear mandate in 1958 to move forward on old age security. It does not suffer from a shortage of constructive ideas on the subject. Even in its own service, the Department of Health and Welfare, it has men of imagination and ability who long for the opportunity to improve the economic standards of the aged in Canada. Before the 1958 election the government pledged that, if elected, it would institute a wage-related program. Robert Clark was appointed to study the U.S. security system. Although he made no recommendations Professor Clark provided the government with ample information on which it could make a decision. The government, however, has been silent. I thank you very much.

MRS. THELMA FORBES (Cypress): I would like to say a few words of comment on the motion of the Honourable Member from Inkster. I think that he has made a very earnest appeal to this House to have old age pensions increased. I think he also paid this government a very fine tribute when he said that our Social Allowance Act was a good bill. But I do think, Mr. Speaker, that he should give a little more thought to the implementation of our Social Allowance Act and what this government is trying to do to alleviate the lot of the old age pensioners. I share with him, his concern that these people in the yesteryears were subjected to a means test, and I also share with him, the fact that they got very little after they were subjected to this means test. But today our government is not subjecting an old age pensioner to a means test, but it is a needs test in every sense of the word. When a social worker is called upon to meet with an old age pensioner, they do so in the shortest time possible. The Honourable Member from St. John's asked the other day, how long does it take to have a social worker call? Well, I would say that it's a very reasonable length of time before a social worker will call. Many times a social worker when they receive an appeal like this, tries to make an appointment with the old age pensioner or whoever the applicant is. Many times when they get there, they find that the old age pensioner isn't at home. There may be a note on the door that they will be back at 5 or at 7. As a result much of the time of the social worker is lost. If the social worker has travelled miles, it means staying over for a length of time. This and other things probably, make it so that as many calls as possible were not made in the day. But the social worker does make as many calls as humanly possible in a day, and it is a very reasonable length of time that elapses before any appeal received is given full attention.

Now, when the social worker does call, he sits down and goes over the needs of the pensioner. Sometimes we find that the need is just to help the pensioner budget the \$55 a month they really do get. I've known cases where the social worker sat down and found out that the recipient of the old age pension handed out money to some of their sons and daughters. If this money was put to their own use they could get by on the \$55 a month. I've also found out sometimes that many of the people who come home to visit the old age pensioners eat off them. This pension wasn't meant to feed their entire family; it was meant to look after the

(Mrs. Forbes, cont'd.)....needs of the pensioner alone -- and this is true, although I hear some "oh's" from the other side. Usually when some social worker is called in to look into a case like this, the need is really there and there is money that is needed to look after the needs of the people and the social worker takes note of this. Sometimes the need isn't so very great. The Honourable Member from Fisher, I think, mentioned that sometimes they receive 5, 7 or \$8. If this is the need, then naturally that is the amount that should be met. But in many times this amount of cash needed. We have known it to go as high as \$50. But this isn't a need that will go on to an undeterminable length of time; it's a need that must be met for the time being, and we hope that the social worker will see that this much cash is available to the person to meet the need at this time.

I've also known cases where a social worker called and money was not the answer. I'm thinking of one case of one lady who had her own surroundings. She was able, as far as her health was concerned to be there every day, and by this I mean she did not need the services of a doctor every day, but she was troubled with arthritis and couldn't do her housekeeping -- she couldn't keep her own person as well as should be kept. As a result her needs were the needs of a housekeeper. Now the social worker found a housekeeper for her. This is the need that was there and it was the need that was met. I also disagree with the Member from Fisher when he mentions that a social worker goes into some of these districts and finds that the social worker asks "what has happened to the farm that you once had" -- "what has happened to your previous possessions". He claims that this is really not a needs test but a means test. Now, I differ with him in this respect that we must also think of who's footing this bill in welfare, and if we find that the pensioner comes to the age where he is going to receive the pension and he has no longer got the farm that he used to possess, I think it's the right of us to know what happened to that farm. I don't think this is a means test, I think this is just a common sense test, where we go through the area and find out what did happen to his farm. We have programs in this government where if one of the sons or daughters wants to take over the farm, there are loans available so that they can get a loan and they pay their parents off for the farm so that the parent is not a welfare case but he has ways and means of protecting himself by having cash to carry on in his old age. I really think that this is something that the taxpayer of this province should be protected in too.

I also would like you to take note that we have in the short time at least hit the hard core of help that was needed in this province. There are many cases in our own constituencies that we could still ask for help and I think it's the duty of each person, each member, to ascertain what is in his or her own constituency and bring it before the Social Welfare so that somebody, some social worker can take the case up. Now I'm not saying that every social worker is perfect, but I do come to the rescue of these people when we have claims made against them that they are actually putting these people to an absolute means test. I really feel that they are doing a job for us; I think that they are doing a good job towards the old age pensioners, I think if we do find one or two maybe that are probably going over the limit, then I think the member should bring this to the attention of a higher authority whereby the social worker could be spoken to. It is not the plan of this government to put any of them through a means test. I appeal very much to the whole House when they're thinking of this question of pensions, I appeal to them to think of the pensioner first, yes, but I also appeal to you to think of the taxpayer who is paying this load. I do not believe that we should ask the taxpayer of Manitoba, of Canada, to increase pensions across the board. I think that there are many who do not need it, and I think that there are many who do need it. I think our plan of meeting need, or asking the Dominion Government, the Federal Government, to increase pensions where there is need is a good one, and therefore I second the motion of the Honourable Member from Portage that this House request the government to petition the Federal Government for an increase for all old age and blind pensioners in the province from \$55 per month on the basis of need.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Would the honourable the member permit a question? Do I understand the Honourable Member for Cypress saying that the supplementary assistance to Manitoba is as high as \$50 to a \$55 old age pension?

MRS. FORBES: We have known cases, Sir, where this amount has been given over and above, to meet the need of the person.

MR. WAGNER: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I understood that the member said as high

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.)....as \$50 supplementary aid, if necessary.

MR. FORBES: That's what I said!

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I hope to be able to follow the example of my two honourable friends who have preceded me, namely the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the CCF Party, by being relatively brief on this resolution which is before the House today. Of course, no lengthy explanation is needed in this connection, the matter was brought up by way of resolution by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in compliance with a ruling of Your Honour, and it reflects, of course, his opposition to one portion of the Elections Committee Report concurrence and which has been moved in another part of the Order Paper. And I don't think and I don't believe that my honourable friend means his motion necessarily to be taken literally -- this is the only means whereby he can object and bring his objection before the House and so I don't propose to dwell on that subject for any length of time. This is the means that is set forth under our rules for debate to take place on this objection and I think it's a very proper way for it to come about. I am extremely happy, Mr. Speaker, that nobody has suggested in the House that this matter has not been already fully debated. I took occasion recently to glance through Hansard of last year. I found that I introduced this Bill, spoke on it at second reading; that there was a six month hoist moved by my honourable friend, the Leader of the CCF Party, subsequently withdrawn, but the Bill then moved into Committee of Privileges and Elections I believe it was. There was some discussion in there -- considerable discussion as I recall. It came back, was reported back to this House; there was full discussion as I recall again in the Committee of the Whole, and altogether it had quite a time getting through the House. And then the poor little Bill which then became an Act ended up in the lap of the Elections Committee which sat during the intermission or sat during the recess of the House and while granted there was not too much discussion on the point at that time, my honourable friends opposite certainly made known their antipathy to this particular section, and properly so, in the Committee. And so now, Sir, we have it before us again. This is a strange paradoxical situation for a lawyer to find himself in because in law we are always taught that repetition or reiteration does not strengthen an argument. My honourable friends opposite certainly are aware of this point and they haven't repeated or reiterated their arguments, and I hope, Sir, in the course of my few words not to fall victim to the same error. In pursuance of my good ideals or my good high hopes in this regard I would refer members opposite only to page 1281 of Hansard of last year in which I did advance certain arguments which I thought were substance of arguments in support of this and related examples from other provinces across the country, and indeed from other areas.

Dealing now, Sir, with the substance of the complaint that is before us, namely that this reduction in the time between the issuing of the writ and the eventual taking of the poll is prejudicial to the proper operation of elections in this province. I think that if anything in the meantime, since this amendment first became part of the law of the province, I think that our judgment on this amendment that it was a progressive amendment has been completely vindicated. I think in order to demonstrate this we have to perhaps resort to some of the commonplace everyday things that we perhaps don't think of too often but some of the little things that provide for us a small lesson in democracy. And I want it made perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that I take no issue whatsoever with the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce in the submission that they presented to the committee. I think it was quite proper that they should advise us and apprise us of their views and let us know what they were thinking on this and other subjects as they have done. I do say, Sir, that with respect to the one argument they used concerning the contraction of time that it would be a valid argument only if elections were conducted in a vacuum without the aid say of party machinery and without the aid of newspaper and all other forms of information media which we have in this province and indeed in this country today. So I would ask the House for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to look at just what are the practical facts of life in the conduct of elections in this province today. What types of election do we

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.)....have? Well, we first of all have by-elections from time to time brought about unfortunately by the passing of friends in this House or sometimes by resignation, and we have general elections. Those are the two main types of elections that we're concerned with, the single or small number of by-elections and a general election which comes once every four or five years. Now what about by-elections? Can anybody say that there is any advantage to a party, whether it be the government party or the opposition party, as a result of this amendment to the Act? I suggest to you, Sir, that there is no advantage at all. Immediately a vacancy occurs whether unfortunately through death or through resignation we all know that that seat must be filled within a year. Everybody in Manitoba knows that to start out with. Immediately all parties are alert that they must start looking about for a candidate and that they must start oiling their political machinery in that particular constituency, because sooner or later they know an election or a by-election is going to take place to fill the vacancy. I don't think that my honourable friends opposite, Sir, would suggest for a moment that any of them wait until that actual issue of the writ before they start becoming concerned about the successor in a particular seat. None of us in this House is that naive and I don't think none of us in this House would make any pretense of political naiveté to that point. Of course we don't. We know that when a vacancy occurs there's going to be an election within a year and I think all parties once having been put on this alert start doing something about it; and so actually when the writ is issued it's rather anticlimactical in a sense because the work is already started among the different party organizations and in the constituency, and indeed this is merely the warning shot so to speak before you're off and running to go and running for the finish line.

Well we had a by-election last fall, Mr. Speaker, as a case in point, and I suggest to you that the proof of the pudding is in the eating; and the proof of this amendment is in the by-election that was held pursuant to it this past fall. This writ was issued on or about -- I think it was the 31st of October, announced on the 1st of November and the polling day was set for the 9th of December. That allowed for some 38 -- approximately 38 campaigning days -- there was no campaigning on the last day, not that we know of in any case, so there was approximately 38 days of campaigning. I think honourable members will have noticed that while the Act prescribes a minimum length of time and a maximum length of time, the minimum length of time wasn't used -- I don't think there would have been any hardship if it had been used -- but it just happened in this case it wasn't the minimum amount of time that was used. Now what happened after that writ issued? Well, from what we are able to read in the newspapers, they started speculating right away about the race. I was looking over some of the clippings, I noticed that a distinguished gentleman by the name of Dr. Thompson came into this poor debt-ridden province from Alberta and announced to all and sundry that Social Credit was going to sweep this by-election and that Social Credit was going to sweep Canada. Some of the other newspaper reports as we go back on that by-election were quite interesting. Well then the next one I came upon was the announcement that the party of my honourable friends opposite, the official opposition, were going to have their nomination meeting on the 14th of November; and in due course they did, on Monday night. "Well attended meeting," according to the Winnipeg Free Press, "200 people jammed the hall at Thornhill," - I think that was the proper quote -- and they nominated at that meeting their candidate for this by-election. Subsequently two days later the Social Credit Party had their nomination meeting in Pembina and they nominated their candidate on November 16th, and the day following the Conservative Party, the Progressive Conservative Party had their nomination meeting, on the 17th, and they nominated a very distinguished candidate who is now the very distinguished member of this House in the person of the Honourable Member from Pembina who sits behind me. Now, I don't think that these nomination dates are particularly suggestive of anything except I note for what it's worth that the party that ultimately won the election was the party that nominated last. I don't think there's any particular significance to the point though, because I think I will attempt to prove in the few words I say today, Mr. Speaker, that timing is really not, timing is really not a matter of too much substance in these elections at all. I don't think anyone would suggest that one party had any greater advantage over any other party in that particular by-election in Pembina. My honourable friends opposite, the Liberal Party, the official opposition put up a good fight, a good fight, a good clean fight I would say. The Social Credit Party put up a good fight, a very industrious fight in that constituency, and I may say without patting ourselves too

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.)....much on the back, I think we put up a pretty good fight down there as well. We all seemed to have sufficient time to get out around the country, take our message to the people. I think our honourable friends opposite had, if anything, perhaps more meetings than we did. I think the Social Credit had a good number of meetings down there but timing didn't -- time was not of the essence as the lawyers say -- it seemed to flow along quite well without any hinderance or without any prejudice at all. (Interjection) The CCF as my honourable friend points out weren't there so they couldn't be prejudiced by this at all, and I think had they been there the only prejudice they would have suffered would be the loss of their deposit, but they weren't there. Now I've even heard the rumour, Mr. Speaker, that -- I don't know from what quarters it came -- that had there been four or five more days or perhaps another week that one or other of the opposition parties might have won that campaign. Well, now that's very proper speculation I would suppose. It's possible, anything is possible, but I think that goes, without looking at our Honourable Member from Pembina and attributing to her the qualities that she has, of intelligence, of attractiveness, indeed of beauty, and remembering as well that she is a lady beloved by her constituents in Pembina and remembering as well much as we might not like to, that she was backed by a party or a government with a fairly sizeable and sound record in this province after only 28 months of being in office, and I think all of these things have to be looked at of course. She was backed by a record of real achievement, and a speculation for what it's worth I would speculate, having spent only a short time down there from time to time, I would speculate that had this campaign gone on for another three or four days that there would have been prejudice wrought to my honourable friends, the Liberals and the Social Credit, because I think they might have lost their deposits had the campaign continued to mount as it was during the last week. And so I say seriously, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that they should be criticizing us for this amendment, I think in fact they should thank us for this amendment, because I think in fact we saved them each \$200 and this is very important. This is very important because had they carried on down there, they were going downhill at a fast rate but only the interruption of the election day pulled them up by the bootstraps and saved their money. Now here again, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you is the proof of the pudding.

MR. PAULLEY: Don't choke.

MR. LYON: Here is the proof of the pudding with respect to by-elections. Well now what about general elections? Let's examine this argument with respect to general elections. Every member of this House, every person in Manitoba who takes an interest in politics and whether he takes an interest or not I think he knows this, it's practically born and engrained into him that there must be a general election in this province every four or five years -- a maximum of five years. Everybody knows that. (Interjection) And any time in between as we well know. Every party in this House today, Mr. Speaker, knows that probably by 1964 at the latest, not probably, by certain, by 1964 at the latest there must be a general election in this province. It's no secret; everybody knows that and we all look forward to it I suppose. Probably this side looks forward to it more than the other side but I think we all look forward to it to a certain extent. Is anybody going to be caught by surprise if a general election is called?

MR. PAULLEY: Not at that stage.

MR. LYON: After all, Mr. Speaker, what are we? We're politicians. This is our business, elections, government, taking part in debate in this House, this is our business, and we must be prepared for what eventualities our business brings to us, and I don't think that they're very surprising eventualities at all. We know that we're going to have elections.

My honourable friends in the official opposition today from time to time like to decry that they have any knowledge of partisan politics or what goes to make up the running of a party in this province. They are just, you know, straw-chewing good fellows that are trying to do the best job they can for the province, and by and large I think that they carry out that posture fairly well. But those of us who are in the game, those of us who are in the business of politics in Manitoba today know that every party represented in this House has official organizers, either part-time or full-time. We know that parties are set up. Why are parties set up? Parties are set up to function in elections and to run elections and to focus public attention on election issues at election time. We know that we have this internal machinery. Each one of us in the House; none of us denies it. Of course we have, and it's quite proper. No reason

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.)....why we shouldn't have it. It's a good thing to have. Now, we all know that when an election comes about that these people who are helpers of each of the parties in this House, they have been working in the background trying to get things arranged for a general election. We know as well, Mr. Speaker, that a good party leader, and we have good party leaders in this House in the person of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the person of the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party, these men are not any political stumble-bums of yesteryear; these are pretty sharp, pretty shrewd (Interjection) pretty sharp, pretty shrewd members and they are good leaders. They know what their business is about; they know that to succeed and to hold their posts of leadership they must run a good campaign at election time and they must produce results or they won't be in the job that they hold. Every party leader knows that. Now, I'm going to let you in on a little bit of a secret, although really I don't think it's much of a secret. The Honourable the First Minister of this House, a man under whom I am privileged to serve in this House, I don't think it's any secret that after he was elected Leader of the Opposition in the years when he used to sit on that side of the House, he knew there was an election coming. You all read in the newspapers from time to time that in certain constituencies Conservative candidates were being nominated. And so they were. There was no secret to it at all. In the years 1956-57; the election came along finally in 1958. I stand before you, Mr. Speaker, as a living example of a person who was nominated in 1957. I didn't know when the election was going to be nor did my leader, but we were preparing for an election that we knew had to come about sooner or later; and as a consequence of that I was nominated waiting for my honourable friends opposite to ring the bell or fire the gun and away we would go toward the finish line. I don't think any of us were caught by surprise. I don't think we could honestly say we were when my honourable friend issued the writ of election in 1958 and the election was subsequently held. We weren't taken advantage of because my honourable friends had the right to fire that gun, not at all -- we weren't taken advantage of at all. And I don't think that we would be taken advantage of anymore today if we were sitting opposite if the law were as it is today, and he were to fire that gun and we had four or five less days in which to reach the finish line. I don't think that time would be of any essence at all -- of any importance at all on that. I venture to suggest, Mr. Speaker, without attempting to be mean to my honourable friends opposite, that a longer election period in 1958 would not have saved the Liberal Party from defeat. I think that they would be the first to admit that. Nor do I think that a shorter election period would have done anything to salvage their chances in that particular election. It all goes to prove that we don't operate on a vacuum; we don't operate according to how many days we campaign. We operate according to the principles that our party stands for; we operate according to the character and the calibre of leadership which the leaders of our party bring to the public of Manitoba. Nineteen fifty-nine is an example in this House. The House was dissolved and an election was called I think 44 days later to the day. The minimum time was observed. Any prejudice there? Not at all. Can anyone on the other side of the House say that they didn't know when the election was going to be? Of course they couldn't, because it was in their hands in effect to call that election when they defeated this minority government, and the shoe in effect was on the other foot. We could name the special day, we could name the day, but it was they who had to cut the string hanging on to the axe that was over our neck. And they did, the House was dissolved, the election was called and there was no particular problem involved in that at all. Now my honourable friends may not have agreed with the results, but that's another matter altogether.

Now this past summer, Mr. Speaker, in our sister province to the west here, our neighbours in Saskatchewan, where by the way the minimum time between the issue of the writ and the polling day is 34 days, one day less than in Manitoba. They dissolved their House in Saskatchewan. Can't say that anybody knew an election was coming. Of course they knew an election was coming and the government had been in office -- what four years? They could have waited for another year but they didn't. Speculation had been ripe in the papers for months that there was going to be an election that summer; hints had been dropped by the Premier of Saskatchewan. Perhaps there might be an election that summer, but he was playing possum as all Premiers do. As my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition occasionally used to do, and with great skill I may say, because he kept us in the opposition wondering when he was going to pull the rug. But this is all part of the game, I say, this is all part of the life of a politician. Well

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.)...that House was dissolved on the 4th of May and the election was set for the 8th of June -- 35 days later. Could either of the members of the Liberal Party opposite, Sir, or the members of the CCF Party claim that any prejudice resulted to either party or any party that ran in the Saskatchewan election. The CCF Government was sustained in power, so my honourable friends opposite on the right obviously can't complain. The Liberal Party under their new white hope, Mr. Thatcher, they increased in stature and in numbers in the House, so obviously they can't complain about that election. Lots of times to air all the problems in Saskatchewan in 35 days. (Interjection) I'm just coming to that. We're the ones that have the complaint. We're the ones that have the complaint, Mr. Speaker, and my honourable friend the representative, the lone one from the Social Credit. We're the ones who are left out in the cold.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. LYON: But I don't think for a moment that any of us would try to say it was because there's a 35 day minimum rule in the Election Act in Saskatchewan because that would be just utter nonsense. That is the fact.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, in the United Kingdom which is the cradle of all parliament, the cradle of parliamentary democracy as we know it in this country today, where they have national and international issues which whether we like it or not dwarf most of the issues that we discuss in this Chamber and most of the issues to which we try to bring out attention and our thoughts, they must disseminate their election campaign material and their speeches in their whole campaign among some forty-odd million people. And you know how much time they have -- the minimum time that they have for calling an election in the United Kingdom -- 23 days over a land mass not quite as large as the Province of Manitoba but almost as large, 40,000,000 people. And what are the issues that they have to talk about in those 23 days? Well they've got the policies on the Commonwealth; they've got their full argument between Labour and Conservative Party on nuclear disarmament; they've got United Nations problems to talk about; they've got their relationship to NATO to talk about; to NORAD to talk about; they've got all the different trade unions, the customs unions, the inner six and the outer seven; they've got the trades of commonwealth; and trade with the rest of the World to talk about. They've got all of these massive national and international issues which they must talk about in 23 days, and disseminate to 40,000,000 people in 23 days. And yet we in Manitoba are complaining that we can't talk about our issues, which whether we like it or not are perhaps not of the same moment as those issues, can't we talk about them satisfactorily in 35 days, if in fact 35 is the minimum time that's given or in 38 days as we gave last fall. Is there any problem here at all? I suggest that when we make this comparison we see that rather than resulting in any prejudice to the people of Manitoba, that we have actually improved the election law of the Province of Manitoba. We have if anything, forced the parties of Manitoba, and I don't think we've forced them to because I think they used to do this on their own volition, to run a campaign of three and a half or four weeks whatever the case may be; sharpen and focus attention upon the issues in that campaign; don't overtax or overtire the people with a lot of repetitious speeches and meetings -- and remember we've got T.V., radio, newspapers, hammering every day of the week at the people down there. Ten years ago they didn't have T.V. and that's one of the most important media as we all know in elections today. How can we say in the light of all of these arguments that any prejudice results either to the people of Manitoba or indeed to this House. Sir, I suggest to you today that if any prejudice did result from this contraction of time that this party and this government would be the first to try ameliorate the situation and correct it and to prevent anything like that from coming about. But I can say to you categorically today, Sir, that that does not result, that we have proved here in one by-election that it doesn't result, and we knew before that it wouldn't. We know from examples in other provinces that no prejudice results. We know from example in the United Kingdom that no prejudice results and indeed that it's the best thing to do. We know, Sir, we feel in our hearts, we know in our minds that this is not anything that is prejudicial to the public interest at all, rather it's something which is in keeping with modern times. We're keeping up with the times, and we try to in most other policies in this province. I think that on the basis of these arguments the Act as presently amended should be sustained and that the resolution of my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition should be defeated.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to my honourable friend? I've listened with great interest to his long harangue. I'd like to ask him just one question in view of all of his statements of time being of no essence, of lots of time, this that and the other to the parties. What was the actual reason for the amending of the legislation?

MR. LYON: The actual reason for the amending of any legislation as my honourable friend well knows is to improve or to enhance the public interest and that was the main reason here.

MR. PAULLEY: You just told us it didn't make any difference.

MR. LYON: I just finished telling you it did.

MR. MOLGAT: The Attorney-General gave us a very interesting discourse on the various by-elections and elections that have been held in the Province of Manitoba for some time and tried to relate them to this matter of the length of time between the issue of the writ and the election. It seems to me, however, that he failed completely to come to the very point of this whole discussion which is the question of my honourable friend the Leader of the CCF. Why are you changing this legislation? What is the reason for changing it? You still haven't told us. You have run around the subject. You've told us there are no disadvantages at all; you spent your whole discussion telling us that there were no disadvantages in this thing. It was of no prejudice to anyone, that timing is not a matter of substance; that timing is not the essence of this thing. Well then why are you changing it? You still haven't told us.

MR. LYON: Could I ask my honourable friend a question?

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly.

MR. LYON: He realizes of course that the Act is changed. What I'm trying to find out is why are my honourable friends still opposing the Law of Manitoba?

MR. MOLGAT: Because my honourable friend never gave us an explanation last year why he was changing it, and you still haven't given us one. And we're saying once again that you have no reason to change it. If you want I'll run over the background of this thing. You proceeded to change it last year at the very same time that you were setting up a Committee of this House to study the Elections Act. A perfectly ridiculous piece of action. Just no sense. You tell the House, you tell the people of Manitoba we're going to analyse the Election Act, we're going to review it, but before we do that we're going to change it. Now what logic? None whatever. You're proceeding the same way again this year, and we're saying the very same things as we said last year; you still have given no indication to this House or to the people of Manitoba why this should be changed. (Interjection) No. What improvement is there? You've just finished telling us that time is no substance. Time doesn't make any difference. Then why change it unless you have some motives that you're not telling us about.

Now certain changes have come about in the electoral picture in Manitoba over the last few years. One of them is the redistribution. I think that we're all agreed that the redistribution was a good step. It will continue. Under the Act as it was passed we will have regular redistributions under a very clearly set-out pattern, and I think a good pattern. Now what does this mean? Well with the increase in population in the Province of Manitoba and by the very physical limitation of this House as I know it at the moment -- I think there are only two vacant chairs -- we are limited to the number of people that we're going to have here unless we change completely our seating plan. But logically we will continue with a House, of say 57 members at the moment, or possibly 59. Now as our population increases that means that the constituencies will be more populated. The redistribution in itself has meant that the rural constituencies at least by and large were substantially larger in area. Now if anything, we shouldn't have a reduction in the time that elections are called. If the members are going to be representing more population, and more area, why give them less time? What's the purpose? I can't see any logic in it. My honourable friend says -- and he runs over the by-elections, the one that was held this year, he says, there was no advantage taken of it. Well that's true. I'm not saying that there was. But isn't it quite feasible that under circumstances, certain circumstances it would be of an advantage to the government. (Interjection) No, no, no, you're the one who's changing this Act, not us. Not us. Remember we changed the redistribution. We made no suggestions at that time that we would reduce the time limit. You're the ones who are doing this. Now you say by the death of a member everyone knows that a by-election is coming up. Let's take another case. Supposing the honourable member was appointed to the bench.

MR. LYON: That's a lovely speculation.

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, and from the appointments that I see, a highly likely one, because my honourable friend has the greatest qualification going, he belongs to the right party. So, assuming that he's appointed to the Bench, now who would know about it? Not us on this side, not my honourable friends here or the Honourable Member for Rhineland. But he would know in advance and the government would know in advance, and they could proceed to call a snap by-election to suit themselves. They could do it in exactly their own timing and no one would know until they called it. Now isn't that a perfectly logical circumstance; isn't there a danger in that situation; isn't it quite possible that that would be the case?

MR. LYON: Would the honourable member permit another question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly.

MR. LYON: Is he aware of the by-election that was held recently at Turtleford in Saskatchewan where just that was done after a court order had set aside the previous election, the Premier of the province announced, I think almost at the same moment an election would be held immediately following that? Does my honourable friend think any prejudice resulted there to anybody?

MR. MOLGAT: My honourable friend is trying to say that because the Liberals won that by-election that the timing had helped. No, it's because we have a good party -- that's not the only reason -- I'm not suggesting that at all. All I'm saying is that the only conceivable reason for changing this by my honourable friends across the way is for some advantage to themselves. Well, then why are you changing it? We come back to the same discussion. You still haven't told us. Unless you intend to use this for your own particular advantages, why are you changing it? The other law worked quite well. There was no harm done at all in the extra week that was in the previous Act. What damage was there done? Whom did it hurt? What was the need for changing? Who requested that the change be made? We have found no indication at all. When it was discussed before the committee you had a group who are disinterested in the subject but interested in public affairs, the Chamber of Commerce, who made a very clear statement in this matter! "There were no groups to our knowledge who came up requesting the reduction."

But coming back to my honourable friend's speech, then he went on to general elections, and said that everyone knows that the general election will come up. Well, true, we know that sometime by 1964 one will come up. But there's nothing preventing my honourable friends from deciding to have one, let's say, is it 29 days now or 35 days, from tomorrow. My honourable friend, the Leader of the House can come in here this afternoon and can fabricate an issue and he can call an election tomorrow.

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q.C. (River Heights): You won't be here.....

MR. MOLGAT: Well, I can assure the Honourable Member for River Heights that there's a great deal more danger of his not being here than mine; if he wants to bet on that one, I'll take him on. However, that's beside the point. But that situation can arise. Now, the parties on this side have no means of knowing in advance that that's going to happen, and I suggest that any reduction in the time allowed is prejudicial to the interests of the parties in opposition, and as such prejudicial to the interests of our democracy. Because you've got to have fair treatment for all parties concerned, the only way that our system works is through the operation of our government and in opposition, and any action that the government takes to reduce the rights of the opposition and the opportunities of the people of Manitoba is harming the whole functioning of our system. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friends have so far only gone to prove in their minds that there are no disadvantages, they claim in this system, that there are no reasons according to them it should be none, but they haven't given us a single reason as to why this course of action should be followed, and I suggest that we should return exactly to the timings that existed before. It worked out quite well, it was satisfactory to all the parties concerned, and there were no objections to it by any groups that we know of.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Chairman, I listened very carefully to the speech made by the Honourable the Attorney-General and I seemed to feel and sense that he himself realized that he was on very poor grounds. He did not give us a speech of the type that he generally gives us. He seemed to apologize all the time and appeal to us all the time so that we might be good enough to support his point of view. This is not the general attitude of the

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.)....honourable minister when he addresses this House. Now he told us about the fact that in the by-election that that worked splendidly -- I do not challenge this statement very strongly, it is immaterial; it doesn't affect the issue in any way, shape or form. I think that our aim in this matter should be to provide to the electors the best possible voters' list so that they would not go to a poll and be turned down and asked to go to another poll to vote; so that they would not have to be sworn in; so that the lists should be as complete, as perfect and as accurate as it is possible to make them. Now, I realize that in a by-election the chief electoral officer together with the deputy returning officer will have time to prepare in the short lapse possibly of 35 days, a voters' list that will be somewhat accurate. But I suggest and I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that in a general election the time was already short enough before this change, because we have had so many complaints that the lists were not accurate enough. Now I'm not blaming the chief electoral officer, and everybody knows that. He's got an impossible job to do to prepare a list in all Manitoba in so short a time even as it was before. But now I think we're facing this man with an impossible situation with the appointment of deputy returning officers all over Manitoba, and for these men to prepare a list, have it certified correct, have it printed and delivered in so short a time, it's impossible to be done. And we will, in spite of all the efforts that might be made by such a conscientious man and capable man as our chief electoral officer and by the deputy returning officer, that we will not have accurate and correct lists. And we will have trouble and complaints.

Now we should do nothing, Mr. Speaker, to discourage people from using their franchise, and we have, to a certain extent, done that in the past. If we adopt this policy of the 35 days, nine days shorter, we will have more incorrectness, inaccuracy in the lists, we will have a situation where voters will come to the wrong poll, will not be on the list, will have to go out and get someone to vouch for them -- more trouble. This has the result of discouraging people from voting. And I think to me that this is the main reason why we should not adopt this policy, this shortening of the days before the issue of the writs and the election. I believe it's the main reason. We should think of the electors of Manitoba not of political parties, not in order to give a chance to a political party as against another, but we should think of the electors of Manitoba and encourage them to come to the polls and cast their vote. Now I strongly object to this change that has been made. I don't think it's good for Manitoba. I don't think that it gives a proper chance to the men who are in charge of preparing the lists. And then, with the shorter time for the candidates to be nominated in the case of a snap election -- and we may have a snap election at any time. When things start to go bad federally, it might be that the First Minister of this province will want to go to the people before Mr. Diefenbaker goes to the people, because whereas this present government came into office largely on the coat tails of the Federal Conservatives, now they're getting away from the coat tails, and I can see the day that they might call -- and I think they will try at least to call a general election in Manitoba before one takes place in the federal field. So that everybody will be surprised on our side; possibly on their side to a certain extent also. But they'll have the strength; they'll be in a position to protect themselves much more than we will. And what about the voters, what chance will they have? What chance will the Chief Electoral Officer have to provide a proper list so that the people will come to the proper place to vote. Now I strongly oppose this change that was made last year. I did oppose it last year and I oppose it again, especially when I think of the electors of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, he can correct if I'm wrong. Am I correct in assuming that the honourable member, in recollecting, that the honourable member was elected to this House about 1936?

MR. PREFONTAINE: 1935. I should not correct you on one year.

MR. LYON: 1935. Does the honourable member then Sir, putting the question to him, does the honourable member know the times that were in force in the Election Act of Manitoba in 1935, when he was first elected? Is he aware of the fact Sir, that the times that were in force then were 45 days maximum, 35 days minimum?

MR. PREFONTAINE: I'm not so positive of the figures, but I do not want to -- at this present day and age with the population increasing, I don't want to see them reduced.

MR. A. J. REID: (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister mentioned that he figured a shorter election period is better because you don't bore and tire the people with

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.)....election propaganda. Well, that's possibly true but I think it's better to bore them during an election period and tire them, than bore and tire them for the next four or five years.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. George. I might say that at the last sitting of the House, I was requested to take this motion under advisement and I am now willing, at this time, to give my considered judgment on it. I feel that this motion is out of order on the grounds of anticipation, covered by our rule 31, and some mention should be made of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, Citation 131, on Page 116. Now I will read that to the House if they wish me to. Citation 131, Page 116, Beauchesne's Fourth Edition: "In determining whether a discussion is out of order on the grounds of "anticipation" regard shall be had by Mr. Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time. The Anticipation rule which forbids discussion on a matter standing on the Paper being forestalled is dependent on the same principle as that which forbids the same question being twice raised in the same session. In applying the Anticipation rule, preference is given to the discussions which lead to the most effective result, and this has been established a descending scale of values for discussions -- Bills, Motions, Amendments, etc. Thus a bill must not be anticipated by discussion of a motion, amendment or subject matter raised on another motion. Any substantive motion standing on the Paper blocks the discussion of an amendment. An amendment on the Paper blocks the raising of its subject matter in debate. The abuse of blocking motions is obviated by the direction given to the Speaker to have regard to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time. I might read you the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which I consider that notice was given of this particular question. I might point out that usually the paragraphs in the Speech from the Throne are rather vague and do not particularly convey direct notice that the government's intention in all matters, but this is rather specific: "The Report of the Manitoba Hospital Service Plan on hospital financing, costs and premium requirements will be laid before you for your consideration." I find that on the notices of motion and now on the Order Paper of the day, they have lived up to the notice that they gave in the Speech from the Throne and I do not see my way clear to make any other ruling than the motion is out of order. I might also say that it would be possible to have the same question in a different form before the House if I did not follow the procedure that I propose to do. I therefore rule that the motion is out of order.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition)(Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I recognize on your ruling that there's not occasion for debate. I also recognize the fact that -- I certainly do not wish to trespass upon the rules on this occasion because I realize that we're working under new ones this year. I'm trying to see that we keep on as proper a basis as possible. I recognize also that there's no method of voicing an objection except to appeal against your ruling. I hesitate to do that because I don't think it's a practice that we want to follow too often. But I would like to put on record the fact I would hope that further consideration could be given to this point, because it seems to me that on the basis of this ruling that almost any matter could be prevented from coming before the House. I must enter that disclaimer, but I don't intend to appeal the rule.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege would Mr. Speaker consider letting the matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: I would be unable to do that. I have already given my ruling twice and I believe it would be a little ridiculous if we deferred it further. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform the House I adjourn that debate in favour of the Honourable Leader of our party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for Kildonan for taking the adjournment in order that I may be able to say a word or two in connection with this

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)....resolution. The House, Mr. Speaker, I think, will recall that a similar resolution was proposed by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain last year, and at that time I did not agree with the resolution that he had proposed, because at that time I had made enquiries of a number of school districts insofar as their construction grants were concerned, and had found that according to the best information that I could obtain -- there were one or two exceptions -- the construction of schools was kept pretty well in line with the \$15,000 grant basis. I also said at that time that I had a fear that if we in this legislature adopted the resolution increasing the base from 15 to \$20,000 per classroom that it might be an incentive to the construction industry and to some school boards to increase the overall costs of construction, which of course, would require a greater amount of financing both by the provincial authority and the schools boards. And for that reason at that time, I opposed the resolution on behalf of our group. However, I have made a similar survey this year, and I do find that there are a considerable number of school districts which are forced because of increased costs in construction to exceed the amount per classroom of \$15,000. I note, also, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the Department of Education is concerned that they are recognizing this fact because they do permit construction for collegiate classrooms to go above the \$15,000 per classroom to the degree of \$3,000 authorized expenditure. And while the department does permit this over-expenditure or additional expenditure of \$3,000. they do not make any contribution of that \$3,000 portion. The base is still the \$15,000. So I feel, Mr. Speaker that it is only fair to those school boards who are facing these increasing costs in excess of the \$15,000 per room that the government grant should now be increased to a higher basis. Whether the figure of \$20,000 is too high may be argued. It might be that the figure that the department recognizes itself, of \$18,000 is a more proper one. I think that could be taken under advisement by the department, because I do feel that if it is authorized for these expenditures then the government should accept the responsibility of paying the 75% of what they authorize for construction grants. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if we adopted the whole of the resolution, however, that we may be prejudicing some of those who have just recently constructed schools on the basis of the \$15,000 per classroom if the resolution which has a retroactive clause in it became effective. In saying that I also recognize however, that there are some schools which possibly have just been placed at a vote, or authority given by a vote may be prejudiced, but I think legislation could be worked out so that those under construction, if this is accepted, may receive the greater amount of the grant. In respect to those school boards who in the past may have constructed their schools and receive the approval of the department for the \$3,000 excess and have been completed, I think it may be unfortunate that they won't be covered, but I sometimes wonder whether or not it's possible to take care of all of these cases.

Now I do not intend to say much more, Mr. Speaker. I think it is a fact as I've said the construction costs have gone up. I think that we have to recognize that; the department has recognized that. I think it would be well for us in this House to recognize it accordingly. But because I say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion it may not be practical to have the retroactive clauses become effective, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows that the motion be amended, the motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain be amended by deleting all the words after the word "room" in sub-section 1 of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN:so that we don't have to get into a problem here, the word "room" appears twice in that first--I'm assuming it's "room" where it appears in the second place.

MR. PAULLEY: In the last place yes; in the last sentence at least. Thanks for the correction.

MR. SPEAKER: It would then read in subsection (1) revising the present authorized grant of \$15,000 as a maximum per schoolroom -- is that the....

MR. PAULLEY:.....\$20,000 per room, Mr. Speaker. Where the word "room" appears for the last time in subsection (1).

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this resolution the members of this House should realize that we have increased the cost of hospitalization and education and other services to the people of Manitoba, and that we are not trying to propose anything radical or plan to socialize anyone. In this House we are supposed to speak for the people of Manitoba, and what better opportunity do we have than now? Here we have a group of citizens, in fact 75% of our working forces, who are not covered by any agreement or protection, so I think it should be only just and fair that they should look to their Legislature for guidance and assistance. Sir, there is not one of us in this Chamber that receives minimum wages, yet we deny that privilege, like the dog in a manger, to others to improve their standard of living. In my place of employment I receive \$2.05 per hour and work a 40-hour week. There is only myself and the wife, yet I live very modestly in a four-room bungalow, have no summer camp or yacht, entertain only at Christmas time and New Years, the rest of the year live very humbly and quietly. Also I have no obligations to meet, such as payments on house, car, household effects, etc. I'm doing this, Sir, to illustrate an average citizen in my position how he lives. Yet, Sir, with the present cost of living and general household expenses we just manage to live -- I mean when I'm working -- just from pay day to pay day without putting a cent away, and as I have mentioned, I have no obligations to meet. Now, Sir, can you or any member in this House try and imagine or realize how any person working for 66¢ an hour, our minimum wage, try to raise a family, either rent or trying to buy a home, cope with this general rise of living costs, at the same time trying to maintain a general decent standard of living? That, Sir, is beyond my wildest scope of imagination, or in fact, that of any member, I believe, in this House. If anyone can prove to me or to this House that this is a satisfactory standard living wage for any human being in this day and age, well I'll never say any more on this subject. But, Sir, I don't think anyone in this House can honestly and sincerely do that.

Now many of you will be thinking that there are not many firms or employers that pay such wages. Well, Sir, as long as we are human you'll find all sorts of people that will take advantages of any legal or technical point of the law for their own benefits; thus the law should be that it would benefit the people and not a group of unscrupulous employers who will go to any means to exploit their fellow man. That is why this law must be changed, Sir. I have heard of cases where employers hire staff at minimum wages on the excuse that they're not experienced, but after a period of time they lay them off then hire a new staff to repeat a similar circle. True, organized labour and other groups are quite able to look after themselves, and many of you'll say, "Well, why should the Provincial Government be a bargaining agent for labour market of Manitoba?", which is absolutely true, but nevertheless, we can pass legislation to at least insure our citizens a decent minimum standard of living conditions, if we agree on this point, and believe me, Sir, it would just be a minimum living condition. Here we are concerned over world conditions when they exist right on our own doorstep. Where's that old slogan that "Charity begins at home?" So let's start the ball rolling and propose such a legislation in Manitoba, because year after year -- actually what legislation, when you consider it, do we pass for people in such a category? When you read this resolution, Sir, I don't see anything socialistic in it or that is repulsive to the two old-line parties. Quote: "Whereas the cost of living has been rising steadily since the end of World War II, and whereas the average wages have been increased in order to keep in line with the cost of living; and whereas in many parts of Canada, including Manitoba, minimum wage rates have not kept pace with the increased cost of living; Therefore be it resolved that this House wishes the Government to give consideration to the advisability of taking the initiative in proposing to the Federal Government that, in conjunction with all the provinces, steps should be taken without delay to institute a minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour for all workers in Canada."

Now, Sir, we're not instigating a program that just Manitoba should have \$1.25 an hour. All we're asking this government is to propose to the Federal Government a national wage scheme of \$1.25 across Canada, and I don't think, Sir, in times, as I mentioned, in these times that it's asking too much. It's not putting any onus on this government or any party at all; all we're just proposing is to get all together right across Canada and ask our Federal Government. So let's all get together and really show the people of Manitoba that we are working on their behalf and make Manitoba and Canada a nation in this world that people will hold up as an example and not as a ridicule. So, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all members to support this

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.) resolution regardless of party, as it in no way interferes with any party policy and we all claim we desire our citizens to have a decent standard of living.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River Heights, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, none of us want to see anyone impoverished because of disease, because of suffering from a disease, and in Manitoba we have gone a long way towards helping those who suffer from cancer. We have, firstly, the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan which provides for hospitalization, unlimited hospitalization, for anyone that goes into hospital without charge other than the premium, and that is certainly a great help to anyone who might have to go there for a long time. And then we have had announced to us within the last few days that the Manitoba Medical Service has extended its policies so that it is possible to get coverage, complete medical coverage, from the Manitoba Medical Service regardless of age, for \$10.50 for three months for a single person. This makes it possible for many, many people who couldn't get insurance in the past to now get insurance so that they can be relieved of a large medical bill. And then we also have other insurance policies available. The Member for Seven Oaks told us of one, but there are other companies too that make insurance policies available to cover the cost, expenses in connection with disease of various kinds. And we have, of course, in Manitoba, Medicare cards. Approximately 17,000 of our older and disabled citizens have Medicare cards which entitle them, without charge, to medical care for whatever medical care they may require. We have, too, the fact that doctors are not very -- not such a hard-hearted group as some people might think, and they, generally speaking, have regard to the means of their patients when they make up their bills, and if people have difficulty paying, if people can't pay, the doctors generally are more lenient and reduce their charges accordingly. And we have, too, in Manitoba some of the best doctors and the best of treatment that can be obtained here in respect of cancer, and we will have more facilities too when the new Cancer Research and Treatment building is constructed with the help of those who used to be in the Blue Cross and with the help from this government.

The Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation provides various services and is an organization which provides cancer treatment in the St. Boniface and Winnipeg General Hospitals. They provide free treatment with radio-active therapy insofar as X-rays and Cobalt Bomb treatment is concerned, radium and radium substitutes are concerned, and insofar as there is treatment from radio-active isotopes. The Cancer Foundation provides complete diagnostic services including biopsy services to both in-patients and out-patients, and all this service is provided without charge to those receiving the treatment. And they provide a follow-up treatment from both of these hospitals; they follow-up their patients to make sure that they are receiving proper treatment and to check on their condition. They also do research work and they keep a central cancer registry where they keep an account and track and record of all cancer patients in the Province of Manitoba. Transportation is provided without charge to those who cannot pay it, to the hospitals from points in the city by taxi, and from points outside of the city into the city by other means of transportation. And also for those who cannot afford to pay board and room in the city when they come in from the country, they are provided with board and room. The Foundation expended in the year ending March 31st, 1960, the sum of \$491,506 in Manitoba, or almost half a million dollars, of which approximately \$115,000 was provided from the costs paid by the Manitoba Hospital Service Plan to in-patients in the two treatment hospitals, \$183,694 came from the Federal Government and \$192,883 came from the Provincial Government. We have in addition in Manitoba, the Manitoba Division of the Canadian Cancer Society which provides financial help for research, and last year it sent over \$50,000 to Toronto, to the Cancer Institute, which is the chief institute in Canada for cancer research, and in turn, the Institute sent over \$50,000 back to Manitoba to carry on research work here. We have -- this organization provides cancer dressings to all patients outside of hospital, without charge; all patients in Manitoba who need them and who ask for them.

One of the main functions of the Manitoba Division of the Canadian Cancer Society is

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.).... education, for -- as I think most of you know -- if you discover cancer in the early stages very often the treatment will be successful in stopping the growth. And it is important that as many people as possible learn the signs so that they can tell if there is any cancer tissue or if they have any suspect of cancerous tissue on their own body. And we as MLAs can do our part to help in the cure of cancer. Each one of us can do something, and we can do our part by trying to have various organizations to which we belong and other organizations with whom we may come into contact, to have a representative of the Canadian Cancer Society come and speak to the organization and show the films that they've got, and have their doctor tell the people of ways and means of discovering cancer in its early stages. Each one of us can help by persuading organizations to have these films shown to them and to have the doctors from the society speak to them and answer questions. The doctors are available without charge, and in some districts in Manitoba, perhaps particularly in St. Vital and in Fort Garry, there's been quite a lot of information given out to various organizations, but in other parts of the province there has not been the call for this educational material that is so readily available. As a matter of fact, it's not only available from the main office in Winnipeg, but it is available from many of the centres throughout the province including Brandon, Portage la Prairie, Dauphin, Minnedosa, Flin Flon, Neepawa, The Pas, Altona, Killarney, Morden, Carman, Beausejour, Pine Falls, Selkirk, Gimli, Steinbach and Souris. At all of these centres there are films available and speakers available who will tell organizations of ways and means of discovering cancer early, so that it can be cured in many cases. As a matter of fact statistics show that in the last five-year period there has been a greater number of cancer-cured, and it is thought that the reason for this is that there has been more education of the people to recognize cancer in its early stages. Also the Cancer Society provides TV shorts for our TV stations, and they have leaflets to distribute to organized groups and individuals. At present the Cancer Society is collaborating with the Department of Education and with the Winnipeg Public School Board in carrying on a campaign to try and have the students stop smoking. There is a definite relationship between smoking, particularly smoking of cigarettes, to lung cancer, and the recent survey has shown that a great many of the students even in the Junior High as well as the Senior High are smoking, and in parts of Winnipeg an educational program is being started in the high schools and in the junior highs which lead into the high schools, and they will be shown a film and given a talk with regard to the danger of cancer -- lung cancer from smoking. And it is hoped that after two years when this experimental campaign has been completed -- it is the first such campaign in Canada -- that a further survey will be made to see if this incidence of smoking among the students is as high as it is today.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we find that in Manitoba there is much help available for cancer patients, and we also find that in Manitoba, like other places, there are a number of people who can afford to pay for the cost of treatment. And I think that we should let people who can afford to pay for the cost, pay for such costs instead of perhaps having the taxpayers help them. Many taxpayers can ill-afford perhaps to pay taxes which would benefit to some extent people that are well-off. If we are going to consider diseases that are expensive to some people, we should certainly consider all diseases and not just cancer. You can have a great deal of expense, we'll say, from arteriosclerosis and other diseases which carry on over a long period of years. I would like to see some day in the not too far distant future where there will be assistance given to those who are faced with catastrophic medical expenses and who have small incomes, and the assistance to their relationship to the income. But that is not the motion before this House today. We have done quite a lot in Manitoba towards helping the cancer patient.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in case some of the newer members don't remember that if they wanted to speak they could have taken the adjournment -- I'm sure my honourable colleague would agree with that -- to waive the adjournment, because by him taking the adjournment, of course, it would mean that the debate would be wound up at the next time.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, in view of the "humps", I wish to move, seconded

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.)..... by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. EVANS: this point, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we should suggest that by unanimous consent of the House the motion which is before us might be withdrawn at the suggestion of the Leader of the CCF Party and the agreement of the mover and seconder? --(Interjection) -- Then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it might be open now to my honourable friend, the Minister of Health and Public Welfare.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, the reflexes were slow this afternoon. I'd like to move, seconded by the Minister of Education, that debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Portage la Prairie): for the Honourable Member for Roblin, I wonder if this matter can be permitted to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Speaker, this resolution touches on a subject that is of very real concern to all of us in this House. The Honourable Member for St. John's has shown very graphically that a need for better housing for many of our citizens exists here in this city, and to a lesser extent, in the other urban areas of the province. One would be very blind indeed if he did not see that there is a great need here in Winnipeg for a slum clearance and urban renewal project. Large areas in the centre of the old city are in varying states of decay. This has been a prime subject of Winnipeg city politics for some years, and I would congratulate the city government on their decision to proceed with this scheme. Now when this government took office, Mr. Speaker, on June 28th, 1959, Manitoba had for some years been lagging behind the rest of Canada in its development. National rate of growth in 1959 was 3.9%, while in Manitoba the rate was minus 1.5%. The new administration was faced with many, many problems and some sort of priority had to be followed, the first of which was to re-awaken in Manitoba the spirit of enterprise; to get Manitoba moving again; to bring our rate of growth at least up to the national average, and if possible ahead of that average. Now, Mr. Speaker, the statistics show that a very large percentage of our unemployed lack any special skills. These are in large part the inhabitants of the slum areas. This waste of human resources had to be fought. The largest and most immediate field of endeavour in this area was in education. The Minister has very ably presented the record of his administration in stopping this waste. New opportunities for a good education in Manitoba are graphically emphasized in the figures of increased enrollment in the high schools, particularly in the rural areas. New technical training facilities are being made available. Grants to universities increased from 1.565 million in 1957-8, to 4.126 million in 1960-61. Scholarships and loan funds increased from \$25,000 in 1957-58, to \$300,000 in 1960-61. The Industrial Development work done by the Department of Industry and Commerce in the last two years were a tremendous value in increasing job opportunities here in Manitoba, and the Minister recently drew our attention to how essential it is for this effort to be maintained. To assure our future growth it has been necessary to spend large sums on power development - \$140 million being spent at Grand Rapids and large expenditures at the Selkirk generating stations and the new distribution facilities. In agriculture new emphasis and drive had to be given to special crops development; to increase opportunity for the farmers; to intensify the farming effort; to make it possible for our rural areas to support larger populations at higher economic levels. Roads, too, urgently required heavy expenditures to up-date the network. Grants to municipalities, cities and town for help in road construction have increased from 2.62 million in 1957-8 to 4.37 million in 1960-61. Total road expenditures have risen from 20.862 million in 1957-8 to 31.53 million in 1960-61. Included in this is the tremendous "roads to resources" program participated in by this government; large amounts of money invested in the future of our great northland, investments, Mr. Speaker, that will yield handsome dividends. In sum, Mr. Speaker, this government has embarked on a program of developing and expanding the economy of Manitoba. They've also materially aided the municipalities and cities with their financial burdens. Total municipal grants have increased from 42.33 million in '57-8 to 57.824 million in '60-61, an increase of 15.492 million. The City of

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd.).... Winnipeg occupies a rather special position in the province having as it does a large proportion of the population and wealth of the province, but it too, has received substantially more financial help than in previous years.

I think the honourable members will agree from the foregoing that while this government has not directly entered any urban rehabilitation program, it has very materially helped all cities and municipalities with their financial burdens. Despite all this, the government has not been completely idle in housing. In '58 direct grants were made to three senior citizens housing projects providing accommodations for 206 persons. In '59 a new Elderly Persons' Housing Act was brought in which, besides increasing outright grants, also provided for supervision and planning of all senior citizens' housing. This provided much needed direction to all the private and municipal groups interested in this field. It also provided substantial assistance in planning and detailed design of this very important type of housing; the results have been most gratifying. During 1960, grants were made to projects providing accommodation for 409 persons, nearly double the previous year, and at present there are a total of 45 projects in various stages of planning; 33 of these projects have been defined as to size and they will provide accommodation for 1,414 persons, and this number, I am sure, will increase substantially as the year progresses. The new Social Allowances legislation has also helped to relieve the municipal tax load by taking over a large part of long-term welfare case load. In addition there is built into the regulations, a rental allowance that permits locating welfare cases in proper surroundings with adequate housing.

Another field where much has been done is in the area of community planning. Last year the Provincial Planning Service was under the guidance of the Metropolitan Planning Commission and was providing a planning service for 16 communities. At that time it was expanded and incorporated in the planning section of the Department of Industry and Commerce. It now provides a community planning service for 37 cities and towns in the Province of Manitoba. This service is most important in the local interest it develops; in the new awareness it stimulates in town planning. It creates an atmosphere and environment in which the formation of new slum areas is inhibited, in which proper redevelopment schemes can develop to fruition. I agree that this planning program is not directly affecting the symptoms of the disease of urban decay, but, Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is attacking the disease at its source. And here, Mr. Speaker, is the vehicle we should use for attacking the symptoms. Here we have the framework within which the planning necessary can be done in the proper environment, where direction can be given to the whole pattern of a community's development. In this framework subsidized housing takes its proper place as a spoke in the wheel of future planning and development, and I submit, Sir, that here it can be most economically and efficiently accomplished. Therefore, Sir, I find I cannot support the resolution as it is presently framed.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question? Are you suggesting therefore that we don't need the housing?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: At the very outset, Sir, I pointed out that there was a need for this type of housing in the communities.

MR. ORLIKOW: You don't think we should do anything about it?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I think my words are quite plain. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he's rather trying to taking them out of context.

MR. ORLIKOW: I hope you don't speak for the government.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Portage has enlightened us with a series of extraneous material which really hasn't too much bearing on the resolution under question. The review of the Agricultural Roads to Resources and Educational Facilities of the province really, in my opinion, haven't too much bearing on the need for housing and slum clearing urban renewal. I think that the Honourable Member from Portage has unfortunately, in my opinion, taken a very dim attitude to the great need for this housing at the present time. He referred to grants made by the government to senior citizens housing in '58, '59 and '60. He didn't say how large the provincial share was or how extensive their assistance was. He referred to attacking disease at its source, and I think this is exactly the purpose of the resolution presented by the Honourable Member from St. John's. I think that attacking disease at its source includes the clearing of some of these desperate slum areas and the replacing in these areas of decent housing at low cost. The Government of Canada has recognized this need,

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.).... and has recognized it, I think, in a very tangible manner. It has recognized it to the extent of offering 75% of the costs of providing this kind of housing -- this kind of slum clearance and this kind of urban renewal. We have gradually recognized the need for it in the City of Winnipeg in particular through the various boards which have studied it, the Welfare Council, the Urban Renewal Board, who have come up with clear-cut and definite suggestions towards solving this problem. The Council of the City of Winnipeg has gradually shown more and more interest towards the development of these projects. I think that whether this resolution is properly worded in calling for the establishment of a new departmental division on housing is necessary or not, I think that the philosophy of the resolution is very good. For as long as the Federal Government is prepared to put up 75% of the cost of this type of redevelopment and the City of Winnipeg or the urban districts involved are prepared to put up their share of the cost of these housing projects, then I suggest that we, as provincial taxpayers, should be prepared to put up and assist with our share.

I, along with many other members read with a great deal of disappointment the article which referred to the Government of Manitoba more or less reluctantly giving their approval, and this consisted of approval without any financial expenditure to projects which obviously are very worthwhile and very necessary. I think we, as taxpayers in the province, federal taxpayers, are -- and this is true -- we as federal taxpayers are assisting the people of Toronto in particular, the people of Ontario in urban centres who are getting over half of this federal money which is going into this kind of housing and yet we are not calling for any of it for ourselves. I think that we are making a mistake not going forward and showing some leadership in this field of slum clearing and urban renewal. So I would urge the Government of Manitoba to show more enthusiasm for this very necessary work, because this -- using the words of the Honourable Member for Portage -- is attacking disease at its source. The slum areas of Winnipeg in particular are sources of many diseases; they are the sources of criminal problems, of social problems, of economic problems. Many, many tests or many, many surveys conducted in this field have shown that people redeveloped from these areas into better housing have developed into better class citizens and have, before long, found themselves in areas as taxpayers, have found themselves in their own homes and have found themselves to be rejuvenated citizens. So if for no other reason than for attacking disease at its source, the disease of the slums, the disease of crime waves, the disease of fire dangers, of the necessary police protection, of all the diseases of the Welfare Department, then I suggest that the Government of Manitoba should seriously consider this proposal.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, it would seem that housing problems, like the poor, have always been with us. But the inadequate housing problem has been aggravated by the increasing trend towards urbanization and reached its height during World War II and afterwards. In 1944 pressure on the Federal Government led to the enactment of The National Housing Act which opened the way to dealing with the problems on a national basis. It was not until 1949 that amendments were passed introducing the principle of subsidy for the first time. The principle of subsidized housing -- as we well know -- is that the taxpayers should make up the difference between rents which would be necessary to make houses or apartment blocks paying propositions and rents which low wage-earners or income-receivers can afford to pay.

How are these costs of housing projects met? In Canada the legislation of 1949 provides for the Federal Government to supply 75% of the capital investment and annual operating loss, if any, and for the Provincial Government to supply the remaining 25%. The latter may share its 25% with the municipalities in any way it sees fit. Since 1949 all but two Canadian provinces have passed complementary legislation. The two exceptions are Quebec and Prince Edward Island. Under the terms of the legislation, some nine to 10,000 units have been approved throughout the country. Of this number a total of 6,225 units have been completed, of which 968 were completed in incomplete projects. I would like to point out that of the 6,225 units complete, none were completed for Manitoba!

How is this plan put into operation. Projects are initiated by the municipality and then approved by the Provincial and Federal Governments. The province and the municipality supply lands and services, while plans and construction are undertaken by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The province, in consultation with Central Mortgage and Housing, appoints a local housing authority which acts as landlord, selecting tenants, establishing and

(Mr. Harris, cont'd.).... collecting rents in accordance with the agreement worked out by the partnership. Arrangements for sharing costs between province and municipality have varied with some municipalities paying relatively little and others the full 25%. Selection of tenants to occupy subsidized public housing units is based on agreements worked out by the partnership and works in the following way: A short time before the units are ready for occupancy, newspaper advertisements announce that applications will be accepted. A written application is required. Each family is then visited by a trained investigator, unless it is automatically disqualified on such grounds as being over the income limit. Tenants are chosen by recommendations of the investigator to the authority which make the decision as based on the following point system: inadequate accommodation - 30 points; notice to vacate - 15 points; numbers of dependents - 10 points; size of the income - with regard to rent - 10 points; size of the income - 5 points; separate families - 15 points; health factors - 15 points, which comes to 100 points. In cases where construction of the project was done on cleared land priority is given to the tenants of the demolished housing. All rents are scaled to the family income, regardless of the size of the unit it occupies. Frequent adjustments are made to keep rent in line with changes in income and family size. For example, a family with three children living on an income of \$300 per month would pay \$65 per month. But I might remind you that according to a survey in 1955 of Greater Winnipeg, at least one-fifth of the families in Greater Winnipeg earned less than \$233 per month. In my constituency -- the CPR and Notre Dame area -- the 1955 study showed that 77.3 % of the families had incomes of less than \$200 per month. It can be readily seen, therefore, that even though all the families pay a shelter rental rate of about 22% of income, on the average, and this is subsidized, this is still an extremely heavy burden on low or moderate family income.

At the time of the 1951 census of Canada, nearly 1,435,000 families earned less than \$3,000 per annum. At that time more than 30% of all Canadian heads of families who were employees earned less than \$2,000 per annum. Most families with such incomes literally cannot save sufficiently to provide a down payment toward the purchase of a home. Those who can manage to save or borrow the required down payment often do not have sufficient income on a required basis to maintain a satisfactory standard of living and at the same time pay a relatively large monthly payment for mortgage interest, repayment of principal and municipal taxes. The basic need for most of these families is rental housing at a price which is a reasonable proportion of their incomes. Yet a family wishing to rent housing has a problem just as difficult. In addition to attaining the financial capacity to pay a specified rental each month, there is a larger problem of finding housing for rent in sufficient quantity to provide a choice of space, location and adequate quality at a price consistent with their income. It is an undeniable fact that in the overcrowded least satisfactory outworn sections of our city quite inadequate shelter often rents at prices which are exorbitant.

The 1955 housing survey by the City of Winnipeg Emergency Housing Department showed a need for 3,900 low rental units in Greater Winnipeg. This need has increased due to the number of housing units since demolished. This need has increased due to larger numbers being unemployed at the present time. This need has increased due to the lower purchasing power of our dollar. The essence of housing problems is, therefore, the need for low-rental housing.

Now, Sir, I would like to say this. Taken from some of our papers -- I won't go into detail on them because I think this has done pretty well, what should have been done -- "More than 4,000 families in poor housing" -- It goes on to say here: "Sees low rental projects as only answer. Winnipeg Welfare Department officials believe there are more than 4,000 families in the city who occupy housing that adversely affects their well-being. Mr. Patrick, Director of Welfare, cites the figure Monday in a report to the City Welfare Committee. At the same meeting committee was told another five families had to be evicted from city-owned accommodation at Flora Place because of overcrowding. Mr. Patrick said that the 4,000 family estimate made in 1955 had probably increased in the last five years because of demolition of dwellings in the downtown area. In a period from May 1st to June 24th this year, 153 families applied to the Welfare Department for assistance in locating housing. These families comprise 853 persons; of the 153 families, 25 were living in dwellings which were unsanitary or violated terms of The Manitoba Health Act" -- that's a good one for our Minister of Health and Welfare. "Another 70 families were homeless and had been evicted or had been given notice to vacate.

(Mr. Harris, cont'd.)..... 'The problem can be met only by increasing the stock of low rental housing', said Mr. Patrick. Without an increase and even with slum clearance in the centre of the city, our areas will invariably deteriorate and become slums. A year ago when the city removed several families whose presence in Flora Place created a violation of provincial statutes, concern in overcrowding, the evictions were held up almost six months. Monday, the Welfare Committee was told that five additional families would be evicted singly, and only as alternate accommodation becomes available. As four of the families are receiving city welfare, they are a city responsibility." So you see, Sir, we need something done, and something done really fast, in this Manitoba of ours.

The City of Winnipeg, I notice, has been trying to do various things. They have talked this subject over time and time again. I don't see our Provincial Government doing anything; they just say, "Well just go ahead", but is there anything behind this going ahead? I would say that our Provincial Government should tell these various people that are going to put on the low housing project, "You have our support", and that's the only way that we could possibly do things; that is if we work together, but if one is going to hide his head in the sand and let the other guy carry the load I don't see how we could do anything.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, if any one factor can point to why we should do away with the Zone A and Zone B system under our Fair Wages Act, it was a strike that we had last year at Brandon Packers in Brandon, Manitoba. What happened there, Sir, the company used the argument that they were in the low wage area, couldn't afford to pay wages that were any higher. What are the facts, Mr. Speaker? What happened? The people were forced to go out on strike. Worker was set against worker. People were getting into fights. One of them had to go to jail because he was found guilty of assaulting a fellow that, I believe, intimidated him to do so. The government, by having this Zone A and Zone B system, in a sense, Mr. Speaker, are controlling wages in certain areas. If they want to control wages, let them control prices too. What happened? Brandon Packers said they couldn't afford to pay more money. What are the facts? Were the people in Brandon getting their product any cheaper? No, Sir. Facts are this, that in Winnipeg, Dauphin, Emerson you could buy Brandon Packers' products for five cents a pound cheaper than you could in Brandon, right where they were produced. What did the enquiry bring out, Sir? It brought out that the company could well afford to pay higher wages, much more than what they actually finally settled for, and so I say, Mr. Speaker, that to get away and not see this thing happen again, that this government should immediately abolish the zoning system under our Fair Wages Act.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would permit a question. If The Fair Wage Act is a means by which the government can control wages, would he recommend the abolishing of The Fair Wage Act?

MR. PETERS: Extend it to the whole province.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the following resolution: Whereas in the Province of Manitoba there are many farms and market gardens where the land is not contiguous; And Whereas such parcels of land, although not contiguous, are very often in near proximity; And Whereas under Section 1011, subsection (2) of The Municipal Act, tax exemptions on farm buildings apply only to those cases where there are 40 or more contiguous acres and four or more contiguous acres of market garden land; Therefore be it resolved that this House wishes the government to give consideration to the advisability of amending Section 1, 011 of The Municipal Act, so that all farmers and market gardeners, whose chief source of income is from the land, pension income excluded, be exempt

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.).... from taxation on their farm buildings, irrespective of acreage.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I presented this same resolution last year. I think that consequently I need not speak at any great length on it at this time. I would, however, like to point out something that's rather obvious, and that is the fact that no human action is ever perfect and no legislation is ever perfect, and when it becomes obvious that the inequities in legislation are there, and when the unfairness in the legislation becomes too great, then remedial action is necessary. It's not a duty. Now I think that as regards this problem of farmland continuity we have now this problem facing us, because in the constituency that I represent, not to mention other constituencies throughout the province, there are so many cases coming up from time to time showing the unfairness inherent in the present Municipal Act in this respect. If farmland and market garden land is — the owners of this land are to be exempt from their buildings, it seems logical to assume and logical to demand legislation which would provide all bona fide farmers and market gardeners this exemption. Along the river lots just east of the Red River we can find practically every third market gardener thus affected. I don't know whether this is a small enough problem that we should ignore it. I feel rather, Mr. Speaker, that it's existed for a considerable number of years; it's an unfair situation, and that something could be done, and I suggest that the terms of this resolution, even with some changes, would deal with the problem. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, I know personally of market gardeners who are bona fide market gardeners in every sense of the word, and who normally would be exempt from taxation on their farm buildings because they have more than the required number of acres, but because this acreage does not happen to be in one piece — it might be a quarter of a mile away or an eighth of a mile away from their home property — and because of this kind of situation they have to pay taxes on their farm buildings. And I see absolutely no justification for this. And I will rest my case on this short statement. Just to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that I know very well that the late Minister of Municipal Affairs had something much like this in mind and spoke to this type of resolution when he was here. The Member for Selkirk also is well acquainted with this injustice. The Member for Springfield — sorry he's not here — also made mention of this on at least one or two occasions. If other members are not familiar with the problem then I think they could acquaint themselves with it by referring to back copies of last year's Hansard. Mr. Speaker, I would ask members of this House to give this resolution sympathetic consideration, and I would solicit their support.

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

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

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

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would crave the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand?

MR. J. D. WATT (Arthur) presented Bill No. 11, An Act to incorporate The Manitoba Automobile Museum Foundation for second reading.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, on this bill on the second reading of it I would like to say a word in appreciation of the organizer and founder of this quite unique museum. It is a distinct tourist attraction for the Province of Manitoba, and it by no means should be regarded as just a collection of second-hand cars or junk. The cars that have been acquired and have been put into working order are indeed museum pieces, and I think all you have to do is to look at news-stands these days to see the publications which depend on old cars for their editorial content to realize it's a subject of very lively interest in peoples' minds and in tourists' minds these days. I think in this particular location it's also very welcome that we have something of a roadside attraction at which the tourist can stop, and which will, I am certain, be a tourist attraction for the Town of Elkhorn and enable them to build other tourist attractions and other tourist facilities around it. And so I think — I would just like to pause at the second reading of this bill to note that there are 65 cars of various makes, models and years at this museum. Forty of

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) them have been rebuilt, and they conform professionally with the original design and specifications. A high degree of craftsmanship has gone into the restoration of the cars. Forty of these old cars are in running order. I think we should pay tribute to the work that has been done in this way and the skill and care with which it has been carried out. This collection is valued at between \$75,000 and \$100,000 and I think we should pause to note that Mr. Isaac Clarkson has deeded this property in perpetuity to the Village of Elkhorn. I think this is a fine example of public spirit on the part of Mr. Clarkson, and it would be well if we took note of it in this House, and I wanted it drawn to the attention of the honourable members.

I think we should note too that the Village of Elkhorn has taken steps itself to raise substantial sums of money to help to build this museum. They have not come to the government for financial aid but we have been able to assist them with advice as to organization and the incorporation of their fund. And so at this moment I'm taking advantage of the second reading of this bill. I would like to pay tribute to Mr. Isaac Clarkson for his devoted work in this connection and for his public spirit in making this deed in perpetuity to the Town of Elkhorn.

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

MR. SCARTH presented Bill No. 8, An Act to amend an Act to incorporate The University of Manitoba Foundation for second reading.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Speaker, the objects are fairly brief. The first amending clause is to the effect that the Foundation Fund should have same powers of investment of this fund as have insurance companies within our province, which is an enlargement over the present Trustee Act. The second amendment merely coincides with a change, or brings the Act up-to-date, by naming the Winnipeg Board of Trade, or substituting the expression, the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce for Winnipeg Board of Trade, and likewise substituting the phrase The Winnipeg and District Labour Council in place of the former body known as The Winnipeg Trade and Labour Council. And the last amendment, Sir, is to give the corporation itself the power to keep the funds in the same way as they had to be delegated to other trust companies or corporations originally.

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

MR. Wm. H. HAMILTON (Dufferin) presented Bill No. 29, An Act respecting the Town of Winkler, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. HAMILTON: Mr. Speaker, this bill would merely give the Town of Winkler permission to acquire approximately 53 acres of land from the Rural Municipality of Stanley for the construction of a brand new high school. The details of this bill can be discussed in committee.

MR. SCHREYER: Would the honourable member repeat the acreage involved?

MR. HAMILTON: According to this map, around 53 acres of land, Mr. Speaker. I may add to that that part of this will be used for a subdivision for homes and such.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 28. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SCARTH presented Bill No. 28, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (1), for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Speaker, the first amendment as to 62(a) is one giving a wider scope of purchasing redeemable treasury bills a longer time after the end of each fiscal year. The second amendment as to the Canadian Legion is merely enlarging the scope of those who might be beneficiaries, that is, who might receive grants. Originally there was the Men's Musical Club, the Women's Institute of Winnipeg, the Manitoba Schools Orchestra, and so forth, and now they have taken in the Canadian Legion. The third amendment is to give the board power to make a grant to a teacher on its staff to enable him to take a further and advanced study. The last amendment, Sir, that is the amendment to 75 (d) was a subject of some controversy within the School Board itself; that is, that the Chairman of the Board of Trustees could not vote except on a casting vote. I might say to the House, however, that an amendment will be asked for when the bill goes to committee, if it goes, somewhat softening up the legislation as

(Mr. Scarth, cont'd.) it is intended now and I will therefore say nothing further about it until such time as the amendment does come before the committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington. Second reading of Bill No. 20 - the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand.

MR. REID presented Bill No. 21, An Act to amend the East Kildonan Charter, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, actually the bill is self-explanatory, but nevertheless I'll explain it. All it is, it's the ward boundaries within the City of East Kildonan; they wish to change the around. They won't encroach on either the city property line, the City of Winnipeg, or the North Kildonan line. It's one of the oldest wards, Ward 1; it's a little smaller than the other wards, Ward II is enlarged, so it's just a matter of moving the boundaries within the municipality itself, and it won't encroach on either any municipality or city outside the city of East Kildonan.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 32, An Act to validate By-Law No. 766 of the Town of Rapid City. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, permission for this to stand please.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand.

MR. E. I. DOW (Turtle Mountain) presented Bill No. 18, An Act respecting the Rural Municipality of Whitewater and The Minto Cemetery Company, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, this bill is a matter of transferring the rights of operating the cemetery from an old-time voluntary company. In Whitewater Municipality you own certain land and there is no evidence that they have incorporated as a company, and a by-law has been passed by the municipality accepting the responsibility of operating this certain property as a cemetery. The bill asks for that permission, Sir.

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

MR. STANES presented Bill No. 17, An Act to amend An Act respecting the School District of St. James, No. 7, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, there are really three sections to this bill; 1, 2, 3, and 5 and 6 concern the name, which is the change and the creation of the school division. The second section, No. 4, concerns the timing of election. Last year there was an amendment to the St. James City Charter bringing the election timing into line with Winnipeg, and it was omitted from the school board and so that brings that in line. The last item does require some explanation. It is concerning, Mr. Speaker, a piece of land which is located in the north-east corner of St. James. Prior to the creation of St. James, this area was included into the Brooklands School Division. I think it was in the year 1908. In 1921, when St. James was created out of the Municipality of Assinibola, this section of land was not included. It was not included in the school administration of St. James; it remained in Brooklands, but it was included into the administrative area of St. James. So in other words we have this area at the moment which is under the municipal administration of the City of St. James, and is the City of St. James, but for school purposes, it comes under Brooklands. The area itself, Mr. Speaker, consists of 597 acres, and that area consists of 363 acres -- in other words almost a little more than half -- which is the Airport, Crown land. One hundred and one acres is owned by the City of St. James, and the balance, 133 acres, is privately owned. The number of houses in that area -- perhaps I should explain first, Sir, that the industrialization of that area has been creeping north and into this area, and bit by bit as St. James has developed this area for industrial purposes by the expenditure of several millions on sewers and services, the people have been pulling out. I might also add that in that regard the City of St. James has helped them considerably in locating elsewhere, a number in St. James. There are only 11 residents in this area at

(Mr. Stanes, cont'd.)..... the moment, so I am informed, who have 15 children at school. Now you might ask a very logical question: Why hasn't this matter been dealt with before, because as you can imagine, it is an administrative problem by one area being controlled by two groups of official bodies? The reason that it wasn't done before or questioned before is because there were a great number more children going to school and Brooklands area was the logical place for them to go to school. As this has become more industrialized, the number of school children has been decreasing. Therefore it has become more logical to approach this problem at the moment. Also, Mr. Speaker, as St. James is selling the land to prospective buyers, or to buyers for development into industrial property, St. James has had to answer the difficult question, what will it cost me in total taxes? And St. James has been unable to give that full answer because it could not give the higher tax rate for Brooklands. Therefore it came upon St. James to ask for purely administrative purposes and purely for a cleaning-up operation, to ask that this be included in the administration of St. James municipally and for school purposes. Now what will be the effect of this, which everybody asks? It's a little difficult to give accurately, Mr. Speaker, because I have not got the actual figures. We were hearing just the other day, in fact it was yesterday afternoon, how St. James — the cost of education had been going up, the grants had been going down, because of the increase in industrialization. This is exactly the point. St. James will pay quite a high price for including this area into the City of St. James even in spite of the fact that they will get the school taxes for this area. I am quite convinced that there will be very little change. In other words what St. James will lose, Brooklands will pick up. Unfortunately it's a complicated calculation, and I have not got those figures, but I am assured that those figures will be available for us in Law Amendments. And there's another factor before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, and that is the legal aspects of this matter. Now they're very complicated. I'm not competent to speak about them, but I believe and understand that there is some legal technicalities which I think will be presented to the committee at second reading.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable member if any of this land in question has been the subject of debate and court case in connection with the school division?

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say this, that I represent some of the people in the Brooklands School District, and I feel that their interests are involved here, certainly in a financial way, and although I'm not prepared to speak on this at the present time I think it's fair to indicate that I'm opposed to it, and I think I can make no mistake in saying I'm opposed to the principle involved, and I give fair warning that when it comes to committee I will be in opposition to this bill.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member can answer my question as he wishes to without in any way interfering with his right to close the debate. Could I have an answer to that question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned. Because of the intervention of the Minister of Agriculture it would, as the First Minister has properly pointed out, bring a second speaker into the question.

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

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