

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, Tuesday, March 14th, 1961.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Muriel Lyons and Others praying for the passing of An Act respecting the Practice of Speech and Hearing Therapy.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. CLERK: The petition of James Malcolm Halliday and Others praying for the passing of An Act to incorporate The Great North Savings and Loan Association. The petition of the Hudson Bay Mining Employees' Health Association praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Hudson Bay Mining Employees' Health Association.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees. Adjourned debate on the motion standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the express purpose of perusing and studying the remarks made by the First Minister when he introduced this motion, and on behalf of the Official Opposition I wish to state that we fully concur in the step that is being taken by the government, and that we fully concur in the reasons given by the First Minister for setting up this committee. In connection with the set of principles which the First Minister mentioned as having been extracted from the committees of a similar nature set up in the United Kingdom and in Australia, I believe that if our committee does adopt these principles they will be sufficiently exhaustive and comprehensive to ensure that that committee will properly and efficiently carry out the duties that are being entrusted to it. I feel too, Mr. Speaker, that the setting up of this committee is a step in the right direction, and the government is to be commended upon taking this step. To me, it gives to this committee, who are members of the Legislature, supervisory control over authority which we are delegating to the executive branch of the government, and by that means we can ensure that any regulations that are passed are in strict conformity to the legislation in respect of which they are passed. There is only one suggestion which I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, and that is this, that I do believe that this committee should be empowered to sit during recess, so that if there is any legislation brought down during this session in respect of which regulations will be enacted, we will be able to peruse these regulations and we will keep our work at least current from this time on. I also wish to thank those who were kind enough to put me on the committee. I feel that it will be very instructive; it will be very educational; and I do wish to congratulate the government on the step that they have taken.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, may I say on behalf of our group that we've also considered the introductory remarks of the First Minister in connection with this committee. I join with the Honourable Member for Selkirk in saying that this is a forward step. There have been times in the past when we have questioned some of the delegated power to others outside of this Assembly. I think one of the functions of the committee will be to draw to our attention, after a perusal of the regulations, any of the regulations which in their opinion they seem to be -- regulations which could well be the subject of legislation rather than a regulation. I have in mind a question which is under consideration at the present time, although in the introductory remarks of the First Minister it would appear that this would be still contained in regulations -- what I have in mind is the tremendous increase in our opinion on hospitalization premiums. We have some reservations as to whether that should be a regulation or whether it should be in the Act itself. Of course, Mr. Speaker, when I mention hospital insurance rates and the likes of that, I do know that the matter is going to be before the Public Accounts Committee, and that factor can be considered at that particular time. But with that slight reservation, Mr. Speaker, we of the CCF group join in this forward piece of legislation, and as is known, there are two representatives of our group on the committee, and I'm sure that they will draw to our attention matters that are under consideration, and I do join with the suggestion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk that the committee should be empowered to meet after the session is over.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notice of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. R. G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell) introduced Bill No. 45, An Act to incorporate The Commonwealth Savings and Loan Association.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose) introduced Bill No. 30, An Act to incorporate Les Soeurs de la Charite de l'Hopital General Sainte-Antoine de Le Pas.

MR. G. MOLGAT introduced Bill No. 31, An Act to incorporate Les Soeurs de la Charite de l'Hopital General de Flin Flon.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. F. T. KLYM (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw your attention and that of this Assembly to the gallery on your left, Sir, to a group of students, 48 in number. They all come from Beausejour, and they are here with their principal, Mr. Donohue, and his assistant, Mr. Mazur. I wish to welcome them very sincerely to this Chamber and I wish that their stay with us this afternoon will be very profitable. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that these same students will have the golden opportunity next fall to attend a school in the Agassiz division which is situated right in the heart of Beausejour, and may I inform this Chamber that that school is pretty well progressing on the way to getting completed this coming summer.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that you eye to your right, and getting away from the left for this moment only. I have very much pleasure to introduce 22 pupils of Grades V and VI of Robertson School. They come from the Inkster constituency, one of the -- not the best, but one of the most intelligent constituencies that we know of. They have used very good judgment -- their parents -- in the last two elections, and I do hope that the children, whether I am alive or dead by that time, will appreciate my service to them, and I'm very anxious they see the procedure here so they'll get acquainted with the democratic system of government and take our place and try to build a better world, a freer world, a world of peace and freedom. I'm sorry, Sir, I forgot to mention that they are here with their teacher, Mr. H. Forrest. I'm sorry.

MR. GEO. W. JOHNSON (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I'm honoured today to have this privilege of introducing to you, and through you to the honourable members of the Legislature, a small group of ladies situated in the Speaker's Gallery, forming a small group from the Civic Study Group from Silver Heights. I need hardly mention where Silver Heights is located. It is that residential area in the great City of St. James. Mr. Speaker, we welcome them here today and trust that the time they stay with us will be informative and instructive and they have the privilege of seeing their legislative in action. Thank you.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to associate myself with the words of the Honourable Member for Springfield. It's a matter of genuine pleasure to me to be able to welcome the students and two teachers from Beausejour, because I know the students all, and I have been associated as a fellow teacher with both Mr. Donohue and Mr. Mazur for the last four years. So I do wish to also extend a welcome to them.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders of the Day, may I lay on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Department of Industry and Commerce, and Manitoba Development Authority for the period ending March 31st, 1960; and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Flood-Fighting Plan.

A MEMBER: Will there be copies of these reports available

MR. EVANS: There will be, Mr. Speaker, by your leave, there will be copies of the departmental reports for all members. There are the usual nine copies of the Flood-Fighting Plan which will provide one for each of the recognized caucus rooms.

HON. GEO HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Drainage Maintenance Districts in the Province of Manitoba for the year ending December 31st, 1959.

HON. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Welfare)(Gimlt): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to table the return to an order of the House dated Monday, February 27th, upon a motion by the Honourable Member for Inkster, and also a reply to a question of the House dated February 27th by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned motion standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed amendment standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of speaking at any length to this resolution. I would, however, like to move an amendment which I hope will clear up any of the uncertainties in the wording that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has or had at the last sitting of the House. I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Arthur, that the amendment be amended as follows: By deleting all after the word "month" in the last line, and adding, "to that amount which is required to adequately meet their individual needs."

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment to the amendment is the same as the amendment. It's the same wording and not only one syllable missing.

MR. ALEXANDER: repeat it in better English.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly I better have a look at this and bring it in at a later date.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may on a privilege, while you're looking at that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition drew to our attention on the main resolution the omission of the word "the" in front of the word "Federal" in the first line of the resolution. I checked with our records in the office and the word "the" was originally there, so possibly we could have that adjusted too on the printing of the next copy of the Orders of the Day in the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, that's a reasonable suggestion. Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. The Honourable Member for Selkirk. The previous order stand.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have already stated in this House that I would like to see the children of Manitoba get the best possible education at the least possible cost. And if I am to be consistent with that belief I cannot support this motion as originally drafted. I have made inquiries in the Winnipeg area, in the Selkirk area, and in other parts of Manitoba within, say, a radius of 50 miles of Winnipeg, and I have found that primary schools can be constructed for an amount not exceeding \$13,000 a room. I have also found that secondary schools can be constructed at an amount not exceeding \$15,000 a room. Now I have discussed this matter with a reputable architect, and that man has told me that if the grant were increased across the board to \$20,000 a room that's what your schools would cost you. On the other hand, I have had the opportunity of discussing this matter with my colleague the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. I have also discussed this matter with the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and I have found that in Manitoba there is a great disparity in the cost of school construction. Now the Honourable Member for Brandon was kind enough to give me a list which he was furnished by the Department of Education, giving the costs of some 39 schools, I believe it was, and of these 39 schools I believe that there was only one which was over the statutory grant of \$15,000 a room. Now in my discussions with the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, and in my discussions with the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, I have come to the conclusion that there are parts of Manitoba where schools are not being constructed at that statutory amount. They're going over it; they're going over it as much as to \$18,500. Now I don't know the reason for that. It may be due to the fact that the distance from the source of supply gives a transportation expense; it may be the facilities that have to be constructed, such as field disposal units for their plumbing, and it may be, too, that some of the subcontractors have to be brought in from Winnipeg or have to be brought in from some other large centre, but there's no doubt in my mind that the people in these areas to which the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain referred are paying more than \$15,000 for their schools.

Now if we take the advertisements that have appeared in the Manitoba Gazette during the year 1960, we'll find on May 14th, 1960, on page 751 of the Manitoba Gazette, that the Pelly

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.) Trail School Division advertised notice of intention of submitting a by-law for a 32-room school, total cost of \$528,000. Now that amounts to \$16,400 a room. May 28th, 1960, page 846 of the Manitoba Gazette, the Midland School Division advertised notice of intention to construct a 29-room school at a total cost of \$522,000, which was \$18,000 per room. May 28th, 1960, page 861, the Red River School Division, 41 rooms, a total cost of \$660,000, or \$16,000 per room; May 21st, page 775, Transcona-Springfield School Division, 65 rooms, \$1,150,000 total cost, \$17,700 per room; May 21st, page 777, Agassiz School Division, 60 rooms, total \$1,080,000, \$18,000 per room; June 11th, page 905, Beautiful Plains School Division, 18 additional rooms plus teacherage \$356,000. If you include the teacherage in there that would be \$19,000 a room; July 2nd, page 1001, Turtle River School Division, 52 rooms, \$908,000, that is \$17,400 per room; July 23rd, page 1187, Souris Valley School Division, 30 rooms cost \$557,000, \$18,500 per room; August 20th, page 1326, Rolling River School Division, 54 rooms, \$928,000, cost per room \$17,180; September 3rd, 1960, Interlake School Division, 61 rooms, \$1,132,000, \$18,500 per room. And so on down the line.

Now, as I say, I don't know why there is these additional costs in connection with these outlying school divisions, but I do say this, that before these debentures, at least before a vote was taken on these debentures, the costs of these various schools were approved by the Building Board of the Department of Education, and they should have at that time investigated this thing to ascertain the reason why there was this additional cost. And we must assume, Mr. Speaker, that they did investigate it, and assuming that, we must come to the conclusion that they figured that these prices per room were reasonable after taking into consideration all the facts and circumstances. Now from that it is apparent that costs of construction in Manitoba vary. As I say, I can't put my finger on the specific reason for the variation in cost but there may be numerous reasons. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I feel that rather than given a blanket increase across the board, I do think that these school districts that can't construct schools at the same price as they can be constructed in the near vicinity of the City of Winnipeg, should not be penalized by reason of the fact that they are removed from sources of supply, or that they are removed from sources of skilled labour or specialized labour. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain be amended: (a) by adding after the word "whereas" in the first paragraph of the preamble the words "in certain areas of the province." (b) By adding after the word "whereas" in the second paragraph of the preamble the words "in these areas". (c) By deleting paragraphs (1) and (2) of the resolution and substituting therefor the following: (1) Revising in these areas the present authorized maximum grant of \$15,000 per schoolroom to the costs per schoolroom as approved by the Building Board of the Department of Education; and (2) Making such increases retroactive to July 1st, 1959.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate, but I think perhaps in view of what the Honourable Member for Selkirk has said that I had better offer some explanation to the members of the House. I see now where these figures were coming from, and I should have realized it because reference was made by the Member for Turtle Mountain to the Manitoba Gazette. I want to say that that information is not necessarily accurate, and indeed in some respects can be misleading insofar as the consideration of this resolution is concerned. May I just say this, that the procedure followed is, when a school district or school division desires to construct a building or an addition to a building, they file with the Department of Education what is known as a Notice of Intent, which is considered by a committee which we have established for that purpose. The job of the committee is to direct their attention to the request, and in particular reference to the need for the accommodation, namely, the number of students to be accommodated in the particular building. That committee, and of course, acting on behalf of the Minister of Education, recommends, and it is then approved that the construction of a building be approved, and that it be given a certain room count.

At that point the district or division then instruct the architect to prepare the plans for the building. The plans are prepared, the necessary bylaw is prepared by the district or

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) division for submission to their resident electors. Now the matter of the bylaw and the amount of money in the bylaw is settled between the district or division and the Municipal Board, not with the Department of Education; we have nothing to say about that, and if the -- in theory, the Municipal Board could approve the inclusion of any amount of money which the division or district would request and include that in the amount of their bylaw. Now the fact of the matter is that many divisions and districts, as a precaution, actually ask for more money than one would get by a straight mathematical computation of multiplying \$15,000 per room by the number of rooms. And they do that for a number of reasons, for which it is unnecessary for me to make any comment -- that's their business -- and they conduct that, and they're within their rights in doing so. When their bylaw has been approved and they call for tenders -- and this is the important point -- it is the tenders that are received for the school that counts, and in the list, for example, which the Honourable Member for Brandon was referring to, those represented actual tender costs for schools, which may be quite different and very much under the amount of money asked for in the bylaw. And if the total amount of money which has been asked for in the bylaw and approved by the resident electors is not required, well, of course, they just don't borrow the money and that's the end of the matter.

For example, just to give you an illustration, the School Division of St. Vital had a project and called for tenders in connection with a school, I think reference was made to it the other day, Hastings School, and the amount of the bylaw called for \$15,000, or whatever that amount was, multiplied by the number of classrooms, but of course, the tenders came in at \$13,000 and something per classroom, so that it will result in the school division simply borrowing the exact amount of money they need. So I want to emphasize that one cannot base any argument insofar as this resolution is concerned on what you find in the Manitoba Gazette, because there may be all sorts of reasons why the division or district has asked for more money in their bylaw than would normally be required by this, and that doesn't prove that the cost of building is more or less or anything. The thing that proves the cost of the building is what it actually comes in on the tenders and, it is true, as the Honourable Member for Selkirk has pointed out, that there are variations, variations which I find it quite difficult to reconcile in my own mind and thinking, and I'm much concerned about it, much concerned about the fact that there should be such variation, even within the same general area. But, of course, the Honourable the Member for Selkirk touched the key to the whole point, the whole question, when he said that to adopt the resolution as presented would mean that the cost of all classrooms in Manitoba, the cost of construction of all classrooms in Manitoba, would be increased, and indeed that would be the fact, and we must face it, and that would be involved if this resolution were to be adopted in this House or in practice. And it is for that reason, and that reason alone, that we feel that the present limitation, while somewhat difficult perhaps for some, is the greatest guarantee that we have of withholding costs, both for the local taxpayers and for the Province of Manitoba.

Now I know it's difficult, and I want to assure the members of the House that we do everything humanly possible that we can to assist boards when they find themselves in this difficulty. I even get into it myself with what limited suggestions I can make for changes and things that will help to meet the situation, and I'm of the strong belief, the very strong belief, that we should continue to do as we have been doing, to meet the problems that arise in particular cases, and to assist as best we can, but to avoid at all costs any action which will result in an over-all cost to the citizens of the Province of Manitoba for their school construction. I would like to suggest, in reference to the amendment which the Honourable Member for Selkirk has presented, that it would be, in my opinion -- and I haven't seen a copy of it; I'm just now relying on the hearing of it -- but in my opinion, that it would not be workable, would not be regarded as fair by the trustees or citizens of the Province of Manitoba, and would only take but a short time until there would be a chaotic condition existing with which it would be impossible to cope. I appreciate that it arises from a desire to assist but I do submit that it would be impractical of operation, would do no more than we are actually accomplishing at the present time.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Would the Minister permit a question? If I furnished you, Mr. Minister, with a copy of the list that I read, could you furnish the House with the actual costs of these school constructions?

MR. McLEAN: I think so. Yes. I'm assuming that we could. I just heard the list read. I haven't seen it.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Minister of Education a non-academic question? Can he tell the House whether the \$20,000 room would give the children more comfort, better education and a nicer environment. If it does, then we are justified to support a \$20,000 room. With all due respect to some of the members who wanted to say it, we cannot -- I'm not in favour of saving dollars at the expense of the education of the children. Would he express his views and tell us whether it's right or wrong?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, answering the question of the Honourable Member Pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: closing the debate.

MR. McLEAN: Well, I'm not

MR. SPEAKER: No, that's right. You're in order to answer the question.

MR. McLEAN: Answering the question of the Honourable the Member for Inkster, the answer is "No." I can present to you a plan of school construction which would not cost more than \$10,000 a room, which would give, for children, adequate, bright, cheerful, warm, well-lighted classroom space which, if you were to be taken into it blindfolded and the blindfold removed while you were in the room, you couldn't tell the difference between that and a school classroom that would cost you \$20,000.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I had really hoped not to have to take part in this particular debate. However, as there appears to be a great deal of misunderstanding with respect to the principle behind our Minimum Wage legislation, I felt that perhaps I should just say a few words on this particular subject. It seems that there are some in this House who feel that the minimum wage should be the going wage in the province; it should be an average fair wage that's paid to all the employees across the province; it should provide for the needs of a man with a family. Well this, Mr. Speaker, was not the intention of the minimum wage legislation. It merely provides the lowest wage that can be paid to an employee in the Province of Manitoba; it's the floor price for wages; it's designed to meet the necessities of life for an employee. Now the Act, Mr. Chairman, is very specific on this particular point, and I would refer any members who would like to look it up to Section 24 of The Employment Standards Act, Section 5, which reads as follows: "A board in settling the recommendation it makes to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall take into consideration and be guided by the cost to an employee of purchasing the necessities of life and health." Some appear to argue that the government should be performing the function of a trade union; that we should be bargaining on behalf of employees in the province in determining the worth of an employee to his employer. I think those who have an association with the trade union movement will agree that this kind of an arrangement is unsatisfactory; would be unacceptable to the trade union movement, would be unacceptable and not in the best interests of labour or to the public. The legislation was not intended to provide the mechanics for negotiation for minimum wage levels, but it was intended to prevent exploitation of workmen to the point of depriving them of a minimum standard of living. The intent, I think, is to protect the new workman, the inexperienced, the learner, the one who is just beginning in the field of labour; one who may be substandard as a workman by reason of his ability or lack of initiative, or one who may have physical or a mental handicap of some kind. It's to protect those people who have little or nothing in the way of a bargaining power with respect to the services that he has to offer to his employer. The intent is to provide food, shelter, clothing and the other necessities of life. This appears to have been the intention of the legislation when it was brought into this House in 1921, and successive legislatures appear to have seen fit to accept this principle and have not altered it or changed it in any way.

Now I would like to comment just for a moment on the suggestion that we should have a uniform minimum wage across the country, and the member who introduced the resolution,

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) the Honourable Member for Elmwood, took us on two excursions from the east to the west coast and brought out a great many statistics which, in my opinion, seemed to favour a differential in minimum wages rather than a standardization of them, because he indicated that the cost of living in the Maritimes is certainly quite different from the cost of living in the central provinces, and certainly different from the western provinces, and similarly on to the west coast. In fact, he went on to point out some of the negotiated wages -- I presume they apply to his own union, the United Packinghouse Workers -- in which it's indicated that even the negotiated wages across the country vary substantially, and I would venture to say for good reasons. Now all of the provinces in Canada have considered this question of minimum wages and they have all, by their own means, arrived at minimums which differ from one another, and I would suspect that they use somewhat the same criterion for measuring minimum wages as we do here in Manitoba. I think if you want to go across the border in the United States you'll find the same kind of differentials exist in the United States as well. In fact, I think some 17 states in the union have no minimum wage schedules at all.

I'd like to comment very briefly on a comment by the Member for St. Vital who was talking about the large number of workers in Manitoba who last year earned less than \$1,000 and less than \$2,000. Now I haven't had an opportunity to examine these statistics to know what kind of people we're talking about, but I would suspect that we have a great many part-time people involved here: housewives who are working during the Christmas holiday season at the various department stores, at the post offices; we have summer replacements in this building, and in many other buildings, where people come in on a part-time basis to do those jobs which they want to do in many cases on a part-time basis. We have university students; we have high school students, who work for limited periods during the summer, who couldn't conceivably be expected to make sufficient during a short work period to enable them to have an assured income that would maintain them year round.

Now I think that all members of this House are concerned about those unfortunate individuals who are working at and living on a subsistence level of income. Our government has, I think, shown great concern in every way for these particular people. The Social Allowances legislation that was brought in, one of the first acts of this government, indicates the concern on the part of the government for people who find themselves in this particular category. I think our concern is also demonstrated by the educational program that has been introduced, the legislation that was introduced to raise the level of education to the point where these people can qualify to meet the job opportunities which will be presenting themselves in the future, and which will place them in a position where they can earn larger incomes than in past, because I think the statistics would seem to indicate that those who are living on the lower levels are those who have little to bargain with by way of education, experience, training, etc. I think, too, we should also mention the vocational and technical training program that's being embarked upon in co-operation with the Federal Government to try to raise the standards of education both at the training level and the academic level as well. I think that our concern is being expressed for the individuals in Manitoba as a result of our attempts to stimulate resource development in the province, and to create new job opportunities, which I think in the long run is the answer to people who are living on low incomes -- more and better jobs available to our people. Our concern, I think, is being expressed by the Department of Industry and Commerce in their looking to the economic health of Manitoba, trying to create and stimulate industry across the province. These are some of the things that I think will, in the long run, provide the only real solution to those people living on minimum wages, living on lower wages.

Now I would like to mention very briefly the Minimum Wage Board. This board is set up, and the purpose of the board and that also is spelled out in the legislation, the purpose for which they're assembled and, in a sense, the method by which they are to operate in arriving at a minimum wage recommendation. And I would like to read from Section 24(1) of The Employment Standards Act which reads as follows: "For the purpose of preparing recommendations as mentioned above in Section 22, a Board shall conduct such inquiries and receive from interested persons such representations as the Board deems necessary and advisable." Now the last Minimum Wage Board that was set up in the province, I think, had hearings in eight communities in Manitoba outside of the Greater Winnipeg area. They received briefs from a

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) great many interested parties, including trade union movement, including industry, including interested organizations, people interested in welfare and other matters, and the purpose of this Board is to obtain these facts and to base their decision on the basis of the information which has been given to them. Now, in getting the facts from which they can make a decision, they got budgets from the Home Economics Department of the University of Manitoba and the YWCA. Now there was some disparity between these two budgets, and they selected the higher budget, and for the interest of the members of the House I'd like to run over some of those things which were included in the budget, which was accepted by the Minimum Wage Board and became the basis for their recommendation to the government.

In clothing -- and these incidentally were based on the requirements of a young lady, and they felt that in basing it on the requirements of a lady there would be really little disparity between that and what would be required by a young adult male. And they also felt that it would be equally applicable to an older person either male or female, feeling that some of the requirements of a young person would not be those requirements of an older person, but that there would be other things which would make up for the difference. So in considering the budget they considered under the heading of Clothing -- dresses, skirts, blouses, sweaters and house-coats, \$112 -- this is an annual budget. Sportswear, which includes blue jeans, slacks, shorts, bathing suit, \$18.00. Underclothes -- slips, bras, girdles, pajamas, etcetera, \$35.50. Incidentally this might be a very good thing for the Member for Kildonan. He was discussing his problems in meeting a budget, and I think if he takes note of some of these things, he can keep check on the lady of the house, maybe. -- (Interjection) -- We'll try, yes, I've been trying to get my wife on a budget for some time. Hosiery, \$18.75. Footwear, \$31.95. Gloves and scarves, \$5.00. Hats, \$4.75. Coats - winter, summer and rain wear, \$33.00. Now, incidentally some of these items, they figured you don't need a new coat every year; they based it on a two-year budget and then cut it down. -- (Interjection) -- They figured a winter coat, for instance, at \$40, but they said that would last two years so they'll take \$20 into account for this year. -- (Interjection) -- It might be. It might be. I can get you a good caribou coat for \$20 if you want something that's warm -- caribou, yes, we recommend it. Handbag, \$5.25. Repairs and cleaning, a very important item, \$18.50. Total clothing budget of \$282.70. Now, Room and Board - \$700.00. Now, under the heading of Health and Hygiene, a very important item, medical plan, it's called an H plan, \$13.80 per year. Yes, this is an H plan \$13.80. Dentist, \$20.00. Hospital Insurance -- this might be an embarrassing point -- \$24.60. Medications, bandages, etc., \$15.00. Personal needs, soap, kleenex, toothpaste, etcetera, this includes cosmetics, home permanents, hair cuts, \$78.74. Recreation, which includes coffee breaks and nights out, etcetera, \$89.90. Education; this includes papers, magazine, etcetera, \$20.00. Now we've got another item here called Holidays, which is the fare home, or fare to church camps, etcetera, \$40.00, making a total of \$302.04 in the category of Health and Hygiene. Now we have a miscellaneous item here -- (Interjection) -- \$302.04. Now, under the category of Miscellaneous, we have unemployment insurance, \$23.92; income tax, \$47; church collections, charities, gifts, collections at work, \$40.00; carfare, \$105.60. Oh, we have another item here, Watch and Radio Repairs, \$8.50, making a total in that category of \$225.04.

The total annual budget is \$1,509.76. Now, on the basis of 66 cents per hour, the weekly income is \$29.04, the monthly income on that basis is \$125.84, with all due respect to the Member for St. Vital who calculated it at \$116.00 I believe -- (Interjection) -- forty-four, forty-four. The annual income on this basis works out to \$1,510.08, just slightly over the required minimum budget as submitted by the YWCA. Now in discussing this budget, some of the members indicated that there were some items in here included that would not be items that would normally be used by a person living on a minimum income. However, they were included, and besides this, of course, we must add our two weeks' vacation with pay, so that we feel that this does provide the minimum requirements of the necessities of life for an individual.

Now, I think that we have another interesting -- I just happened to have with me here today a little draft that I think shows a very interesting item. The red line shows the minimum wage as it has varied since 1952, I believe it is, as compared to the consumer price index. And the very interesting thing is that the minimum wage is higher today in relation to the

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) consumer price index than it's been since the introduction of this legislation in 1921. Now, the consumer price index, for the benefit of the members who may not know, was brought in to replace the old cost of living index because it no longer became truly representative of the changes in prices that were taking place. When the change took place, the explanation for it read that "It measures the average percentage change in retail prices of goods and services bought by a large and representative group of Canadian urban families." The change in title was made to clarify the fact that the index is a measure of price change. Thus there's no attempt to differentiate between luxuries and necessities. I think there's a very interesting article here in the Winnipeg Free Press on February 7th which said: "The index will mirror modern living costs". It goes on to say some of the things, "Canadian families with higher purchasing power is spending more on recreation, sports and a family car. A smaller share of their budget is being spent to meet the basic needs of life, food, clothing and shelter." And all of this, of course, is related to the index as at the year 1949, which was the base year. But it includes such items as alcoholic beverages, soft drinks, electric sewing machines, sports equipment, jewellery, air travel, television repairs and things of this kind, so it's really not based just on the necessities of life; it's based on, of course, a great many things which people are purchasing today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it may be obvious that I propose to oppose this resolution on the grounds that those members who spoke in favour of the uniform price didn't build a case; didn't sell me, at least, on the idea of a minimum -- at least a uniform minimum wage across Canada. And I'm also opposed on the grounds that our basis for determining the minimum wage is the necessities of life, and until such time as the Legislature sees fit to consider a change which would place it on some other basis, I think we're not prepared to seriously recommend this to any other governments of Canada. Well, Mr. Speaker, I propose to vote against this resolution.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): 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 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned this debate I adjourned it for my colleague, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, and as you all know, he had introduced this resolution, and if he speaks he'll be closing the debate, so if anybody else wishes to speak, they may.

MR. SPEAKER: Anyone else wish to speak? The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, closing the debate.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, in rising to close the debate, I do not wish to go into all the detail I did last year, or even in presenting a resolution again this year. Sometimes I don't think that the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare and I are too far apart in our thinking in regard to the humanitarian aspects of the care and treatment of cancer, but I would like to point out the field of difference between us. The Honourable Minister pointed out the bright side of the picture, and I would like to quote from Hansard, Mr. Speaker, of March 7th. The Honourable Minister said, "I would like to point out, however, the bright side of the story in the Province of Manitoba, for which certainly this government takes just part of the credit since we have been in office in the last couple of years, but gradually we have seen evolved in this province in the field of cancer, a completely comprehensive free biopsy service. And this past year we saw the Medical Association and the hospital authorities get together to introduce a completely comprehensive tissue service, that is, all tissues removed in all hospitals are now examined." Mr. Speaker, I agree that much has been done in this field of research in cancer, and for which, as I said before, we are extremely grateful. But, Mr. Speaker, we have many people left yet who are not a direct responsibility of the government, people of low income who are still paddling their own canoe. They want to go to their own doctor, and as I pointed out before, there's nothing elaborate or unusual about people going to their own doctor, and we do not propose to eliminate this doctor-patient relationship. And to say that the cobalt bomb is free to everyone, Mr. Speaker, is good, but the greatest costs, in my opinion, are still the costs of having your own doctor.

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.)

I would like to quote again from the Honourable Minister's speech, and I quote, "In this province through our Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation at total public expense all radiation therapy, treatment with radium, cobalt, radioactive isotopes, chemo therapy, all this is provided at public expense. And I think my honourable friend and I come back to the same question as we did a year ago, what is left?" Well, Mr. Speaker, the group that is left is the group that I'm worrying about. It's the man who is still struggling, he's not a direct charge on public welfare; who say, as we've mentioned before, is getting the minimum wage in Manitoba of 66 cents an hour. Now, to expect this man to pay his Manitoba Hospital Services premium which is \$6.00 per month, and if he enrolls in the Manitoba Medical Service to protect his family there's a further \$10.00; this is a total of \$16.00, and I suggest that \$16.00 per month from the wages of anyone on the minimum wage in Manitoba is far too excessive. The Honourable Minister referred more than once to the fact that comprehensive medical care is getting much thought. And I would like to quote again, Mr. Speaker, from the Honourable Minister's speech, "But I submit the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that I think the answer is not to pick out conditions of illness as a basis for a program. I think over the years we have seen this in the area of tuberculosis, mental illness and TB control. We've picked these things out one at a time and made them complete public responsibilities for various reasons which are now no longer valid. I think we should just say at this point that the services for diagnosis, the services for treatment, the availability of many to make these services available unto themselves, exists. And governments have become — this government has already become involved in the comprehensive care to the recipient of public assistance, and I think governments we see across Canada, and parties, Mr. Speaker, are becoming increasingly more concerned with the introduction of comprehensive medical care plans." I think that the Honourable Minister can see that it's inevitable that comprehensive medical care will come about. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it will be much easier for this government to go into the field of comprehensive medical care if this government, like the Government of Saskatchewan, would first implement this free care of cancer. For instance, I believe that it will be easier for the Government of Saskatchewan to inaugurate their scheme of comprehensive medical care because of the fact that they have had in Saskatchewan for the past 15 years this free treatment of cancer. I believe that the mechanics that they have set up there — the machinery that they have set up to take care of these people will certainly make it much more easy for them. Now, Mr. Speaker, I can anticipate that this resolution will be defeated, but I feel that time is not far off when many people will be able to enjoy the fruits of the labour of our fine doctors and our scientists without having to resort to the indignity of becoming public charges.

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

A MEMBER: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being:

YEAS: Messrs. Gray, Harris, Hawryluk, Orlikow, Pauley, Peters, Reid, Schreyer, Wagner and Wright.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas - 10; Nays - 46.

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

MR. ALEXANDER: Order stand?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this with the understanding, with the thought that maybe the Honourable Member for Brandon wanted to speak on this. He was asked on that evening. I don't know whether, at this time, he wants to speak or not.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I might beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand.

MR. LISSAMAN: May I adjourn it? I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot support this resolution the way it is drafted. I have tried to see how it could be amended in order to accomplish what the Honourable Member for Brokenhead is trying to accomplish, but I have failed in my efforts. I quite agree with the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that if this resolution were passed in its present form that it would give rise to complications unthought of by the proposer of the resolution. I feel that it would result in the mushrooming up of small villages where they'd have no taxable assessment. But I do feel, though, that something should be done in connection with building assessments under The Municipal Act, and one of the matters which I have in mind is this: where a man's acreage is reduced below the statutory acreage in order to obtain building exemption by reason of the construction of some public work, such as a road or a grade, I think that the amount of acreage taken by that public work should still be estimated in his total acreage in figuring the four, forty or eighty acres in question. I also feel too, that The Municipal Act should be further amended in respect of determining income. At the present moment we have in Manitoba, particularly in my own constituency, a number of elderly people who previously made their money from market gardening. Now these people now, by reason of the fact that they are in receipt of Old Age Pension, that Old Age Pension is taken into their income and is their chief source of livelihood, yet they are still carrying on in a small way as market gardeners. Now, I don't think that these people should be penalized by taking Old Age Pension and then finding that their buildings are assessed as a result of that additional income. These are the two matters that I would like to mention.

Now, as to the suggestion made by the Honourable Member for Portage, that this matter be referred to the Municipal Advisory Board, I think a similar resolution, not exactly in the same words, but a resolution dealing with building exemptions came before this House in March of 1960. At that time it was amended to refer it to the Municipal Advisory Council. Now, I don't know how long this council has been sitting, but I think it has been sitting for about two years, and I feel that some urging should be done on the part of the government, or suggestions made to that Advisory Council, to deal with this vexatious question of building exemptions in respect of farm properties, before they bring down their complete report, if they intend to bring one down, dealing with the whole municipal set-up in Manitoba. But for these reasons, I can't support the resolution, and accordingly I'm going to vote against it.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Would the honourable member permit a question? I presume he was referring to the Municipal Inquiry Commission, rather than the Municipal Advisory Board. He nods his head in agreement.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Right.

MR. LYON: Thanks.

MR. HILLHOUSE: You've got so many boards, I forget their names.

MR. LYON: Well, that one isn't ours.

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would only like to add to what the Honourable Member for Selkirk has said, to encourage the government to review this situation of building taxation on farm lands. In addition to the description of situations which have been made by both the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and the Honourable Member for Selkirk as to problems which exist in communities, particularly around Winnipeg, in

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) municipal areas, I'd like to note that in the constituency which I represent, there are a goodly number of people, particularly along the St. Mary's Road, of bona fide farmers, good, sound, young farmers, who, through various difficulties, crop losses and problems which exist locally, have gone to work in order to keep their farm. They have taken employment in the city or nearby, but taken employment, and doing their chores in the morning and at night, and their wives doing much of the work on the farm. And they have taken this employment with the sole purpose of being able to keep their farm. They have been, in effect, since they've done this, penalized for doing so, by finding that their buildings were taxed by the local authorities. The buildings on their farms were taxed to a point that it would cost them \$50, \$100 or more a year because they decided to try and keep their farms by going to work. This is only one of the problems which exist through the present Municipal Act and I think that other problems exist in the southeast of Manitoba. I know that the Municipality of Hanover is planning or hoping for a great revision in this business of assessing farm buildings. They would like to see -- they have passed a resolution themselves, in that all buildings in their municipality be taxed so that they could equalize this problem. They have problems of extremely high-valued buildings, buildings worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, on lands worth virtually nothing, with the farmers paying, in this case, no tax on the buildings because they own sufficient land so that they didn't have to pay the tax. And yet, not very far away will be other farmers such as the ones I've just mentioned, who are good, sound, bona fide farmers, young people who have gone to work in order to keep their farms, and yet are being penalized because they keep their farm, because more than half of their income in any one year came from non-farm sources, and as the Minister is aware, I'm sure, in many cases in the past few years, with crop losses, flooding and so forth, that it is difficult to find that even if you have an ordinary job off the farm, that more than half your income will come from non-farm sources.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the motion

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave of the House to ask a question of the Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs?

MR. SPEAKER: Questions should be asked on the Orders of the Day or on an adjourned debate which they Does the honourable member have leave of the House to ask a question?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it pertains to the resolution which we've just been speaking about. Could the Minister tell us when the report of the Municipal Advisory Committee might be expected?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend is referring to the Municipal Inquiry Commission, not the Municipal Advisory Board which is a continuing Board which sits fairly regularly, I have no solid information for him on that point at all. This is the Board which -- the Commission, you're getting me confused now -- a Commission which while subsidized initially to the extent of about \$2,000 by this government, is entirely a creation of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association. Their considerations have been going on now from some year to 18 months, or 15 months. Dr. Murray Fisher is the Chairman; they are looking at very fundamental problems including, as I understand it, the present problem before the House in the form of a resolution, but I have no accurate information at all as to when they may consider bringing down their report.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Fisher.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, I was quite surprised when my honourable member or colleague from Brokenhead introduced the resolution and none of the other groups cared to adjourn it. Neither did the Conservatives, neither did the Liberals want to adjourn it, because I was deliberately waiting not to adjourn it after my colleague, and the Speaker merely had it over in the question, and I have to jump up in defence of this resolution, and I'm just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if agriculture in Manitoba shouldn't be discussed already

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) in the province, in Manitoba, or in this House. I would like to see more members take However, that prompted me to go into a library and pick out the Agricultural Stabilization Act. Maybe I can find out some support from the city members if I cannot stir up the country members, so Mr. Speaker, I will be very close to my notes for the first portion of my speech, because I would like to put in the record, and I would like to encourage the members to listen how this Stabilization Act came into being, and how it has been introduced in the House of Commons. So, Mr. Speaker, I shall state that the Act, the Agricultural Stabilization Act was passed in 1958 as a successor to the Agricultural Prices Support Act. Payments related to aids to marketing were common prior to 1940. These included guaranteed advances, bonuses, premiums for quality, assistance in building cold storage and other facilities for warehousing products, as well as numerous types of transportation and price assistance, mostly on ad hoc basis. In 1944, partly, if not wholly as a result of the acceptance by farmers of price ceilings during the war years, parliament provided a formal basis for agricultural price support for all products except wheat. Wheat was provided for under special legislation. The Agricultural Prices Support Act and The Agricultural Stabilization Act, which succeeded it in 1958, provided for a three-man administrative board which in recent years has had as its members permanent civil servants. Under The Agricultural Prices Support Act provision was made on a permissive basis for the General Advisory Committee. This committee at that time was chaired by the President of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and included all provincial deputy ministers of agriculture or their representatives, as well as producer representatives from the main agricultural regions and commodity groups. Under the new Agricultural Stabilization Act, the Minister is required to name an advisory committee of up to ten members, who shall be farmers or representatives of farm organizations. In addition, the Board under each Act as seemed appropriate from time to time called in special advisory committees either from the trade or from producer groups to assist in the Board's operation in a particular field. The Agricultural Stabilization Board has at its disposal a revolving fund of \$250 million which is \$50 million higher than that made available to its predecessor. This fund is maintained at that amount by annual appropriations by Parliament to cover any loss that may take place during the year, and if there should be any surplus to the Board's account it is to be turned over each year to the general Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Now during the period in which the Agricultural Prices Support Act was operated, the board used a total working capital of approximately \$600 million in supporting 11 different commodities at various times during the 12-year period from '46 to '58. Of this amount it recovered through resale of commodities purchased, approximately \$500 million, leaving a total net cost to the Canadian taxpayer of \$100 million for its operation over the period. In the first year of operation of the Agricultural Stabilization Board, 21 commodities were under support with a price prescribed in terms of a percentage of a 10-year average market price. In the year ending March 31st, 1960, 18 commodities were under support. Most of the commodities were at the 80 percent or higher level of the 10-year average. The net cost of support in the fiscal year 1957-58 was approximately \$15 million, and in the fiscal year 1958-59 \$60 million. No formula for establishing price support levels was set out, nor was the Board required to support any particular agricultural commodity under The Agricultural Prices Support Act. Under the Agricultural Stabilization Act all price support levels have to be related to a price formula based on the most recent 10-year average of market prices for the product concerned. In addition, the Board unless the government sets a higher support level, must support the prices of nine named key commodities at not less than 80 percent of the 10-year average market price. The named commodities are butter, cheese, eggs, cattle, hogs, sheep, wheat, oats and barley. For the latter three, that is for wheat, oats and barley, the support applies to grain produced outside the prairie areas designated under the Canadian Wheat Board Act. Other commodities can be supported at such percentage of the 10-year average market price as may be approved by the government from time to time. In other words, other commodities are in the same position as all commodities were under the Agricultural Prices Support Act, except that under the new Act the support level has to be prescribed as a percentage of a 10-year average market price.

The Agricultural Stabilization Act also requires that the prices established for the nine

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) named or key commodities have to be announced, so that they can apply for 12 months from the effective date. The general intent of the Act is that a similar procedure should apply to all commodities, but legally there is leeway for shorter or longer periods of application for the announcement of support prices of other commodities than for the commodities that the Board is required to support continuously.

The Agricultural Stabilization Board may support the price of products in any one or more three ways: an offer to purchase by the Board; underwriting the market through producer guarantees, commonly called the "deficiency payment" method; or, making such payment for the benefit of producers as may be authorized for the purpose of stabilizing the price of an agricultural commodity. The third method is new under the Agricultural Stabilization Act. All methods have been used during the first years of operation of the Act, although recently there has been some tendency to use the so-called "deficiency payment" method to a greater degree.

The Board has no statutory limits placed on it in the Act insofar as disposal of product is concerned. Unless the government makes a regulation or the Minister of Agriculture gives a direction, the Board legally may give the required product away, sell it or otherwise dispose of it. Regardless of future developments, the course likely to be followed by the Federal Government is to develop broad national policies in an effort to maintain an expanding demand for agricultural products in both domestic and export markets, and to encourage the greatest degree of self-help by those in the industry concerned so that production and marketing efficiency may be at the maximum level, with support and control measures occupying a significant but not necessarily major role in assistance to agriculture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's as far as the Stabilization Act I quoted. However, in no place does this Stabilization Bill mention cost of production or parity price that the Board shall increase the support price to the proportion of the cost, to the proportion of rising costs of the commodities that the farmer is buying and the farmer is producing. Also, the 80 percent of the 10-year average, it goes on the sliding scale; it is not a cost of production, and once you take this into account, the Bill in itself is very ineffective. Now we always hear in this House stating that agricultural economy is going down. Naturally so. Everybody admits that it's going down, and I don't want to repeat myself again, as I spoke just the other day. However, to prove that it is going down, again I must myself to the city members because the rural members ought to know; however, sometimes I feel maybe the city members have more sympathy to the farm people than even our own farm members.

I have a table here I read from the Farmers Union: five year total and averages -- farm cash and net income. From 1950 to 1954 farm cash income was \$1,141,671,000; the farm net income was \$609,941,000. You take the average of these five; the farm cash income was \$228,814,000; farm net income of those five years on the average was \$121,988,000. Now let's take '55 and '59, the five years; farm cash income was \$1,039,220,000; farm net income was \$527,755,000. An average out of those five was \$207,844,000; farm net income was \$105,551,000. Income loss between the two five-year periods was \$102,451,000 on the farm cash income. The net income was in these five years \$82,186,000. So says the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. So the total net loss in terms of farm net income in Manitoba in the last five years has been \$82,186,000, estimating approximately in round figures 40,000 farmers in Manitoba. Average farm operator, there was a loss of \$2,054 per farm. So there are the figures and facts that the farm economy is going down. That is a clear-cut picture, and I would ask anybody if any industry or any business can operate on a loss.

But the grain picture, Mr. Speaker, is entirely different, because this Agricultural Stabilization Bill does not apply to the areas where the Wheat Board is operating, particularly to the three western provinces. So the picture is entirely different. And I want to quote from the Minister's bulletin, Report on Crops, Live Stock, Etc. 1959, by authority of Honourable George Hutton, Minister of Agriculture and Conservation, and this is a very good bulletin, but we should have in this bulletin the cost of production yet, and it would be complete. In 1950 the wheat, on the average price, point of shipment, was \$1.62. Now, in 1957, the average price was \$1.33. However, I assume that in 1958, in 1959 it would be even less, because the Honourable Minister has for 1958 - \$1.17 and \$1.19 for 1959, but this is only the average price and the interim payment is not included. So I would add 10 cents, that would come for

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) 1959 up to \$1.29 or \$1.30 a bushel. Oats, in 1950, it was 72 cents and in 1957, 53 cents. Here again we have 48 cents for '58, and 48 cents for '59, but that's initial payment only; I would add on the average of those years from 1950 down or seven cents a bushel on the average, I would add, in 1959 the oats would be 55 cents.

MR. HUTTON: 16 cents.

MR. WAGNER: In 1959 for oats? Well, I stand corrected. Barley, in 1950, it was \$1.14; in 1957, 81 cents; but in 1958, here again we have only initial payments 77 cents and 1959, 77 cents. And what was the interim payment, final payment on barley? I add another seven cents. And so the Minister gives a nod of the head; that means 84 cents for barley. So there you have such a large stretch from 1950 -- (Interjection) -- I can quote you the ten years. He's got all the figures, but I take the 1950 and then I go down to 1959. And it quotes further on, but I don't need to bore you with these figures.

However, Mr. Speaker, we heard the other day quite a bit of talk that the farmers are getting all kinds of support prices, deficiency payments, but I want to inform the House that the farmer, particularly the western farmer, has to pay storage for grain up to 178,000,000 bushels. There he is penalized that he has to pay that storage. Also, he has to pay \$19,500,000, if I have the figures correct, in exchange of currency United States and Canada. This the farmer carries alone. And I don't see, Mr. Speaker, why should I be penalized when I bring my load of grain to the elevator once I sold it; when the agent took it away from me why should I pay all that storage? Why should I pay the exchange currency fee when there is only 13 percent of the farmers in Canada, there's 87 percent of other groups of people; why penalize the 13 percent to carry for the other ones -- in my own interpretation, subsidize 18,000,000 people, that's the total, I would say. Furthermore, the farmer not only he has to subsidize, in my own language, the people of Canada, but he has to compete with the subsidized countries in other parts of the world. And I just want to put myself on the record -- possibly if it's not useful to the members maybe the people and they're going to be reading the Hansard, they will have some use of this. "Wheat subsidies in other countries have been responsible in part for the price decline experienced by the Canadian grain producers. Almost every wheat importing country pays domestic prices, excessively high prices, to grow wheat -- often uneconomically, while at the same time imports of lower-priced Canadian wheat are subject to certain measures of control. Thus the Canadian wheat producer finds himself in the ridiculous position of growing the best quality produced in the world and at the same time receiving the world's lowest price. Our prairie farm price for wheat in 1956-57 (the last completed crop year) averaged \$1.24 per bushel. This is in sharp contrast with the following table, which shows wheat price levels to domestic producers in a number of importing countries most of which are currently good customers for Canadian wheat."

Now I quote: "United States - \$2.01; United Kingdom - \$2.03; South Africa - \$2.18; Ireland - \$2.13; Belgium - \$2.48; Japan - \$2.67; Germany - \$2.78; Italy - \$2.93; Norway - \$3.31; Finland - \$3.78; Switzerland - \$4.15. So selected from a list contained in "Wheat, A Commodity Policy Review," by Frank Shefrin, Agriculture Abroad, Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, February 1959."

Just to conclude this quotation, "Most importing countries, in addition to providing high price supports for domestic producers, control the flow of imported wheat through import licenses, exchange controls, import quotas, milling quotas which require a specified volume of domestic grain to be used in the grist. All these actions involving artificial support prices and import restrictions are efforts by foreign governments to protect their domestic industries. The Canadian wheat producer feels that he has a right to expect assistance from his own government in meeting the difficult competition resulting from this situation."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other day the Honourable Minister of Agriculture stated that he would be willing to lead the farmers' "March to Ottawa" providing the farmers are going to give their fair share to the underdeveloped countries. I believe we are coping already with this. I believe the farmer is already giving that fair share. Here I want to make a quotation. I was surprised even to find this in the Canadian Packing House Worker. Even the labour people are talking already about the farmer, and the other day my colleague from Elmwood stated in his own opinion, and no doubt he feels that the labour people feel the same way, that if the agricultural economy goes down, everybody follows it: Here it is, Canadian Packinghouse

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) Worker, February 2nd, 1961: "In Britain, the five percent of the farmers in the population receive five percent of the national income, and in Denmark the 20 percent who are farmers get 18 percent, but in Canada the 13 percent who are farmers get seven percent of the national income." There is the picture.

The other day the Honourable Member for Emerson was speaking, and he was speaking about did we need export markets and everything that goes with it. The Honourable Minister pointed the hand and made an utterance -- speak to the left, speak to the CCF group, because they don't understand nothing except prices. Yes, he has given; that we don't understand nothing but prices. However, it's not true. If the Honourable Minister will just himself of what I was saying, and my leader, he will find that we quoted also that we need all these markets, and exports, and what goes with it. All these farm policies, but the main focus I still maintain, I still maintain, prices is the main objective.

It's not only me that's speaking that prices is the main objective. I was the other day. I will quote something else, and he is a man that's leading Manitoba farmers. I wouldn't say all Manitoba farmers but most of them, and here it is, Basic Farm Problems Prices, The Voice of the Farmer, December 1960, and I shall put this on record too. "MFU President Rudy Usick took strong exception to the Federal Government's refusal to attack the main farm problem, the price problem. Addressing the 10th Annual Convention in Winnipeg of the Manitoba Farmers Union, Mr. Usick declared farmers can only be helped by the government establishing parity prices. He termed it a "fallacy" promoted to farmers for generations, that the solution to the farm problem is to tackle it on all fronts except the main one - price. "They are doomed to failure before they start." Parity First. Mr. Usick was critical too of the government's contention that it has fulfilled its election promises with the setting up of "fringe benefits" to the farmer. "Let us not forget that the first part of the agricultural problem is a fair price; cost of production. Unless he gets that, the other programs may not be very meaningful to the farmer, because he may not be here to enjoy them." Honourable A. Hamilton, Federal Minister of Agriculture, has said at the Dominion-Provincial Conference that they would take 3.5 million acres out of marginal land; some would go into grass and some into pulpwood of which there would be a shortage 25 to 30 years from now. Asked what was the farmer to do in the interval, Mr. Hamilton replied there would be "a difficult transitional period." Price ignored. When the agricultural situation is discussed in Ottawa by Department of Agricultural officials, economists, university professors, by so many of those who are supposed to understand the farm problem, they talk all around the problem, which is price, said Mr. Usick, "They talk about soil and water conservation, crop insurance, farm credit and other phases of the farm problem, but not about price. They say the solution is fewer farmers producing more, more efficiently yet statistics show tremendous increases in production today in almost every line of farming. Hogs, cattle, eggs, poultry, milk, cream, honey, rapeseed, sunflowers -- everything is up. Still the farmers last year got 10 percent less income than they did 10 years ago. The take-home pay of farmers is down, but they are working twice as hard and producing much more."

But here is one of the most interesting things: "Not the answer. How long can we try to solve the farm problem by producing more? Nearly every farm product is in surplus or near surplus. In the next ten years we will be in a state of perpetual surplus", Mr. Usick said. Farmers are admonished to be concerned about the bogey of the law of supply and demand. "We can answer that criticism by looking around at anything we want to buy. We have a surplus of every item we want to buy. If you want, you can buy a cake of soap; or a thousand cakes. If you have the money you can buy 100 tractors, 100 cars, as many suits of clothing as you want. There is no shortage of anything, yet the price of these items is continually on the increase. Manufacturers say it requires a certain amount of margin to cover the cost of production, and a bit more for a profit. Industry has to have its cost of production, plus. In agriculture they haven't even recognized yet that we have to receive cost of production alone, never mind "plus". Agriculture is no different than any other business. If we don't have cost of production, then we cannot stay in business."

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I wonder how long the honourable member is going to continue reading somebody else's speech from this paper.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Speaker, I'm just quoting from the paper and I'm putting it down

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) and I wholeheartedly agree with this, but to convince the honourable members on the other side because they say that this group, the CCF, doesn't know anything except price. I want to prove to them that there is somebody else who agrees with us, that it tries to move objectively.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to say this, but let the Honourable Minister of Agriculture bring the prices to the farmers the same as they were during the World War II years. The farmer is not going to beef too much when he brings the price controls as they were during the war years. Nobody went broke; neither the manufacturer or the farmer. We, today, are spending practically as much on National Defence as we had been doing during the Second World War.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Roblin stated: "How long am I going to from the papers?" I'll show him something else. No doubt he must have seen it, but just for the information of the city members I'll show you a map. Here, as you all can see, the prices of wheat in the years -- possibly this will answer the question. You will note in 1917, peak level -- it's hard for me to hold -- in 1921, 1922, 1923, very low; in 1931, 1932, rock bottom; in 1937 it came up; 1941, down again; 1945, up to the highest when the controls were on; 1958, down, close to the rock bottom of the '30's. Something to go by.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I have another map. The Honourable Member for Osborne was mixing margarine here -- I'll be showing the map. Look on the top of production, the farm crops of production and you will note how far the farmer is down. Just look at it. Farm crop rose up to 50 percent; the wheat price is down 21 percent. Take note! The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdown the other day, when my colleague from Brokenhead was speaking, asked what was the cost of production of a bushel of wheat. Naturally I would take it for granted that the honourable member -- he's not in his seat, I'm sorry -- knows that there are 14 regions in Manitoba and one would have to do quite a bit of homework to get the cost of production but I would venture to say that our provincial Minister should undertake that job and come as close as possible, for all the people of Manitoba, that they would know how much is the cost of production in Canada -- at least western Canada. They haven't got it or I don't know where to look for it. I tried to find it and I couldn't get it.

However, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we here in Canada, that 13 percent of farmers subsidize the 87 percent and I think it is not right. However, I have here a cost of production. Maybe that will help to answer some of the questions. June 1st, 1960, the Voice of the Farmer, "Farmers' Cost of Production. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics Index of Commodities and Services used by the prairie farmers -- the farmers' cost of living and production stood in mid-May at 243.9 -- 1935-39 equalled 100." Well, maybe I have the cost of production after all. I withdraw the statement where I said I couldn't find it. That is to say, it cost prairie farmers \$2.439 to buy what \$1.00 would buy in 1935 and '39. Now I want to repeat this -- I'll say it differently. It takes \$2.439 to buy what \$1.00 would buy in 1935-39. "This means, therefore, that the \$1.40 initial wheat payment is worth only 57.4 cents in terms of the 1935-39 value of money, basis No. 1 Northern Fort William, or at the average country elevator point, it is worth 49.8 cents a bushel." Then, Mr. Speaker, in other words, the dollar value of the bushel is 50 cents at Fisher Branch. "The index of \$243.9 represents a moderate decline from the previous level reported in August, 1959. However, it is accounted for almost entirely by the seasonal decline in farm wage rates. The portion of the index relating to equipment materials used by farmers was actually 2.9 above the previous level -- farm machinery, building materials, feed, binder twine, seed and hardware all showing an increase. Items included in the family farm living costs varied. Food and miscellaneous items showed a decrease from August. Clothing and household equipment remained unchanged, while fuel and health maintenance items increased, points out of the Searle Grain Company bulletin."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is as close as I can come. However, we all understand in this House -- never mind my group -- we are not trying to tell this government to give the farmers a subsidy because we very well realize that no one province can do that. All that we are asking in our resolution is to send it to the senior government, to the Ottawa Government, that the Ottawa Government would take steps. However, Mr. Speaker, I still have a good one in here. I introduced it once or I quoted it once in here, but it is so good that I shall quote it again because those same people that are in Ottawa today, when I was a delegate with the Honourable

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) Minister at the moment, this same man told us, "parity for farmers, not charity". And here I'm standing, sorry to say in disagreement with the Honourable Minister of Agriculture of Manitoba, but we were there on the same principle and here's what happened, what our Honourable Prime Minister of Canada -- at that time he was in the Opposition -- and this has a heading "Tory Speeches -- It should not be necessary to argue this case in great detail with the present Federal Government because some of the best speeches which have been made in the House of Commons for parity prices were made by Prime Minister Diefenbaker when he sat on the Opposition benches. On March 12th, 1956, Mr. Diefenbaker moved a motion which reads as follows: "In the opinion of this House, consideration should be given by the government to the possibility of introducing"

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WAGNER: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: You may not read the proceedings of another House in the Chamber. I believe that the legislative actions are separate. I also should maybe inform you that you have another four minutes before your time is up.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I must object on the point that you raised. I think that it's perfectly proper for the honourable member to refer back to a former debate and a resolution. I agree that you would be proper if the matter was before the House of Commons by resolution at the present time. I do suggest though, Your Honour, that the member is correct when he's referring to past procedures in any Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not too sure that the Honourable the Leader of the CCF is correct in this matter. However, it's not important right at the moment and the honourable member can continue his speech as he has another three or four minutes left.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just suggest that it may be important to my colleague who is trying to establish the difference of the principles of the First Minister of Canada now as it was at the time that he's referring to in Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I believe he has the right to say that, but he doesn't have the right to refer to the debate in the House.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, if I might say something on a point of order, if your ruling were to stand then it would mean that when we were debating a question here, that we could not read the statement of any Minister or any member of the House of Commons. Now just a moment's reflection, I'm sure, will convince you, Mr. Speaker, that we haven't ever applied that rule before, because certainly I have quoted the immediately past Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa with regard to crop insurance fairly recently, and I'm sure that many other members have done it. I would ask that before you make that as a ruling, Mr. Speaker, you check it very carefully.

MR. SPEAKER: I might say that I just read the article this morning in Beausheue and I am prepared to take another look at it. I don't intend to be rigid on this matter at all.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to go out of leaps and bounds, but I quoted the same resolution in 1958 so it's in the Hansard. However, I don't want to cause no friction or arguments or anything of that kind, but this resolution is applying to what I was trying to convince the House that they would pass the resolution. That's why I was quoting. So, Mr. Speaker, "In the opinion of this House consideration should be given by the government to the possibility of introducing during the present Session, legislation to create parity of price for agricultural products at levels to ensure producers a fair cost-price relationship. This can be found on page 2020 of Hansard: the squeeze which the farmer suffers results from the disparity in the relationship between the prices of farm products and the prices the farmer has to pay. When they are in proper relationship parity is established, and it is parity that the farm organizations across this country are asking for today. Not charity but parity."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that's all I wanted to establish, that at one time we were all fighting equally for parity not for charity, and now somehow there's a split. I must admit I have an article and I still could find it -- even the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons stated that now is the time to apply parity. However, in 1957 when I was a delegate, the Liberal Government was there and they said it couldn't be done. With this statement, Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude. I solicit the support of all the members in this House, because, as far as I'm concerned, it is not only important for the agricultural man that this resolution goes to Ottawa but it is in

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) the interest of all people in Manitoba. If you're going to get the farmer out of the farm you are going to throw him into the lap of the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare; you're going to throw him on the social assistance -- on the welfare. Thank you.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Arthur, that the debate be adjourned.

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

. Continued next page.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that whereas unemployment in Canada and in Manitoba is at an all-time post-war high; and whereas this unemployment has serious effects on more than the 30,000 people of this Province who are unemployed and on the people of Manitoba as a whole; therefore be it resolved that this House urges the Government to give consideration to the advisability of an immediate and vigorous program, in co-operation with the Federal Government or by itself, which would put those people now unemployed back to productive work.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this resolution, may I first of all say that the question of unemployment is one that is giving serious concern to peoples of all levels of government; and is the grave concern particularly of those who are affected by unemployment at the present time. Now much has been said about it but there is very little being done in respect of attempting to solve the grave problem of unemployment, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we here in the Legislature of Manitoba have our part to play in trying to solve the problem.

Unemployment, Sir, is becoming an increasing problem year by year. Since the last war there has been a constant boom and bust in our economy. For a few years following the war we had a period of relative prosperity. At that time the nation was catching up on producing the requirements of a nation at peace. Goods, which were unobtainable during the war, were being manufactured and were being purchased by the citizens of Canada. After two or three years of relative prosperity because of this, we started to get into difficulties once again. In 1949-50 we had the first so-called slackening of the economy. After this period of slackening was over our unemployed personnel represented 2.4 percent of the total workers in the year 1951. In 1953-54 another year of softening occurred. Following the so-called come-back to a stable economy, our total unemployed in relation to the working force amounted to 3.4 percent unemployed. It is generally considered by foremost economists that when unemployment percentages exceed three percent of the total working force, then we have a problem. Financial difficulties were encountered again in 1957 and 1958. In 1958 the seasonally adjusted unemployment percentage was 6.6 percent. This dropped in 1959 to 5.6 percent and we thought again that we may be in a period of economic recovery. When we opened the present decade, 1960, we did it heralding a new decade and trusted that in the '60's we would have prosperity and progress once again. But such has not been the case, Mr. Speaker. In 1960 the seasonally adjusted figures show that over six percent of the total working force were unemployed over the year. However, in the last six months, the total of unemployed were increasing above this average and by January of 1961 nearly 700,000 were registered as unemployed, or 10.8 percent of the labour force. In February of this year this had increased again to three-quarters of a million unemployed and seeking work. Unfortunately, Sir, there appears, at the present time, no real halt to this trend. I acknowledge that in today's press it is reported from the unemployment commission that we have had a reduction in the City of Winnipeg, or the Greater Winnipeg area, of some 180. Whether this is an indication of a change in the tempo of unemployment remains to be seen.

Nevertheless, Sir, we still have a great problem and still have to tackle the situation as it is. There are some, Sir, that are predicting that before the peak of winter unemployment is reached, that 800,000 will be unemployed, or about 12 1/2 percent of the total working force. In total numbers this would only be about 25,000 less unemployed than we had in 1933, which was in the middle of the great depression that sometimes is forgotten. In 1933, Sir, the unemployed represented about 19 percent of the total working force at that time. I do not suggest that the situation today compares with the depression years. Built-in stabilizers, such as unemployment insurance, have greatly aided in easing the adverse effects of unemployment. I do warn, however, that if the constant yearly increase in unemployment continues as it has in the past two or three years, we may be faced with the acute problems of the '30's. More and more of our unemployed are exhausting their unemployment benefits which will add to those on provincial or municipal aid. The greatest tragedy, Mr. Speaker, of the present situation, in my opinion, is the number of young people out of work. Over a quarter of those now unemployed are under 20 years of age. These are the persons who should be in a position to have steady

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)....employment and who are the foundation for our future. These are the persons who normally would be thinking of marriage in the years ahead. They should be in a position to add to the economy of Canada by purchasing new homes and being able to purchase the products of our factories. These are the persons who, Providence forbid, would be called upon to serve their Queen and country in the event of any hostilities.

Another group of unemployed which presents a great problem are those over the age of 45. Many of these are victims of automation and have been displaced by machines. For example, on our great national transportation systems of the railroads, the total number employed are constantly being reduced to the effects of automation. In the non-op organizations alone, those who do not run the trains, there is a constant reduction of 10 percent going on. In the road-building industry, less and less persons are being required in the construction of our roads due to an increase of road-building equipment and due to the fact that they are able to achieve more. Our clerical staffs are also adversely affected in these days because of the introduction of IBM machines, and the likes of that, which are replacing many of our clerical staff and stenographers who formerly performed the work.

You may well say to me, "We know all about the situation and know the problems. Aren't we meeting the situation by setting up commissions to consider what can be done? Are we not providing a winter works program to alleviate the situation?" My answer, Sir, is the problem is an immediate one. We cannot afford to wait on commission reports. Our winter works program in Canada at the present time is only providing employment for 100,000 men. The Throne Speech of this government, introduced on February 14th, informed us that 8,200 persons in Manitoba were employed in winter work.

MR. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I would just like to inform my honourable friend -- I know that he's not attempting to mislead us -- but I think the 8,200 includes winter work people, as such, through the municipalities plus what we've been able to put to work through our own public utilities and other investment programs. It's only a technical objection but I just wanted to correct the statement.

MR. PAULLEY: Well I thank my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker. All I'm doing is taking the text from the Throne Speech itself. There wasn't the reservation, as I recall it, in the Throne Speech.

MR. ROBLIN: It does particularly mention the two sources of employment here. I was particular to see that it did.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, okay, Mr. Speaker. Then let us decide or discover what is being done here then in the question of our winter works program here in the Province of Manitoba, as contained in one of the informational bulletins of the Department of Industry and Commerce. I refer to the issue of February 3rd in which the Honourable John Carroll -- "Manitoba's Minister of Labour said Friday, the total projects involved the employment of 3,099 men with direct payroll costs of some two million-odd dollars." I'm glad the First Minister -- he must have anticipated what I was going to say because he has included the number working on our utilities. I sincerely trust that the ones that he is referring to are permanently employed and will not be laid off at the conclusion of the winter season. And then, Sir, the informational bulletin goes on to indicate that there will be more employed as the result of the winter works program in the Province of Manitoba. I have the latest figure, Sir, as of March 8th, 1961, from the Unemployment Commission, which I believe is the proper source, that the total number of men employed in Manitoba on winter works programs are now 3,172, which indicates that the winter works program is only a drop in the bucket. I would like to suggest too, just by comparison, that in the Province of Saskatchewan at the present time there are 10,021 employed on winter works projects; and in the Province of Alberta, for a further example, there are 11,299 employed as of March 8th of this year. We must remember that one of the reasons possibly for the higher figures in the two sister provinces to the west is because that in Saskatchewan and Alberta there are no restrictions on the status of the worker to be employed providing they are unemployed; whereas here in Manitoba the government provides wage assistance only to those who have been on relief for 90 days or more.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, that's only for our own provincial plan not the federal plan. The winter works incentive.....

MR. PAULLEY: Now then, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we are rapidly--

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)....if we have not reached the situation where our endeavours have got to be more and more on year round employment -- that we have been concentrating on the fact of winter employment; but due to changes in our economy and the rapid increase in the number who are becoming employable, the problem now has magnified itself so that we have to do it on a year round basis instead of just winter works. Some may say to me, Mr. Speaker, "well if all the married women were replaced, this would create jobs for the unemployed." I would suggest that many married women who are working are only doing so because of financial problems at home. True, some may be working who do not require the income, but I suggest that this is not the answer to our problem as some suggest. You may say to me that some men have two jobs. This also may be true, but we must know the reasons why they have two jobs before we become too critical of them. Many are forced to do this because of the high cost of housing and of low wages. The fact of the matter is, in my opinion, that sometimes we just merely look for excuses and blame each other because of the situation, and not do very much to remedy it. I would refer, Sir, to an editorial which appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune on Friday, December 16th, 1960, which indicates this to me. "After reviewing the situation and saying concern about creating more jobs is, of course, necessary and praiseworthy, but the concern about more jobs and unemployment should not be allowed to run wild and create a completely distorted picture of the economy. This is so much nonsense. Canada is not in a major recession or anything like it." Then in order to substantiate the case that the editor is making, Sir, he refers back -- I presume this is because it's usually considered that the Tribune is tinged with Conservatism against Liberalism -- it refers back, "The problem of unemployment persisted during the Liberal regime just as it has under the Conservatives. Even in 1942 when the nation was nearing the peak of its war effort, three percent of the labour force was out of work. In 1957 when the Liberals were voted out of office, the figure was 4.3 percent." I read that to indicate that too often people attempt to say that, simply because of the fact under both Liberals and Conservatives we've had unemployment, what are we hollering about? I suggest of course, in my present position, Mr. Speaker, that while either one of these two political parties are in power we are going to have a considerable amount of unemployment. This approach to the situation shows that the Conservatives try to blame the Liberals and vice versa. We maintain that both have failed to accept responsibility and neither would plan economy to provide for full employment.

In Winnipeg recently Dean F. C. Cronkite, Chairman of the Prairie Regional Employment Committee, is reported as saying that the unemployment situation has reached a danger level with about ten percent of the labour force without jobs. He intimated there was no reason for panic and I agree, Sir, that there should be no panic; but stout statesmanship is required. I suggest, Sir, to the members of this House that they should give consideration to the remarks of the Honourable W. S. Lloyd, the new Provincial Treasurer of Saskatchewan, when he introduced his budget on Monday, February 27th, of this year, in which he said, and I'm quoting on page 4 and 5, "The economy of Canada has not been growing fast enough to maintain the high level of activity we must have if our increasing manpower resources and our investment in plants should be kept fully employed." He says, "It seems to me inescapable that to achieve our essential goals we must emphasize the instrument of governments; that governments, in turn, must adopt the technique of purposeful planning."

What are the future forecasts in Canada and Manitoba at the present time? Mr. Frank C. Denton has recorded in the Press the other day -- Mr. Denton, an economist for the Senate Committee on Manpower and Employment, is quoted as saying, "One million more jobs must be found in Canada before 1965 if unemployment is reduced to the three percent level considered normal." Dr. Deutsch, Vice Principal of Queen's University, Kingston, who is a consultant to the Senate Committee, has been reported as saying, "There are prospects for increasing employment in the service field as against the goods-producing industries." But he also stated, "We are heavily dependent upon the goods-producing industries for export." The forecast he predicted for the next five years is an almost straight level of employment in the goods-producing industries with service industries showing a rise. It has been held in many quarters that unless goods-producing industries expand, service industries only add to the cost of purchases paid for by our consumer.

What does our own Minister of Industry and Commerce say of the future here in the

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.)....Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker? I refer to the informational bulletin of his department of February 24th, 1961, where he says, "between now and 1970 we will have 39,000 more persons available for work than we have at the present time." At the present time we have somewhere in the neighbourhood of 35,000 unemployed. Add this 39,000 suggested for our economy in 1970, it would mean approximately 74,000 more jobs required if we absorb our first 35 today. He points out to us that we've got to have a tremendous growth in the rates of investment and in development here in the Province of Manitoba to achieve this. We have to have an increase of .16 percent in the industrial employment here in the Province of Manitoba to achieve that end.

What does the Financial Post have to say in connection with this very important thing of the forecast of the future, Mr. Speaker? I refer to the issue of December 17th, of 1960, where the Financial Post speaks of the outlook for the year 1961. On the first page it says, "Canada's gross national product it is estimated will very probably only etch up to the 36 billion mark next year from this year's projected total of 35.5 billion. Such a 1961 gain would be less than half the 1959 advance. Not an increase big enough to spell prosperity for all sectors of the economy or to create the fast growth needed to mop up unemployment. But just when the economy will shift from contraction to expansion in 1961 will depend largely on what happens in two key areas: inventories and capital spending."

Nowthen, Sir, I've tried to establish the position that we're in at the present time -- the forecast for the future. Now what can be done about unemployment? Firstly, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is not within the possibility of a Provincial Government to cure the situation in itself. I suggest that, in many respects, it is a federal problem. Other countries, Sir, have taken the steps, federally, to assist in seeing that the economy is at a reasonable level and that their unemployed are put back to work. And I'd like, Sir, first of all, to read a few excerpts from the brief which the Canadian Labour Congress presented to the Senate Committee on Unemployment as to what they are doing in a few countries across the pond. In the United Kingdom, in 1958, the government passed a Distribution of Industry Act. The purpose of the Act was to permit the Treasury, subject to certain conditions, to provide loans or annual grants to any sound project that was likely to reduce unemployment in an area where unemployment was high and persistent. The Board of Trade had to be satisfied that the loan or grant would lead to a reduction of unemployment in the area and that the Treasury was satisfied that the undertaking was likely to be ultimately successful without further financial assistance. Then Sir, on April 1st, of 1960, this Act was changed; but fundamentally, the latest act in the United Kingdom continues the policy laid down in the previous act I referred to, which was that aid was to be available to any locality in Great Britain which in the opinion of the Board of Trade a high rate of unemployment exists or is eminent or is likely to persist, whether seasonally or generally. In areas of high unemployment, aid consists of construction of industrial centres on land acquired by purchase agreement or condemnation; loans and grants to private companies to induce them to locate in such areas; improvement of basic community services; and the acquisition and improvement of abandoned, unsightly or neglected land, to provide for industrial use and generally improve the neighbourhood. In Great Britain, encouragement is also given to unemployed workers to move where jobs are available. The unemployed worker is asked by the local employment office whether he is willing to move. If so, he is considered for suitable employment for which no unemployed person is available in the new location. The worker receives free transportation for himself and his family, as well as a lodging allowance for a maximum of two years if his dependents are unable to join him. It has been stated that the British Government has done more to influence the location of industrial plants, at least since the end of World War II, than any other governments in the free world.

In Belgium, Sir, they also have a program dealing with the question of unemployment. In Belgium, assistance may take the following form: construction of business centres by the government; loans under advantageous conditions; guarantees of loans; tax incentives to private companies which apply within three years after an area has been declared a development region. Low interest for loans may be obtained from specified banks which are subsidized by the government in amounts equal to the difference of the actual rate charged and the going rate as determined by the government. As little as one percent may be charged on these loans. In West Germany, in order to assist in the provision of employment, more loans are available -- 20-year loans at two percent to local communities for the improvement of public facilities such

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.).....as roads, electricity and water. Even more favourable conditions are available for street construction --25-year loans at two percent. Grants are also made available to public and private non-profit organizations -- 20-year two percent loans for vocational training to local governments, chambers of commerce, agriculture and other such institutions. In Sweden, in broad terms, unemployment is dealt with first by insisting that unemployed workers move where work is available; second, by encouraging the location of new businesses in an area where it would give work; and thirdly, public works. So you see, Sir, other countries are doing much to alleviate and attempt to solve the question of unemployment, which they recognize is not simply a temporary winter affair as we so often do here in Canada.

Now then, what could we do here in the Province of Manitoba? I suggest, in all deference to the Minister of Labour, one of the first things we could do would be to increase the minimum wage rates of the Province of Manitoba. I was most interested to hear him, this afternoon, give us a breakdown of what 66¢ an hour means in terms of dollars and cents and the necessities of life. If I got his figures correctly, Mr. Speaker, when we take the total income at 66¢ per hour for a 44-hour week, and take the cost of the bare necessities as he suggested that the report that he received, or what the rate was established by, we have a huge surplus of 32 cents per annum. I suggest, Sir, that one of the basic problems that we have in employment today is because, within the confines of our own country and our own province, we haven't sufficient people with sufficient money to purchase the products of the factories and of our industry. I suggest that the Province of Manitoba could give assistance for the construction of low rental housing and slum clearance. We have before us a resolution dealing with this, so of course I won't go into that. Another method by which we could help increase employment is by adopting here in the Province of Manitoba a 40-hour, five day week for labour. I suggest that here in the Province of Manitoba that we could undertake a program of hospital construction. We're still awaiting the report of the Hospital Survey Board. I suggest that we could undertake a program of rehabilitation and restoration for our mental hospitals here in the Province of Manitoba as another means by which we could assist in employment here in the Province of Manitoba. I do not need to say at this particular time how much is required in the field of mental health and a re-brushing of our institutions here, which could conceivably provide employment for many. I suggest another thing insofar as our unemployed, and this won't put them back to work, but I would suggest to the government that they give consideration to allowing exemptions of our hospitalization premiums to our unemployed who have exhausted their benefits. The government of the Province of Manitoba could require, as a condition of agreement, that companies which extract our natural resources should allocate funds for the development of secondary industries using the products involved. It could if necessary, in my opinion, construct with provincial funds alone, the secondary industries. James Coyne of the Bank of Canada says that American investment in Canada has had an adverse effect on Canadian stability of employment and costs of production. This, he says, because American investment has been channelled into primary rather than secondary industries. Canada could have achieved the same standard of living and had more stable employment without U.S. financial help. These things, I suggest, could be considered by this House at the provincial level, and at the federal level. I suggest that these things could be done. Our Unemployment Insurance benefits could be increased both insofar as the rates are concerned and the period of benefit. The Federal Government could undertake a road construction program, including the provision of a second east-west highway. They could undertake a program of school construction; aid in the construction of hospitals; and do a lot toward the creation of cultural centres in the Dominion of Canada. I suggest that here is an opportunity for the First Minister of our province to take under discussion with the Federal authorities the building of the cultural centre that he suggested we should have for our 100th anniversary.

Another very important thing I think that the Federal Government could do, is to bring about the lowering of interest rates and make money available for the construction of industrial plants. I suggest that the present industrial development bank of the Dominion of Canada is not doing this job to the degree that is required. I suggest that the Federal Government could continue the family allowances above the age of 16 years for those at school or university or technical training schools. It has been pointed out to us that a great percentage of those unemployed at the present time are those who have not received sufficient educational standards,

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)....that they have not been trained in technical standards. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, in all deference to the Honourable Member from Cypress, that if the family allowances were increased, at least during the period that these youngsters were receiving an education and a training, that it might be a great assistance and it might aid in the development and the keeping of these youngsters in school for a greater period of time. I think that the Federal Government should concentrate more on placing greater purchasing power of potential customers here in Canada. We worry about export trade and markets when we have a huge segment of our country without the means to buy the products of our factories. If we take these 750,000 unemployed at the present time and presume that they are responsible for three persons each, this alone would represent about 2 1/4 million lost customers for those things that they require and should have above the bare necessities of life. A time of acute unemployment, Sir, I suggest, is not the time for financial retrenchment but time to make money easier to obtain at less cost.

Sir, I invite all of the members of this House, no matter what their political faith may be, to discuss this great problem and to consider ways and means of solving the immediate situation and offer suggestions for plans for the future which will establish a more constant level of employment here and in Canada. In saying this, Sir, I realize quite fully that the Minister of Industry and Commerce of this province has made certain suggestions in regard to setting up commissions. I think it's admirable but, Sir, these have been done so often before, and I think that it is time we all joined together in this great problem. There is a solution, and I suggest that by serious consideration of all aspects of the problem, that it can be solved here in the Province of Manitoba and in the Dominion of Canada; and I commend, Sir, this resolution to the serious contemplation of this House.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if no one cares to continue this debate at the present time and I see no one standing, I would like to move the adjournment of this debate, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. 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 Seven Oaks.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave of the House to withdraw this resolution because I feel that, because of the public demand at the present time for an investigation in regard to the high cost of drugs, the Federal Government is about to start an investigation.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that you should move the resolution.

MR. WRIGHT: Is it in order to move the resolution first?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker you may not have heard him. The Honourable Member is going to ask for permission to withdraw the resolution in view of something that has happened at Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Resolution withdrawn.

MR. PAULLEY: In view of the commission being set up at Ottawa.

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

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's.): Mr. Speaker, I beg permission of the House to let this matter stand.

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

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask the same request. I haven't got the information from the department yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the House has heard enough of me this afternoon and I beg to have this matter stand.

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

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Speaker, I don't feel that I would be able to properly introduce this resolution before 5:30. Would you consider calling it 5:30 at this time?

MR. ROBLIN: I think, Mr. Speaker, that that might be acceptable to members of the House if you were so to rule.

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