

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

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 10th, 1961.

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. ROBERT G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Graham Haig and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Commonwealth Savings and Loan Company.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (St e. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Augustine LaFleur and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Les Soeurs de la Charite de l'hopital General Saint-Antoine de le Pas; and as well I beg to present the petition of Eugenie Landry and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate les Soeurs de la Charite General de Flin Flon.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable Member for Roblin,
The Honourable the First Minister.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate yesterday because I wanted to make a comment or two about the fact that we are appointing for the first time a new Standing Committee of the House, namely, the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, which will be a relatively small committee and will be staffed by Honourable Messrs. Lyon, McLean, Messrs. Christianson, Groves, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Orlikow, Scarth, Smellie and Wright. I'd like to draw attention to this new committee, Sir, because although it was arranged for at the last session of our Legislature, it perhaps has not received as much attention from us as yet, and perhaps from the general public as well, as I trust it will deserve. We amended the rules of the House to establish this Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders in order that we might have such a committee to examine all the regulations registered under The Regulations Act. We also amended The Regulations Act to require that such regulations be referred to the committee, and we made provision for the repeal or the amendment of the regulations as might be required by a resolution of the House. Owing to the large and increasing amount and the complex nature of the legislation with which in modern times legislatures have had to deal, it has, I'm afraid, become necessary for them to delegate to other persons and ancillary bodies in the administrative side of government some pretty wide powers to prescribe in detail what did not seem expedient or possible to outline in the statute or in the legislation itself. I think, Sir, that it has been a matter of general concern on all sides of the House that these delegated powers be exercised with due discretion and within the ambit of the authority delegated, since, in fact, these regulations and orders that are made affect in some cases very large numbers of our citizens to a considerable degree; and as far as they're concerned, become laws which they must observe, and if they fail to observe them they are subject to penalty.

In 1945 Manitoba Enacted The Regulations Act, prepared by the Conference of Commissioners on the Uniformity of Legislation in Canada. It was in fact the second province to do so and I think credit should be given for that step. The Enactment of The Regulations Act was a necessary and useful first step but it did fall short in establishing a real parliamentary control over the powers that are delegated, as we so often do today. The House is aware, Sir, that in other parts of the Commonwealth, notably in the United Kingdom and in the Commonwealth of Australia, measures have been taken to reassert the control of the Legislature over the exercise of these delegated powers with a view to curbing any abuse or undue use thereof, and I think that it would be agreed that those measures taken elsewhere have been successful. And now we in this province are advancing in the same direction. I think we are the first Legislature in Canada, and in that term I include the Parliament of Canada itself, to make a provision of this sort, and I believe that this may be regarded in time as a constitutional measure of some considerable importance -- important to the legislature and to the government; important in the administration of justice; and thereby important to the whole body of our citizens.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) The Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders will be holding its first meeting this session and, no doubt, they will have to work out some details of their procedure and how they would wish to operate. It might be useful if I would give some account of how such committees operate in other places, and offer some suggestions that those on the committee might consider, that might affect the operation of our own committee here. In the United Kingdom the similar committee of the House of Commons has established a tradition of non-partisanship in the examination of the regulations. Indeed, policy is not considered, and it has been the fact that their findings have usually been unanimous. I hope that our committee may find it possible to operate in much the same way. In respect of the operations of the committee in the United Kingdom, which they call the Scrutiny Committee, there's an interesting comment I would like to offer to the House, made by Sir Cecil Kerr, who is the main authority in the United Kingdom on the question of delegated powers. When it wanted his observations, he had this to say, "This Commons Committee, like that of the Lords, avoids issues of government policy, consequently is happily free from partisan controversy. A spectator could not safely guess the political affiliations of its members. It has never had a division or a cross word. It has refrained from clashing with departments or telling them how to administer their concerns. It has falsified the pessimistic prediction that it would be either tolerant and therefore odious, or else dominant and therefore constitutionally disturbing." Sir Cecil Kerr's statement goes on to say that, "the Scrutiny Committee does not deal with policy," and that statement is confirmed by referring to a report of the Select Committee of the United Kingdom House of Commons set up in December, 1952, to consider the procedures for the control of delegated legislation and the existing practice with respect thereto. That committee's report said in part as follows: "The duty of the committee is to consider whether the special attention of the House should be drawn to a statutory instrument or draft on any of the following grounds. (1) That it imposes a charge," -- and here I may interject that the expression charge has a special meaning in this context, it refers to taxation rather than fees or licenses or matters of that sort. "(2) That it excludes challenge in the court. (3) That it purports without specific authority in the parent Act to have retroactive aspects. (4) That there has been an unjustifiable delay in publication, or laying before parliament, or in sending a notification to Mr. Speaker when the instrument comes into operation before it has been laid. (5) That its form or purport calls for elucidation. Or (6) That it make some unusual or unexpected use of the powers conferred by the statute under which it was made." And the report goes on to say that, "the Scrutiny Committee cannot consider or report on the merits or policy of any of the instruments. In drawing the attention of the House to an instrument, it gives no detailed reason but merely refers to the heading under which it reports. Before, however, it reports it must and does hear what the department concerned with the instrument has to say. The department's answer is annexed to the report and usually indicates the committee's point. In several sessions the committee has submitted a special report containing general comments on possible improvements in departmental practice. Treasury circulars have directed the attention of departments to these special reports." That is the end of the quotation from the Standing Select Committee of the United Kingdom House in November, 1952.

From the practice of similar committees in the United Kingdom and in Australia, certain principles which these committees follow may be abstracted. I believe that these principles should be followed by the committee on Regulations and Orders of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, and I would list them as follows: (a) The regulations should not contain substantive legislation that should be enacted by the legislature, but it should be confined to administrative matters. (b) The regulations should be in strict accord with the statute conferring the power, and unless so authorized by the statute, should not contain a retroactive effect. (c) A regulation should not exclude the jurisdiction of the courts. (d) A regulations should not impose a fine, imprisonment, or other penalty, or shift the onus of proof of innocence onto a person accused of an offence. (e) The regulation in respect of personal liberties should be strictly confined to the authorization of the statute. (f) The regulation should not impose anything in way of a tax, as distinct from the fixing of an amount of a license, fee, or the like. (g) The regulation should not make any unusual or unexpected use of the delegated power; and finally, the regulation should be precise and unambiguous in its parts.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the members who compose this committee will be

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)....giving some thought to the advisability of considering such a framework for the operation of their committee. It may well be that there are other points of importance in this matter which I have not raised, but which will become apparent when the committee begins its work. I must say, Sir, that I think that the personnel of the committee as reported in the votes and proceedings is certainly well qualified, on all sides, for the task which they are being assigned. There is quite a mass of regulations that accumulate for their examination. It may be that a great many of them are of a routine character and can be disposed of easily. On the other hand, it may be that they cannot conclude their work during the sitting of the Legislature. If that were the case, I think it would be wise if they should so recommend to us that they should be allowed to sit during the recess to continue their examination of these regulations. I've taken the trouble, Sir, of giving the House what information I can about the way these similar committees have operated in other jurisdictions. We have found very often that the experience of other Legislatures similar to our own, particularly that of the Mother of Parliament at Westminster, has been very useful because, in essence, their problems are the same as ours; and while one wouldn't give a blanket approval of all the solutions that they employ for the settlement of their difficulties, I think certainly it would be quite a useful guide for us in consideration of this matter. I feel that the committee should give close attention to setting forth some principles of operation during its early sessions that can be agreed upon by the members so that there may be a clear understanding of the task which is involved, and the way in which that task should be undertaken. And while the committee will be free to make its own decisions, Sir, as is only right and proper, I am hopeful that the observations I have made this afternoon may be of some assistance to them in their consideration of their problems.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notice of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HON. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Public Welfare) (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 40, an Act to amend the Hospitals Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE introduced Bill No. 38, an Act to incorporate Association for Retarded Children in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the honourable members of this House and the press of the importance of today's date, for on March 10, 1861, Ukraine's greatest poet and emancipator of freedom, Taras Shevchenko, died in Kiev. Today, 100 years later, freedom loving Ukrainians in all parts of the world, with profound and revered feeling, are commemorating his death.

Mr. Speaker, at one time or another people of every country and every nationality pay homage and revere the sacred memories of famous men and, on such special occasions and anniversaries, praises her sons; words of appreciation and wisdom are quoted; and famous deeds are remembered of these great national heroes; who, through the medium of the voice, the pen or the sword, have made this a better world to live in. Just as the English feel a great pride in the names of William Shakespeare and the present great man, Winston Churchill; just as the hearts of the Scottish people glow with warmth when celebrating Bobbie Burns day; just as the Irish celebrate St. Patrick's day; just as the American people gratefully and spontaneously respond to the name of the father of the country, George Washington, and the great emancipator Abraham Lincoln; so do the Ukrainian people, wherever they may be, respond with great pride and reverence and solemn prayer to the name of their greatest poet, prophet, and fighter for truth and liberty, their honoured son of the Ukrainian soil, Taras Shevchenko.

Our poet was born March 9, 1814, near Kiev, in what was called the feudal and serf period. During this period the serfs were not given any opportunity to learn to write or read for fear that the acquired knowledge would make them realize their subserviency and attempts would be made to gain the freedom which they were denied. Such were the depressing conditions under which our famous poet was born. He died at the early age of 47, 100 years ago

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd.) today, living just four years of freedom for which he fought, and we gained, after serving ten long years in Siberia because he dared to write the truth; he dared to write in his poetry -- and I have a copy of one of the books -- it's a rare one, "The Kolzar", and many other prose works about the servitude and suppression of his people to which he continually challenged the despotism and tyranny of the Russian Czar. But, Mr. Speaker, although he died rather prematurely, his words and spirit have lived all these years and are stronger today than ever before. His works have been translated into many foreign languages and I'd like to name a few of them -- possibly you must be aware -- Doctor Hunter, well-known in Manitoba here in Teulon; William Morfelt; Percy Paul Silver; Florence Livesay, Edna Underwood, Rev. Cundy; Professor Clarence Manning of the University of Columbia; Professor Watson Kirkconnell, former member of the United College; Mr. and Mrs. Arthur M. Coleman; and the present one, Mrs. Myra Lazechko Haas, who is a prominent Canadian poetess.

And what Uncle Tom's Cabin did to the United States and negroes after and during the civil war, the poems of Taras Shevchenko did the same for his people, because it was two days after his death that the Czar issued a declaration freeing all the people. Possibly the dying poet knew it was coming and died the happier at that time. At no other time in the history, honourable members, of a free world, has Shevchenko's works been so necessary to us as it is today. His universal message cannot be restricted just to the Ukrainian national boundary. His works are a reminder of democracy's meaning that we should fight to preserve our human personal freedom, our human rights, and our human dignity at all times.

Mr. Speaker, preparations were made several years ago to celebrate the 100th anniversary of our poet's death by the Ukrainian-Canadian Committee under the presidency of Dr. Kushner; and negotiating with the former government, Mr. Campbell and his cabinet, from whom they received permission to erect a beautiful dignified monument on the grounds of the Manitoba Legislative Building, it was thought this was the most suitable place in Canada because of the fact we have a large number of people living here. I would like to record publicly, to thank on behalf of the Ukrainian-Canadian Committee, the former Premier of this province and his Cabinet for providing a site; and also to the present First Minister and his Cabinet for fulfilling and continued co-operation; because on July 8th and 9th of this year the unveiling is to take place, to which are expected hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian origin from Canada, United States and from Europe, and there's no doubt in my mind that there'll be many tourists coming in to see the unveiling of the statue and other memorable festivities. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. John Diefenbaker, and the Rt. Hon. Mr. Pearson have accepted invitations to attend this unveiling.

Again I wish to reiterate, Sir, that this celebration is not merely being celebrated in Canada among the half-million non-Communist Ukrainians, but many preparations are being made also in the United States. As a matter of fact, the American Congress passed a resolution in recognition of Shevchenko's works and authorized the erection of a statue on the grounds of the Capital City in Washington, D.C.; and on September 13th of last year, the former president of the United States signed the declaration which hereby made it the law of the land. Although the communists have tried to accept him as champion of the downtrodden Ukrainian people then under the Czarist domination, a reading of his works by any person, incidentally the translations are here, will readily convince any objective person that Shevchenko belonged to the freedom-loving Ukrainians and to the free world, and not to the tyrannical communist, Russia.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, again it is with profound gratitude that I speak on behalf of not only the Ukrainian-Canadian Committee but of all the Ukrainian people living in Canada, to express our heartfelt thanks and our appreciation to Mr. Campbell's former government and Mr. Roblin and his present government in granting us this request. It is hoped that the statues, both here in Winnipeg and in Washington, D.C., when unveiled, in the honour of our national poet and bard, the Ukraine prophet and the poet lord of 45 million Ukrainian people scattered throughout this world, will be a tribute not only to our Ukrainian poet but also to all the people of those nations who dearly cherish the liberty, justice, freedom of worship, and freedom of speech that we so enjoy in Canada and the United States. And, Mr. Speaker, in closing, it is hoped that Shevchenko's greatest dream, the independence of the Ukraine, will soon be realized. Thank you.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think it is entirely fitting that the honourable member who has just spoken should have made such a statement in this Chamber, because while it is true that Canadians of Ukrainian ancestry are to be found in every part of the Dominion of Canada, I think we can say, with some pride, that here in the Province of Manitoba and in the City of Winnipeg we find the place where Ukrainian settlers in Canada first made their mark in this Dominion, and wherever since they have progressed in such a way as we might I think, with justifiable pride, regard this city and this province as the center of their influence and culture in the Dominion of Canada. Indeed, in this House, I think that it may be unique -- I think probably it happened here first, in any case, where we find representatives of the people of this province, coming from various constituencies, sitting in all the parties, being men who can claim Ukrainian ancestry and Ukrainian descent. We also recall with affection the name of a former Speaker of this House, of a former Attorney-General who still is with us, as being men of that prominence who made their mark in the political life of our nation. I think, Sir, that one could celebrate this anniversary entirely, however, on the contribution of the man whose name has been referred to, Taras Shevchenko; because he has personified in his life and in his struggle and in his works, the aspirations and the feelings of a whole people. His story is their story. His suffering, his achievement, is their suffering and their achievement; and he brings before their minds and indeed the minds of people everywhere who wish to think about it, the indomitable character of the human spirit and how in every race and every community, no matter how hard the circumstances or how terrible the obstacles, that human nature can rise above them to reach for those heights of freedom and of liberty which will ever be associated with his name.

I am glad to acknowledge that when I assumed my present position, it was brought to my notice that the former Premier of the province, who is here now, had graciously undertaken to provide for the erection of a statue to this great man on our Legislative grounds. I was certainly very happy to concur and to honour that decision of his and of his colleagues, because I think that the Ukrainian people have a special claim to this privilege. Not only is this the centre, in my view, of their contribution to the cultural life of our nation, but they are a people today who are in a sense without a homeland, whose homeland is in the hands of another; and where that freedom and liberty, which we look for, is not to be found. In that special sense, having made their new homes here, it seems to me that there ought to be a place for a memorial to this man, their national hero, on the grounds of this provincial capital. So, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this tribute to the national hero of the Ukrainian people. May I add to it my keen sense of appreciation of what Canadian Ukrainians have done and have meant to the building of this province and of this nation, because in their work and their lives they, too, are erecting a memorial, which shall not perish, to those deep aspirations to liberty and to freedom and to the building of a nation where all may be happy, that animated Taras Shevchenko and animates them today.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to join the previous speakers, as well as the millions of Ukrainians throughout the world, and pay tribute to the memory of a great man. I want to thank the Honourable the First Minister for the kind and understanding words he expressed. Mr. Speaker, every nation at one time or another faces severe trial and severe crises; and it seems that Divine Providence steps in, when hope is about lost, when there doesn't seem to be anything left in the future but despair. Divine Providence will step in and give those people an inspired leader. We see it throughout the history of all nations, and such an inspired leader was very sorely needed by the Ukrainians during the last century. The Ukrainians have been a subjugated and oppressed race for centuries, and I do believe that if it wasn't for the appearance of Taras Shevchenko on the scene that the Ukrainians, as an ethnic group, would have disappeared from the face of the world. I think that it was through his inspiration, through his dedication to one objective, and that was a continuous fight under very adverse conditions towards the bringing about of freedom and liberty to his people and giving them the courage to stand up to the oppression and the adversities that they were at that time undergoing.

Now he wasn't only a great Ukrainian. As was mentioned by the Honourable Member for Burrows, his works have been translated into many languages, and just to give you one or two opinions of what other people thought of him and his work, I would like to quote this from

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.)... Alfred Janssen, a Swedish writer, "Taras Shevchenko has been not only a national hero, but also a universal genius -- one of the lights of humanity." Then we have several translations into the English language, but one of these was made by Clarence Manning, an American, and here is what he has to say about Shevchenko. "Seldom has a poet lived and suffered to the full as did Shevchenko, and rarely has a man so fully incorporated all the aspirations of his people. He is one of the great poets of the 19th century, without regard to nationality or language, and his fearless appeal to right and truth justly speaks as eloquently in the new world as it did in the old." And I would close with these words, Mr. Speaker, that the statue which the Honourable Member for Burrows has spoken, I believe will ever be a symbol to the Ukrainians, that it is a solemn duty of theirs to fight for justice, freedom and liberty of the individual.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I am very very happy this afternoon to join with my colleague the Honourable Member for Burrows, and others in this House, in a tribute to this great poet and patriot of the Ukraine. He, I think, laid to a considerable degree the foundation of what we here in Canada have come to accept as a great contribution from a great people. Others have spoken of members of this Assembly who are of Ukrainian extraction and descent. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to be the leader of a party of ten, of which four of my members are of Ukrainian ancestry. I feel sure, Sir, that you and the rest of the members of this Assembly will join with me in saying that they are making a valuable contribution, as others have before them, and others yet to be elected to this Assembly will do. A tribute has been paid, Sir, to the former occupant of your high office in this Legislature, Mr. Bachynsky. I think he showed to this House an example of honesty and justice and uprightness, which is a characteristic of the Ukrainian people. It is true, Sir, as my colleague from Burrows has pointed out, that here on these Legislative grounds a statue will be built in honour of the memory of this great poet, oft'times called the Robby Burns of the Ukraine; and also, that a statue will be erected on the grounds of the capital of the great democracy to the south of us. These, Sir, will be a constant reminder, in a visual and outward manner, of this great poet. I suggest to you, Sir, and to this House, the greatest monument that this man has is in the thoughts and hearts of those people who have ventured into this land and other lands from the Ukraine. A far greater tribute, in my opinion, is the keen devotion of all in their hearts and minds to this great man. And so, Mr. Speaker, I am happy on behalf of my group, to join in the tribute to this great commoner who, in his way, set an example to his people which has had a tremendous influence on all freedom-loving peoples all over the globe.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I would also like to join with previous speakers in paying tribute to the memory of Taras Shevchenko, the greatest of Ukrainian poets. Although he is not physically among us now, I know that his spirit will be with the Ukrainian people forever.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw your attention and the attention of the members of the House to the galleries on your left, Sir, where there are 50 pupils from Nelson MacIntyre Collegiate in Norwood, which is in my constituency. These pupils are from Grade XI and with their teacher, Mr. S. J. Dronzek. Nelson MacIntyre Collegiate is in Norwood and is on the border of my constituency and I am sure that any of the students that attend that school are also residents of the constituency of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface. Nelson MacIntyre Collegiate has some fond memories for me, Mr. Speaker, because it was in the auditorium of this school that I was first nominated to fill the position that I now hold in this House. Although, Mr. Speaker, we are always glad to see students from the schools of our province visit us in the Legislature, I think that we are particularly interested and particularly pleased when we have students from Grade XI or from Grade XII. These students are reaching the point in life where they have not too many years to go before they are ready to make their own way in the world; and I think that it is of special interest, to these students particularly, to see how we operate in this Legislature and how the laws of their province are made. We extend through you, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Dronzek and his students, a cordial welcome, and I hope that they will come back and visit us again.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I wish to lay on the table of the House, an answer to questions asked by the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to lay on the table of the House a return to an Order of the House, No. 9, dated February 27th, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster. I should also like to lay on the table of the House, answers to thirteen questions put by -- two from the Honourable Member for Elmwood; one by the Honourable Member for Logan; one by the Honourable Member for West Kildonan; two by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead; two by the Honourable Member for Kildonan; four by the Honourable Member for St. John's; and one further from the Honourable Member from Logan.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, last week the Honourable Member for Minnedosa had a certain announcement to make concerning a certain sport, very popular in the Province of Manitoba. I understand that there has been a sequel to that series, and I wonder if he would not be prepared to make an announcement today as well.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose wouldn't be so quick to jump up ahead of me, I had been all ready to get up because I was requested on behalf of the Honourable Leader of the CCF to make this announcement. Now, Sir, before I make the announcement I would like to inform the House that, prior to the second major sporting event of this session, our rink held a full caucus in our committee room and we decided that, under the circumstances, it was not wise to go into this contest today standing on the government record. We decided that under the circumstances it might be wiser to adopt a certain private member's resolution. Now being a member of this side of the House Sir, we are not in the habit of making excuses, rather we tend to things of good reason and good judgment. Now in this caucus we had a reason for coming to this conclusion, and I think that I can best give you the reason by telling you that we have come to the conclusion that what happened last week could have had something to do with beginner's luck. We had a skip, Mr. Speaker, a self-appointed skip. He was there by virtue of the fact that he out-ranked the rest of us. The grass behind the brass. The brass was at the top and he overruled us. Today we found out the amount of his experience, the type of knowledge that he has in this world sport. He rented a broom or he had a broom rented for him at the Granite last week, and I think he begrudged the quarter or whatever the broom cost, so he went down and bought a new broom. Lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, he showed up with this broom today, straw all wrapped in plastic, and if it wasn't a house broom. It took some convincing on our part, Mr. Speaker, to convince him that there were two kinds of brooms. We came to the conclusion that possibly he owes some support to one very fine organization in the country, but he didn't have to show it this way because the broom that he bought was a "blind" broom. Now I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if he had been buying a broom and was intending to use it for skipping, he might have been better to have bought a stable broom because it covers that much more space and we might have been able to hit it.

To take nothing away from the victory of the CCF, I might say that I have a note here on my desk along with a photograph of four curlers and their coach. In it it says, "I have just received excellent pictures of our championship team. I thought you would like to have one." Now considering this is the championship team, Mr. Speaker, mine is the only face that appears in it of the group that curled today. Now I think that I should maybe announce the fact that the CCF won today's bout with a score of 12 to 7. But before I sit down I think I should also say that when the third man was finished shooting, our rink was 2 down. We were shot 3; there were only 4 rocks to come, 2 of ours and 2 of the CCF. When it was all washed up and done, the CCF counted 3. Now if this isn't good proof of the story that I've given you and the fact that we feel that it should be considered as a private member's resolution, having been adopted.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think in offering congratulations to the victors that I also want to pay tribute to the honourable member for the very touching tribute he paid to me on my ability this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for the Day.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day,

(Mrs. Morrison, cont'd.) I wish to present to you, Sir, and to the honourable members of this Assembly, a fine looking group of students up in the speaker's gallery. They are the Grade XII students, 16 in number, from the Richards Collegiate Institute of Somerset. Their teachers were not able to come with them so they have been accompanied by two lovely ladies from Somerset, Mrs. Timmerman and Mrs. Thevenot. Somerset, as many of you know, is in the northern part of my constituency, about 100 miles from Winnipeg. I would also like to present the three gentlemen who so kindly provided their cars and their time in order that these students could have the opportunity of coming here to see the legislators of Manitoba in action. Now these gentlemen are Mr. Weiker, Mr. Messner and Mr. Mestdagh. It certainly is a fine gesture on their part that they were willing to bring these students in this distance to get a first-hand view of how our democratic government works and to see, also, that in the midst of our law-making we can take time out to pay tribute to great people who have gone on before. I'm also glad that they have had the opportunity to view our Legislative Buildings here which we, as citizens of Manitoba, are so justly proud. I hope their visit here will be most enjoyable and that the students will find it has added stimulus to their studies. I would like to tell these visitors from Somerset that they are the first group that I have had the opportunity to present to this House. It is a great honour and a privilege. I hope you will have a wonderful day, and thank you for coming.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Questions -- the Honourable Member from Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health and Welfare these questions. (1) When was the Manitoba Hospital Council formed? (2) Who are the members? (3) What is the function of the Council? (4) How often do they meet? (5) When did they hold their last meeting? (6) To whom is the Council responsible?

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: (1) The names, locations, and owners of all the liquor agencies in Manitoba. (2) The amount of liquor sold in each agency in 1958, 1959 and 1960. (3) The commission paid to each agency in 1958, 1959, and 1960. (4) The locations of all government liquor stores in Manitoba. (5) The names of those persons who own the aforesaid stores. (6) The rent paid by the government to the aforesaid, and the terms and conditions of each lease. (7) The amount of liquor sold by each liquor store in 1958, 1959 and 1960.

MR. SPEAKER: Who was your seconder?

MR. GUTTORMSON: The Member for Emerson.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would just make one or two comments about this order before the question is put. We have no objection to giving the honourable member the bulk of the information he requests. I would point out to him that Question No. 1 will be found in the Annual Report of the Liquor Control Commission, so we wouldn't propose to answer that. Question No. 2, I would prefer it if the honourable member would be agreeable, I can give him the totals of the sales and I can explain to him why these sales are not broken down in the reports. If he insists on having them from each agency we would consider it, but I would prefer to give him the totals of sales from all agencies. The same thing would apply to No. 3. That could be broken down but that is information that has not generally been made available. I have no objection to making it available to the honourable member, but I think he will appreciate that there are others, shall we say, who are in the wholesale end of this business who would also be quite happy to get this and to whom this information is not generally made available. The other question, No. 6, no problem there on the rent. Does he really want each lease for each leased store to be given to him? That would be quite a voluminous job. It may take several days or weeks to get that all together, but we can do that if that's what the honourable member wants. I can give him the rent, but to give him the terms and conditions would mean, in effect, giving him the whole lease, to which we have no objection. I merely point out that if he has any particular ones in mind we'd be quite happy to give him, but if he wants them all, this could be done but with considerable trouble. The amount of liquor sold by each

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.)....liquor store in '58, '59 and '60 -- I would make the same condition to that. That information is not generally made available. The bulk figures are available, however, in the Annual Report showing what the total liquor is, sold through stores and through agencies.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I think the Attorney-General is in error when he says this information regarding Question No. 1 is already available. The owners of these agencies - that information is not available in the report. The location is, but not the owners of the stores. And Question No. 2, I would prefer it if I could have that information as to how much liquor is sold in each agency. I have a very good reason for wanting to know, and the commissions paid, because that's the purpose of my question. Totals are of no value to me at all.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: I'm not ready to accept that, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LYON: I merely say to the honourable member that we would not accept that. I would like to attach the conditions that I mentioned before. I can speak to the honourable member about this if he would like to stand it for the time being, and I will explain to him perhaps what I am getting at.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to stand it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Logan, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: (1) The total number of deaf children in the province; (a) in Greater Winnipeg, (b) in the remaining portion of the Province. (2) The number of Manitoba children attending school for the deaf; (a) Saskatoon School, Saskatoon; (b) in Winnipeg; (c) in other provinces and also the United States. (3) The total cost to the province; (a) for those attending the Saskatoon school; (b) for those attending in Winnipeg; (c) for those attending other schools, including the United States.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN Q.C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I think I should just make this comment concerning Question No. 1. We will be glad to give the information as long as it is understood that we can only give the information that we have available to us. I wouldn't undertake to be able to say what the total number of deaf children in the province are because there may be some of whom we have no knowledge. We will give what figures we have available in our records.

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

.....Continued next page

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

MR. R. SEABORN (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I had not originally intended to speak on this resolution sponsored by the Honourable Member from Inkster, but frankly I was bothered by the inconsistencies that seem to exist in this country. We seem to agree on one principle and turn around and violate it in another direction. I know that the Honourable Member from Inkster is sincere. He is vitally concerned over the welfare of our elder citizens and may I assure him that I too, have the same concern. I know the predicament that older folks can get into, because if I had not helped my folks, my folks would not have had any support for many, many years. However, Mr. Speaker, the more I pondered over this amendment of my colleague, the more disturbed I became. Now I am a limitarian; I believe in limited government; but if you're going to engage in state welfare, let us do it with some degree of consistency.

Now, Sir, I started delving into the amounts that the Federal Government hands out in various directions and I do not see the needs test applied to the individual. First of all, I looked at the agricultural subsidies and learned that the Federal Government suffered a net loss of \$60 million in this area. There was a loss of \$3 million in butter alone; \$5 million on eggs; \$28 million on pork; and for some reason, \$8 million on milk. I found out that the Federal Government subsidized wheat to the tune of \$42 million. I am not an agriculture man, Mr. Speaker, but I do raise this question: Did the Federal Government ask the individual farmer whether he was in need of these subsidies? I am sure they didn't. Next I took a look at the Federal Government's Department of Health and Welfare. It was also very enlightening. Family Allowances as of March 31st, 1960, were \$491,214,000. Now, Sir, if you want to start a needs test this, to me, would be the logical place to institute it. Many young parents do not need this extra assistance. They are in their prime of life and are able to look after their children in a very adequate fashion. The contributions of the Federal Government to our other welfare programs is also very substantial, and if you are interested in figures, I will give you the facts that I uncovered. The Federal Government contributed \$30,349,000 for old age assistance in Canada. We received \$1,596,000 for an age group that represents 28 percent of our population in Manitoba, that is 65 to 70. The Federal Government also gave \$574,887,000 to our old age pensioners in Canada. There are 53,284 recipients in Manitoba, or 24 percent of our population who receive \$35 million approximately. There are 396 recipients of the Blind Pension in Manitoba who received a total of \$195,336 from Ottawa. There are 1,376 recipients of the Disabled Persons Allowances in Manitoba, to whom the Federal Government contributed a half million approximately. The Unemployment Insurance paid out for the whole of Canada, \$40 million; in Manitoba, \$2-1/2 million.

Now these are large sums of money, Mr. Speaker, but as I stated at the beginning, state welfare has been plagued by inconsistencies. While the governments promise handouts of all kinds when seeking election, their generous hearts seem to contract when they begin to look for revenue. Let us consider the treatment Canadian widows received at the hands of the Revenue Department -- as the Brandon Sun put it just the other day, February 24th to be exact, in an editorial called, "Protecting Widows' Rights", quote: "It is a sad commentary on the shortcomings of state welfarism in Canada that widows should be singled out for unnecessarily burdensome taxation. Yet this is precisely what happens today to widows in Canada under the terms of the Federal Government's Estate Tax Legislation. For widows to have to pay an enormous estate tax on their pensions as well as income tax on what they receive by way of pension payments, is grossly unfair." Now it seems to me, Sir, that if governments are going to be so open-hearted in so many ways and hand out money without a means test through so many avenues, then the milk of government kindness should not dry up completely when it comes to our old folks or these widows of dead husbands.

The amendment by the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie deals with a means test. The Socialist Party claims to abhor the means test, yet we all face a means test everytime we fill out an income tax form. It is a very mean test indeed, because the purpose of it is not to give us something free but to take from us a substantial portion of all that we have earned; and this means test gets even meaner when it is applied to the widows pensions. The tax department of an open-hearted government suddenly takes a cold, cruel, accountant's-eye view of the

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.)....situation and grabs all the revenue it can from the widow of any man thoughtful enough to arrange a decent pension for his wife after he dies. So let us not suddenly scorn the means test in one department, the hand-out department, while lauding it in the grasp-in department. Every dollar the government gets must be taken from us before it can be handed out, and there can be mean tests in both cases. The meanest of all is the tax on widows' pensions. I really would like to hear my CCF friend show a little concern about that, but he seems blissfully unaware that governments can be as mean or meaner in grasping for money as they can be in giving back our money in transfer payment.

Now, Sir, I do not wish to continue much longer. I am not a proponent on the welfare state by any means, but I reiterate again that if we are going to engage on this precarious path, we should show some degree of consistency. Well I could not agree with the amendment of my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie; I do not think we should be telling the Federal Government what to do, particularly in such an arbitrary way. I feel the Government of Canada should be cognizant of the financial condition of many of our old folks and, in their conception of a welfare state, should be prepared to assist them and our blind citizens too, in a realistic way, based on the standard of living in this country. I will therefore vote against the amendment and the original resolution.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak at this time because my health is not so good, and I don't know whether I can be every day in the House. I hope I will. With regard to the last speaker, we have supported the Social Allowance Bill because it was half a loaf; it was something. In principle we were against it, so his argument, because we have supported the Social Allowance Bill, is no argument in this particular motion. After all, we are dealing with the old age pensioners. The next item is about government handing-out. Governments are not handing out their own money. They are acting on behalf of the people, and I am certain that if a referendum is taken throughout the province to increase the old age pension at all, without a means test, up to \$75.00, I venture to say that a great majority would be in favour of this. I would almost guarantee it. So they are spending the people's money. It isn't a question of whether the money is here or not, it is a question whether the old age pensioners need additional help or they don't, without a means test of course. You gave us millions of figures, but you haven't given us the figures of the wealth of the province or of the wealth of Canada. You haven't given us these figures at all. They amount to much more millions of dollars -- for the Insurance Companies and the Trust Companies and the mining interest and all of the others. There's a lot of money in this world -- we are a very rich province. The question, I think, is not where to get the money. Are the old age pensioners entitled, after working for 70 years, to a little bit more than they are getting now? That's all there is to it.

Now what does the motion say? The motion says that this House requests the government to petition the Federal Government for an increase of old age and blind pensioners in the province from \$55.00 to \$75.00 per month. You say that we have no right to ask the government. Let me show you. If you take the trouble, and I know you are taking the trouble finding out figures -- the Honourable Member for Wellington is taking the trouble of finding out figures -- he is taking the trouble of finding out the evils of socialist ideas and he must have worked very hard on it -- surely to goodness he would take the trouble of going into the journal and he will find that every time a motion was suggested about an increase from the time the pension was \$20.00 a month, it was never defeated; never turned down; but it was always turned down by another motion. In other words, sometimes compelling us to vote for the amendment, which amendment doesn't mean anything in my opinion.

Now let me show you just one example. In 1941 our motion read: that the present maximum of \$25.00 a month for persons under the Old Age and Blind Persons Act is insufficient and, therefore, we suggest that they bring up the amount to \$30.00 a month -- it's only five dollars.

MR. SEABORN: I did not say that we should not petition the government. I said we should not petition them in such an arbitrary way and set figures that would restrict their movement.

MR. GRAY: Well, I understood it that we should not tell the Federal Government what to do. That was my understanding. It's true that perhaps -- if you didn't say it, I'll accept this. But then an amendment was moved that the words "pension of \$25.00 a month" in the

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)....first line of the proposed motion be stroked out and the following substituted therefor: "a livable income" and then the words after Assembly in the third line of the proposed motion be stroked out and the following substituted therefore: "Commends" -- now listen to this -- commends the government" -- this wasn't done by us it was done by a member of the government at that time -- "Commends the government for its efforts to secure the approval and support of other provincial governments". In other words, you had a record in 1941 --you, the government at that time, suggested that they petition the government; and that's what we are doing now. So what is the difference? If you look up the journals for the last 19 years, you'll always find an amendment which turns down the motion and it didn't mean anything. It's meaningless. So is this amendment that we have now. It is absolutely meaningless. You're telling us that taxing the widow's allowances -- the widow's pensions. We were fighting for an increase, social allowance for these widows and children for years. So you cannot accuse us of approving the taking off of the income tax.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank very much -- he's not in his seat -- the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie for his kind words. After he uttered those words, he immediately sat down in a very comfortable chair and listened to his master's voice. And this is, by adding the two, something which does not mean what we asked for. I haven't got his figures yet on the social allowance contribution. It may be here on Monday and I may have another chance to speak on the motion. If not, I don't know the details but at any rate, whatever it is, it's a means test and we were fighting against the means test for years and years and years. We cannot see how a person who needs another loaf of bread -- an old age person who needs another loaf of bread, who needs a little bit of additional help, would lower his dignity -- and ask all the old people who are also men with honour and dignity -- they're not tramps. They are the ones, as has already been outlined and said, that built our institutions; that have built our streets; that have built our sewers; that have made our life more comfortable, at a low wage. At the age of 60 they were turned down. They were thrown out of employment, taken by younger men; and they had to suffer, sell things or go and appeal to their children to keep them between 60 and 65.

Now I understand, I wasn't in the House, that the charming lady from Cypress said something about the children helping them. Let me tell you something. In the first place, the children have their own responsibility. The children have their own families. The children have their own way of living. And above all, don't forget that the man that marries a girl, does not marry the mother-in-law. And it is also the same thing when a girl marries a man, she doesn't marry his mother-in-law or his father-in-law. They have their own life to live. And for him it is either steal from himself, or steal from the allowances of his wife, or the wife from the husband, and deceive with by-play their parents. What else can they do? There is no relief; there is no pensions; and he has to do the best that he can for five years. By that time they absolutely have nothing. Then at 65, they have to go through an application with about 54 questions. They have to sign an affidavit and keep on signing affidavits from year to year to prove they haven't got a cent hidden away, or they haven't got any other earnings except allowed by the Pension Board. So the situation is bad.

There are many, many who do not apply for pension until they are 70 because they will not lower their dignity, their standing in the community for hand-outs -- standing behind the little window in the offices. And then they are sending inspectors to investigate. It's a little bit easier now, but I still remember those days when they had to ransack every drawer, every cupboard to find where there's an extra loaf of bread. So what are we asking today? Let's have it all over Canada -- the people in Saskatchewan, the people in Ontario who haven't got anything to live on are just as important as the people of this province. So let us petition the government and suggest to them, as far as we are concerned, the very, very polite way of doing it, we are not opposed if the government finds -- or we petition and ask the government to consider another \$20.00 a month for the old age pensioners. I can assure you that if they get the \$20.00 a month you will save considerable many from the social allowance part, because if people get another \$20.00, surely to goodness they're not going to go to the Social Allowance Department and ask for three, or four or five dollars. I really don't know yet the exact amount they are getting because we haven't got the returns, but I don't think they get very, very much as far as I know. And then they will save the money for administration -- the cost of

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)....administration is terrible, because it is on the Means Test. They have to investigate each and every one. And you know how much it takes time to investigate; how many reports they have to make, and it has to go through so many hands. First it goes through to the senior inspector, then it goes to the chief clerk, then to the assistant director, and then to the director. And the director may have to consult the Minister, and the Minister may have to consult the Cabinet. God knows by the time they get it what they do with it there.

Let me tell you something else. It isn't a few. I already mentioned that, in my opinion, there are 75 percent of the old age pensioners in the province -- there are about 60,000, who could qualify under the Means Test -- could qualify. Based on the figures which I have already given that in 1952, downstairs from the Old Age Pension Board here, 18,000 are a federal responsibility. And since then, over 1,200 a year -- over 1,200 a year. Don't forget there are thousands who manage themselves -- God knows how -- and did not apply for pension until they reached the age of 70. So I feel that the tragedies here, the situation warrants, and I don't see for the life of me, why it isn't being considered. I cannot also understand either every time that we suggest something of improved conditions for the old age pensioners, instead of expressing your opinion by yes or no, it's always watered down, which doesn't mean anything by an amendment. I feel personally, that the people of Manitoba will get the \$20.00. Why let them suffer or why let them wait. Why let them wait. It was already suggested in Ottawa; it was suggested at conventions of the big glorious parties that they have had recently. For once, let's show the old age pensioner that we realize their situation. I want to assure the House that this group has never claimed that they're the only defender of the poor and the needy. Never claimed that. We are suggesting it because it doesn't come anything from there. And right now I'm willing to withdraw my motion if the amendment is withdrawn and allow the other side to make the very same motion. I'll be very happy to do it. You'd get the credit for it. I don't get credit anyway, anywhere, so what's the use of me getting this credit. So I feel that we should honestly approve -- defeat -- turn down the amendment and accept the motion. Let's be on record. Don't forget that the children and the grandchildren are going to read the history of this province. Are going to read their action. They are going to read the journals when they will see names, prominent names voted against the old age pensioners. You can't hide it. The yeas and nays are here in the last 19 years. Let's for once encourage the coming generation and tell them that we are building for them; the same as our fathers built everything for us. I'm not worrying about expense today; let posterity pay. We are giving away our generation today, buildings and trains and buses and planes. Everything for their comfort. Surely to goodness they are entitled to contribute something for what we have invested for them. We all invest for our children. We all suffer for the children. When we buy a home it's more for the children than for us. When we send them to school, it's for the children. Our life is bound up with them. Why shouldn't they later on pay something for it? If anybody comes around and says there's a hundred million dollars here and seventy million dollars there I think it is -- I wouldn't say ridiculous, it's not the explanatory word -- but I think it's wrong -- (Interjection) Is it? Okay. (Interjection) The money's here and as someone once, I don't remember who it was, told us just recently, he was a member of parliament in Ottawa -- and then he asked for five million dollars for housing and unemployment and relief and so on, they say have no money. War broke out the very next month and they obtained in three days fifteen hundred billion dollars. So I appeal again to you, "Please, Mister spare a dime."

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, if this is going to the vote I have to say something. I dislike saying it, I regret having to bring it up. I was hoping someone else would point out the same matter because I don't want to be thought to be technical. I haven't the qualifications to be a pedant and somebody may suggest one or the other about it. I'm glad that this didn't come up while the Grade XI and Grade XII students were in the gallery because I've been looking time after time after time at this resolution. And Mr. Speaker, it just is so worded that it doesn't make sense. I'm not referring to the leaving out of the definite article in the first line. That could have been just a typographical error. But even that one, I suggest, should be corrected when we're going to put these resolutions down in the Journals of the House for all times. My honourable friend is right in saying that folks are going to be looking back years later to see how we voted on these things and they'll be reading

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....these resolutions, and it disturbs my sense of the fitness of things and parliamentary institutions that we should put resolutions in the book that are either ungrammatical or that don't do the thing they intend to do. That one however, leaving out the word "the" is unimportant, but should be corrected. But the other one, if you strike out all the words after \$55.00 and then add the words that are suggested here, Mr. Speaker, this resolution just stays up in the air. It is not complete, it is imperfect, and I don't think any of us should be asked to vote on a resolution that is so imperfect. I heard the Honourable Member for Wellington say that he was going to vote against both the amendment and the resolution. Well I don't blame him for that. I could do that on account of this imperfection; on the other hand the sense is clear -- for goodness sakes, the sense being clear, let's get the language right so that this doesn't go down on the journals of the House in the shape that it's in now. I repeat, I was hoping that I wouldn't have to say this, that I could avoid it, I don't like purely technical arguments, I certainly don't like people trying to parade any grammatical knowledge, and I haven't got any -- I'm not good at it -- but I think that the motions, the resolutions that we put on the Order Paper here should be at least clear and definite, and I submit to you that when this would read: "That this House request the government to petition the Federal Government" -- I think that correction should be made -- "for an increase for all old-age and blind pensioners in the province, from \$55.00 per month on the basis of need." That leaves it up in the air -- to what?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. CAMPBELL: I am sure that if anyone else wishes to proceed on this or if the government wishes to wind up the debate on it, there's no need of it being carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. S. ROBERTS (La Verendrye): I am sorry to be out of the House, Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to refer briefly to this resolution, drawing the House's attention to the fact that at the time this was discussed in the special committee that reservations were made by the Members of the Opposition concerning the change in the Act. Since that time the Honourable the Attorney-General has made considerable reference to various elections which have been held in the province throughout the country and various references to the number of days between the issuance of the writ and the actual election itself. Now examples can be found to prove almost anything, but I am sure that no examples that were presented by the Honourable the Attorney-General proved that it was beneficial to shorten the length of time between the issuance of writ and the election date itself. I think this is an important feature and I think that particularly coming from the government, headed by the present Premier of Manitoba, who when in Opposition, was such a valiant defender of the rights of the Opposition, and the rights of the Opposition to present its case in the House and to the country, that is surprising and disappointing that this attempt should be made or this motion made to reduce the number of days between the issuance of a writ and the election itself. So with this few remarks I would urge the House to allow the setting up of this special committee again to study this problem; to give the -- and I think it's quite fair to say to give the Opposition party an opportunity to present their case to the public at the time of an election. I think that every member in the House will agree that the Opposition parties do not have the same opportunity to know when an election is going to be called; they do not know when an appointment is going to be made in case of a by-election. They have no way of having the same source of information as to the date of an election or by-election that the government has. Following this reasoning, there can be no other reason for shortening the date than to prevent the Opposition from giving its side of an election issue as well as the government can; and for these reasons I would urge that the House do give this opportunity -- to set up the special committee to study this matter again.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Speaker, I think the ground has been pretty well covered, but there is one thing that I think I raised in the House last year when this same matter was before us, and that is that it will discourage, to some degree, new blood coming into the provincial political

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.)....field. I think that the government is taking advantage of its numbers in proposing this and taking advantage of the fact that they are in a preferable position at the moment. Those of us that are here at the moment, of course have an advantage over anybody that will oppose us at the next coming election. We have advantages of different kinds; one is that we have had the opportunity of the public getting to know us -- which is not always an advantage -- but it is considered as on. Any new man or woman coming into the picture and wanting to be a candidate is at the disadvantage of having less time within which to let the public know them and to become acquainted with what the public desires, and I think it's a mistake. I don't think we should shorten it. It has been said that we have television today and that we have radio and so forth. I say Mr. Speaker, that in spite of these channels I still think that the average elector likes to meet his candidate, and in rural ridings especially. Unless a new candidate is given sufficient time, he just can't possibly do it. I would urge the government to re-consider its position and let us go back to committee and correct this error.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I have just one or two very brief observations to make on what has been said. I think I can say with some justice that I have, recently at any rate, so far as recent terms go, I have been responsible for introducing more new candidates into the field than anybody here. I have had some considerable and extensive experience in opposition, and a very short experience in government, with respect to the running of by-elections and elections. I think I can say quite candidly that the time element was never a factor, so far as we were concerned.

The only other thing I want to say is this, that last year we made some changes in the rules of this House in connection with the time allowed to the Speech from the Throne, and I remember the charges levied by the Honourable Member for Carillon in particular, there may have been others -- that this was an effort to throttle the opposition; this was an effort to prevent free discussion; this was an effort to bring in a shackle that would inhibit the usual parliamentary process, and it was wrong. Well when it came to the actual event and we had the Throne Speech debate this year, I doubt that it could be maintained with much justice that any of those fears materialized. I think that it did not come to that in the point. Not only did they not materialize but everybody who wanted to speak had the opportunity, and in fact had we wished to sit the full sitting time during that debate, there would have been some further period left over where others could also have taken part in the debate had they wished to do so. Well now my honourable friend over there interjected a minute or two ago that this was for once it happened this way. Well all I can say, that in other jurisdictions they have had similar rules for many years, most of them much more restrictive than ours are alleged to be, with no great harm to the parliamentary system and a considerable improvement in the conduct of the business. Now those are just a couple of random observations that I would like to make on this, because I feel that -- (Interjection). You certainly may.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): What similarity is there with respect to the length of the debate in this House and the length necessary to prepare an election voters' list and to prepare for an election?

MR. ROBLIN: Well I think the similarity lies in this; that charges are being made that we are trying to throttle the opposition in these matters, and the same principle applies whether it is in the Throne Speech Debate or in the length of time to run an election. I am simply adducing as some evidence to the contrary that we have so far not found it to be a handicap in the Throne Speech debate; and speaking from some considerable experience in the opposition, in fact apart from some -- no, looking over the field I think I can say with complete accuracy that there's no one in this House that has had more experience in the opposition than I have, no one -- in any part -- in any side -- and speaking from that experience I do not think that these new proposals are unjust.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Is there anyone else

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member is closing the debate.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the First Minister has indicated that he thinks the burden of the arguments that we have used with regard to the merit of this resolution deal with the rights of the opposition, and he seems to take some considerable pride in the fact that he's well acquainted with the duties of the opposition. I suggest then that he'll

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)... soon be getting better acquainted with them once more, and one of the ways to do it is by using the power of the government to put in legislation that is not in the public interest. I was quite astonished last year when I found that although a committee was being set up to consider the Election Act, that it was the determination of the government to go ahead and put in this major change of all, actually at the time that the committee was being set up. You will recall that I was guilty of some confusion in that regard, because I honestly thought that we had the undertaking of the Attorney-General that he was leaving this matter for the discussion of the Special Election Committee, but it turned out that we didn't. I admit that I was wrong in taking that interpretation at the time but I had thought it was so logical that it would be that that would be a reason for leaving such an important piece of legislation as this for discussion in the special election committee. Well this is the only way, Mr. Speaker -- and I appreciate your co-operation in regard to it -- this is the only way that we have on this side of the House of bringing the matter once again to the attention of the House; we're wanting to establish the principle and I must say that I am recognizing the fact that all we're doing here is putting ourselves on record as believing in the longer term being in the general public interest. Not just in the interest of the opposition. We aren't too much concerned in a personal way about that because our sojourn in opposition will be short, but in the public interest, in the general public interest, I'm sure that with the work that has to be done, not only by the candidates but by the chief electoral officer, and by the many people that have to go into action quickly and immediately into high gear in order to carry through the many things that have to be done in order to secure the proper taking of the vote in a general election that the time was short enough as it was. We think a mistake was made; this is our way of making a protestand at the same time asking for the committee to be re-established and so we intend to declare ourselves upon it and that's what this resolution does.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes of course.

MR. SMELLIE: He has stated that his sojourn in opposition would be very short. Would the honourable member give this House notice as to when he intends to retire so that we will have ample time to introduce a candidate before the by-election?

MR. CAMPBELL: My colleagues and I all serve notice that when the general election comes along we will be retiring from this position to the other side of the House.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: The Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House: Motion by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that a Special Committee to consist of Honourable Members Roblin, Lyon, McLean; Messrs. Alexander, Campbell, Dow, Orlikow, Paulley, Shewman and Smellie, be appointed and instructed to consider the Election Act with a view to recommending such amendments as may be deemed necessary to provide a more orderly and efficient conduct of the election in the Province of Manitoba; that said same committee make its report and such recommendations as it deems advisable to the House at the present session.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Campbell, Prefontaine, Hryhorczuk, Gray, Paulley, Hawryluk, Wagner, Wright, Orlikow, Tanchak, Molgat, Hillhouse, Guttormson, Froese, Schreyer, Reid, Peters, Harris, Dow, Shoemaker, Roberts, Desjardins.

Nays: The Honourable Messrs: Roblin, Carroll, Johnson, McLean, Evans, Lyon, Thompson, Witney, Hutton; Messrs: Lissaman, Shewman, Alexander, Scarth, Martin, Cowan, Groves, Corbett, Christianson, Watt, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Stanes, Smellie, Strickland, McKellar, Weir, Johnson, Baizley, Bjornson, Klym, Hamilton, Mrs. Morrison, Mrs. Forbes.

MR. CLERK: Yeas: 22. Nays: 33.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain and proposed amendment thereto of the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E.R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I shall attempt to be brief in speaking to this resolution because it's been up before us before. I simply want to make a few points in this regard. First of all, the reason why my leader brought in the amendment which in essence supports the main resolution is because of the fact that in the last year it's become

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.)....obvious that the cost per classroom of school construction has been on the rise, and we of course are completely convinced that real property taxation is rising at too uncomfortable a rate. Something must be done to attempt to put a stop to the rise in real property tax. Therefore, we support the implications of the resolution. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that I for one am completely in accord with the Member for Brandon with the remarks that he had to make on this resolution when speaking to it last Tuesday. It seems to me that in education and education costs there aren't too many places where we can very effectively hold the line on costs, but here is one; the cost in construction. And what should be our concern, Mr. Speaker? It should be to build schools with classrooms and facilities that are functional and utilitarian. I think this is a basic need and we have to keep that at all times in our mind. Now it seems equally clear to me that in the last few years there has been a somewhat unfortunate tendency in some areas at least to go perhaps a little bit beyond the pales in school construction, in building schools, classrooms where there are just a few too many frills, doors of Phillipine Mahogany, material, and all the paraphernalia that goes with it, perhaps being unnecessary in a good many cases. And then too, as the Member for Brandon pointed out so ably, individual districts must purchase, or retain the services of architectural firms, pay very high fees for this service, and I think that the Member for Brandon put his finger on a very important point here. I think that we should have or should attempt to arrive at some standardization of school plan which would be functional and would serve the purpose, and at the same time would be as economical as humanly possible. I anticipate that the Minister of Education and his department will be looking into this before too long, yet before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I must say again that even though we are in complete accord on the need for economy by way of standardization of plans and so on, we still feel that real property tax is the thing here that must be guarded against, and therefore we support the implications of the resolution by way of this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. B.P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the statements made by the last speaker conflict somewhat. First of all he says he is supporting this resolution because the costs are going up, and he's saying the property tax is too high; but surely he realizes that by raising the cost that areas are allowed to use on the building of these schools is going to raise the property tax again. I have a letter before me today from an architect firm. They've had costs of their estimates on schools from a six-classroom school as high as a 40 equivalent classroom school and the highest cost per classroom is \$12,585. This is over a period of the last six years that these estimates have been given. A year ago I mentioned that I was talking to another firm in the City of Winnipeg. They built the Hamiota School. It was somewhat less than the \$15,000; it has all the functional and utilitarian requirements of a school. I think that we must use what powers we have in controlling these costs. I think that -- in fact I know that many people on our country school boards have had no experience, have had no knowledge of buildings to this extent. They can only rely on expert advice, and who do they go to but the architects. They are, supposedly, the experts. When we have certain architect firms who say that it can be done for less covering all of the required services in modern schools, I think that we as legislators should do all in our power to hold these costs down. I think we have proof when architects themselves come out and make these statements to say that this rise is not required.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Speaker, there does still seem to be some doubt as to who pays the additional cost of the school over and above the \$15,000 per classroom. The honourable member who has just spoken made the statement that if the costs of the schools are increased that the real property tax will be increased. Well, Mr. Speaker, let us say that a school today costs \$18,000 per room. The government pays 75 percent of \$15,000; the division through a real estate tax pays the balance of 25 percent; but the additional cost of \$3,000 is borne directly by the division, directly by a real property tax. And that \$3,000 is just exactly one-sixth of the \$18,000. If this resolution passes and the policy is adopted by the government, then the additional \$3,000 will be shared on the same basis of 75 and 25 percent. It's simple mathematics to see that the burden on real estate will be lowered considerably and not increased.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party to the motion proposed by the Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain, the amendment reads as follows: "That the motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain be amended by deleting all the words after the words "\$20,000 per room" in sub-section (1) of the resolution."

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Gray, Harris, Hawryluk, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Schreyer, Wagner, Wright.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas: 10. Nays: 45.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The question before the House, the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. George that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us that was proposed by the Honourable Member for Elmwood is divided into four parts: Firstly, it deals with the cost of living. It says "The cost of living has been rising steadily since the end of World War II." Well there's some doubt in my mind about that Mr. Speaker, because I think it was just the other day that we read in the newspapers that the cost of living index has again declined. However, that isn't important as far as the substance of this resolution is concerned. The second part of his resolution states, "That whereas average wages have been increased in order to keep in line with the cost of living." Well we certainly have to agree with that. Average wages have been increased. The third part of his resolution states that "Whereas in many parts of Canada, including Manitoba, minimum wage rates have not kept pace with the increased cost of living." And I certainly agree with that. The final paragraph of his letter, however, I think we have to deal with in two parts. I can see no harm in the first section of this paragraph calling on this government to take the lead in proposing a conference with the other provinces and the Federal Government to review the whole field of minimum wages. Honourable members during this session of the House have recently referred to jungles. And if there ever was a jungle, Mr. Speaker, in Canada, it's the jungle of minimum wage legislation. Minimum wage legislation in Canada today has been very briefly and very neatly summarized in the Brief of the Manitoba Federation of Labour. It points out that minimum wages vary from no minimum wage to a maximum of 75 cents in the Province of B. C. In Newfoundland -- and I'll just quote the male minimum wage figures, because in some provinces they're the same and in some cases there is a female minimum wage and no male wage -- just to show how the minimum wage legislation differs in the various provinces, I'll just compare the male rates. In Newfoundland it's 50 cents an hour. In Prince Edward Island, although they have legislation on the books passed in 1960 for males, the regulations are not yet known. In Nova Scotia the Male Minimum Wage Act was passed in 1945 but has not yet been proclaimed. In New Brunswick 65 cents an hour. Quebec 70 cents an hour. Ontario -- Ontario does provide for a male minimum wage but so far none have been passed, a minimum wage hasn't been set. In Manitoba it's 66 cents an hour. In Saskatchewan 73 cents. In Alberta 68 cents and in B.C. 75 cents. So at such a conference with the Federal Government and the other provinces to review this whole field of minimum wage legislation certainly could do no harm, and I would heartily recommend it to this government. The Honourable Member from St. John's said the other day that he didn't know whether the CCF Government in Saskatchewan forwarded resolutions of this type to the Federal Government from time to time. One would think that they would however, and the convening of such a conference would certainly give us the views of the Province of Saskatchewan on this subject and

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.). . . . and would give us the views of the other provinces, as well as the views of the Federal Government on a subject that I think, Mr. Speaker, is very, very important.

Now again going back to the very last paragraph of this resolution, the latter part, "In conjunction with the provinces, steps should be taken without delay to institute a minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour for all workers in Canada". I'd like to emphasize Mr. Speaker, "steps should be taken without delay to institute a minimum wage of \$1.25 for all workers in Canada." Here-in I think Mr. Speaker, lies the weakness of the honourable member's case because if you will think back now to the various quotations that I made from the minimum wage legislation in other provinces, I'm sure that we would agree that some provinces wouldn't even come to such a conference if they knew that it was tied to arriving at \$1.25 minimum wage rate. I'm inclined to think that we should aim, in Manitoba particularly, for \$1.00 an hour. This is quite an improvement over what we have now: 66 cents an hour in the urban areas, 61 cents in rural areas and 48 cents for those who are under 18 years of age. This is six cents better, mind you than we had for men a year ago. I think Mr. Speaker, that rather than aiming for a national minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour that we should be concerned with first things first. That we should be concerned with raising the minimum wage in Manitoba to a standard that is comparable to what it costs people to live. There are many people, Mr. Speaker, in the Province of Manitoba that are living on substandard wages. The Department of National Revenue, the income tax division, issues a booklet every year that they call "Taxation Statistics" and it's available in our provincial library, and this booklet gives us some idea of the number of people in Manitoba that are living on substandard wages. This booklet tells us that -- and these deal with total income figures, not taxable income -- and these figures by the way are applicable to the year 1958 which are the latest available. Taxable returns filed were \$83,908 - that should be non-taxable returns. The total income reported on these returns was \$107,903 and the total exemptions and deductions were \$161,506. We should remember that in order to be taxable a single person has to earn over \$1,000 and a married person over \$2,000. It goes on to show that those in the Province of Manitoba earning \$1,000 a year or less -- there are 680 in Winnipeg; 360 in all other areas of the province and 1,040 total. Those earning between \$1,000 and \$2,000 in Brandon, there are 1,540 of these who filed returns; in The Pas and Flin Flon 680; in Winnipeg 23,840; all other areas of the province 8,420; a total of 34,480 earning between \$2,000 and \$3,000, and I give the totals only 48,280; and between \$3,000 and \$4,000, 50,360. So even if we disregard the last two classifications we find that there are over 35,000 people in the Province of Manitoba filing returns showing a total income of less than \$2,000. In the booklet that table is further broken down, that is those earning from \$1,000 to \$2,000, the numbers filing returns within that category are broken down into hundreds of dollars of income. So it's from \$1,000 to \$1,100; from \$1,100 to \$1,200 per annum there are 2,840; and then from \$1,200 up to \$1,600 they average about 3,600 people. Between \$1,800 and \$1,900 there's 4,020 people; and between \$1,900 and \$2,000 there are 4,620 making up my total of 35,520. Now these figures from this booklet that was issued by the Income Tax Department show that there are 1,040 people in the Province of Manitoba, of which 680 are in the City of Winnipeg, earning less than \$1,000 a year. There are 34,480 people in the province of which 23,840 are in the City of Winnipeg earning between \$1,000 and \$2,000 a year, and these I think, are the people that we're mainly dealing with in this resolution. Some are tempted to say that perhaps most of these are earning pretty close to \$2,000, but I think that the last table that I read, Mr. Speaker, reproduced from the department's booklet shows the extent of the number of people that are earning between \$1,000 and \$1,100, and that there is pretty even distribution of the remaining 34,400 people amongst the nine remaining income brackets of a hundred dollars. 35,000 people Mr. Speaker, earning less than \$2,000 a year represents many families; it represents a great deal of purchasing power, and I maintain that to increase the purchasing power or the income of this group can do nothing but good for the Province of Manitoba.

Now let's consider proposing an amendment to this resolution that would in effect, converted to a resolution urging the Provincial Government to establish a minimum wage in Manitoba of \$1.00 an hour. I have even considered voting for this resolution as a protest against the level of minimum wages that we have in this province even though I think that the \$1.25 the honourable member is asking in his resolution is too high as a start, but much closer to what I would like to see than we have at the present time.

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.)....I think that I have made clear my reluctance to do the latter and with respect to amending the resolution there are two reasons why I hesitate to do this. One is that if such an amendment were carried it would destroy the intention of the mover of getting this House's opinion on the establishment of a national minimum wage of \$1.25, and this I don't think he should be deprived of. And secondly, it would in essence mean the urging upon the government of the abandonment of the Minimum Wage Board, and at the present -- (Interjection) I hesitate to do that Mr. Speaker, because at the present time in my opinion both management and labour and government seem to favour this method of setting the minimum wage. More can be accomplished I think, by urging upon the Minimum Wage Board the reconsideration of this matter, urging on them to establish a minimum wage of \$1.00 an hour in the Province of Manitoba and by pressing for a change in the make-up of the Minimum Wage Board. The Minimum Wage Board as it stands right now consists of two representatives of management and two representatives of labour, and I think that they might be able to more effectively present their respective cases to a board that was not biased or personally interested in the outcome of the deliberations. I'm not criticizing the board as such, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Minimum Wage Board in Manitoba is a personal friend of mine. I have met the other members of the Board and I think that they're all honourable gentlemen, but let's face it, their deliberations cannot be free of bias. Labour is bargaining for a high minimum wage; management is bargaining for a low minimum wage; and the chairman is desperately trying to get the two of them to agree. As a result we get as a minimum wage in Manitoba the lowest that labour is prepared to go and the highest that management is prepared to go, and in the case of our present minimum wage, it took the Minimum Wage Board over six months I believe to try to come to this compromise. The government might seriously consider this suggestion as a means of getting a fair and a more up-to-date minimum wage for these workers in the Province of Manitoba. Having management and organized labour on this board is like -- and I'm quoting from an article dealing with another subject that I clipped from a magazine -- "having management and organized labour on this Board is like having a Jehovah's Witness as a chairman of a Red Cross Blood Bank, or having a Doukkabor as president of Tip Top Tailors -- that's how silly it is." Having the two parties that are most concerned in the outcome of their deliberations serving on the board that's supposed to bring in a recommendation for a minimum wage. I think, and I would like to emphasize again, that both labour and management could more effectively present their respective viewpoints on this matter by making submission to a Minimum Wage Board consisting of lay people so to speak.

If we glance through the blue booklet that was placed on our desks the other day, the Annual Wage and Salaries Survey of the Province of Manitoba, we won't find, at least I didn't find any people paying minimum wages; but it does reveal that there are large numbers of people even in this survey that are paying substandard wages to workers in the Province of Manitoba. Our present minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, is ridiculous too, because in many cases a man can do better dollar-wise by going on municipal relief, particularly if he has a large family. Now I have, with the -- I shouldn't say with the co-operation -- but I have asked the Welfare Department of St. Vital and the Welfare Department for Winnipeg, our Social Allowance Department and the Unemployment Insurance Commission for some figures to prove my point, and I've divided this into three categories. A single man, a married couple, a married couple with a two year old child, and let's see how they compare or how they fare in these various categories. A single man on relief in St. Vital gets \$40 a month; in Winnipeg he gets \$55 a month. If he works eight hours a day, five and a half days a week for four weeks under the minimum wage he would get \$116.16. If he received unemployment insurance for four weeks he would get \$84 and I couldn't find a comparable category in our social allowance so I've left that out. Now let's take a married couple or a man supporting his wife. In St. Vital if he's on relief he gets \$84.90; in Winnipeg he gets \$105.13. If he works eight hours a day five and a half days a week on the minimum wage he gets \$116.16, if he is drawing unemployment insurance he gets \$112 and if he -- in this case it would be a she, if it was a mother supporting a dependent on Mothers' Allowance under our Social Allowance Regulations, her income would be \$114 a month. Now a married man and his wife with a two year old child in St. Vital if they are on municipal welfare they would get in cash \$96.74; in the City of Winnipeg they would get \$121.94. If they were on a minimum wage -- and again I emphasize working

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) eight hours a day, five and a half days a week -- he would get \$116.16; if he was drawing unemployment insurance -- and for unemployment insurance purposes here, I have assumed that this man is a laborer earning \$1.25 an hour -- he would draw \$112; and if it was a mother on social allowance, supporting an invalid husband and a child, the highest she would receive would be \$141, if she was supporting a husband and an invalid child. Now there is something seriously wrong, Mr. Speaker, when we legislate for a minimum wage and many employers use our minimum wage as an excuse or a legal way of paying people low wages. There is something seriously wrong when we give this shield to employers that puts people that are willing to work, that can work eight hours a day for five and a half days a week, in a position comparable to those receiving public assistance in one form or another. I emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, there is something seriously wrong when we are legislating against wages for people that will go out and work, that puts them in a comparable position with others who are living in idleness on municipal relief or welfare of some form or another.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, that we have to take into consideration, and this was mentioned the other day -- inflation -- only I am going to use it in a different way. Inflation has cut the value of our dollar and this should be taken into consideration when we are setting the minimum wage. I have a clipping here from the Financial Post that shows that from 1949 to the present time, based on an increase in the official cost of living between those two periods, that the value of our dollar has been cut from 100 percent to some 80 percent. This is something that should be taken into consideration, not in reducing the minimum wage, but increasing the minimum wage. I have also got there, Mr. Speaker, two letters that I would like to quote little parts from, in connection with minimum wages that are paid in the Province of Manitoba. This one comes from a man in Winnipeg, he says: "I happen to work for a building management firm and how much do you think they pay? No more than is required by law. I have worked for them for three years and in that time I have received only one raise and it was only a \$5.00 raise at that." That means that the employees of this firm receive only \$72.50 for working 93-1/2 hours in two weeks. And then he goes on to say, "Have you ever thought of how you would like to work for money like that?" Now this works out to 77 cents per hour, Mr. Speaker and this man is supporting a wife and his family. I have got a letter here from Brandon: "It is not to the credit of any province to be the lowest paid. Experienced sales girls in Brandon are very fortunate and lucky to get \$28.00 per week. The less fortunate take home \$23.50;" and I know myself, Mr. Speaker, of an example, right here in the City of Winnipeg, of a girl that has worked in a retail store -- a girl who is supporting an invalid father -- who has worked in a retail store, not Eaton's or the Hudson Bay, for 20 years, and do you know what she is getting after 20 years of service -- \$32.00. She supports herself and her invalid father -- \$32.50 a week after 20 years service. This is an example, Mr. Speaker, of too many employers who are skimming all the cream off the top for themselves and who are in effect helping to destroy the free enterprise system that permits them to be in business at the present time. I am not suggesting Mr. Speaker, that \$1.00 an hour is the fair amount that should be paid, but, it should, in our time and in our province, be an amount at which no worker should be expected to work for less. Any worker who is willing and able to go out and work eight hours a day, five and a half or six days a week, shouldn't be permitted in the Province of Manitoba, to earn less than \$1.00 an hour.

I referred earlier to the purchasing powers that's represented by these people. Increasing the minimum wage will assure increased consumer purchasing power for these people who are in no position to save any increase that they get. These people are going to go out and spend it; put this money into circulation because they need it. The long run success, Mr. Speaker, of every business in Manitoba, depends on maintaining a sustained level or an increased level of consumer purchasing power, and there are 34,480 families represented in the statistics which I quoted that can inject new purchasing power into the economy of our province. Everybody is entitled if they are prepared to work, to a decent wage and to their fair share of our productive income. This spirit I am sure, Mr. Speaker, enters into all negotiations for wage increases, whether they are conducted by unions on behalf of employers or not, and I maintain that we should not have in this province a law that denies this same treatment to such a large group. I think that we must concern ourselves first with the protection of an individual's standard of living; this is essential in my opinion, if we are going to preserve the free enterprise

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) system which has given to employees in this province one of the highest standards of living in the world.

I have used, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend's resolution to express my views on minimum wages in Manitoba and although I may not vote for his resolution, I can certainly assure him that in one respect of it at least, our thinking is not too far apart.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, the last speaker in this debate has convinced me that there is a great deal of woolly thinking when people turn their attention to minimum wages. I would suggest to you, Sir, that a great deal of this is due to the fact that we are living in one of the most revolutionary periods, the great transition from the old hand labour to mechanization, probably in the future almost complete mechanization. If anyone in this House thinks that a rural backwoods type of industry such as you will have developed outside of the great concentrated areas, either in Manitoba or anywhere in Canada, can bear the same wage schedule that a highly technicalized production-line type of production, such as the automobile industry, if you think that you can get those wages comparable at all, why then you're not looking at the facts. -- (Interjection) -- I realize that, but wait until I am finished and you'll see a little sense in what I am going to tell you. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these gentlemen on my right and on your left are putting the cart before the horse. I want you to think of the way small businesses start to grow anywhere. Usually a man is an independent character; he decides that he's out to make his own way in this world; he starts a little business; he probably can employ one or two helpers; he can't afford much in the way of machinery, so it's largely hand labour he's using, so he can't pay high wages. But let's suppose that he goes along with these low wages for awhile and his workers go with him and literally they learn the business with him. They are as vitally interested as he is in making a success. Gradually he gets a bit of machinery and if the business is entirely successful he becomes quite mechanized, and then at that point he can compete with the industries and the businesses in the larger centres. I think we have a perfect example in the origin of the Brandon Packers in Brandon. It is unfortunate that they are going through a troublesome period now, but let me tell you a little of the early history, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate this point. Here is a case of a man who had a dream, a dream that he believed that a packing house could exist and flourish in the community. The area in which he chose to locate his packing plant and draw the labour from was probably one of the poorer districts of the city. Now I had the good fortune to be closely connected with Brandon Packers -- we built all their buildings, and I am proud to say that -- as Mr. Donaldson has often repeated -- there was never a scratch of a pen between us. It was strictly the old type of business that probably the pioneers performed in this country where a word was as good as a bond on either side. However, this business started off and I can recall looking back, there were many wastes in the process, raw blood was being thrown away; many of the products, the by-products which eventually when an industry has been established and gets the extra machinery to take care of it, were being wasted. I can remember the blood cooker going in and a press, for pressing the Well now, if a government had come in at that point and said, "Here, you must pay \$1.25 minimum wage right away", that business would never have got started. As it was, it grew and flourished because it filled a definite need and service in that community --

MR. PAULLEY: What year did it start?

MR. LISSAMAN: Oh, I can't recall exactly, somewhere in the 30's. -- (Interjection) -- '47 - no, it was earlier than that -- '37 -- somewhere in the 30's.

MR. PAULLEY: The end of the depression, nobody got \$1.25.

MR. LISSAMAN: Now while I am on this particular point, I'd like to pose this idea, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the House. If we'd have had this beautiful Utopian planned state, which these gentlemen would like to think as the coming Utopia, I would suggest that this would have occurred: Someone in our locality would have had this dream, a dream of being useful to their society, to their locality, and have come in and consulted the authorities that might have then existed in Winnipeg, and these authorities could have proven on paper, so beautifully clearly, that there was no need for a packing house outside of Greater Winnipeg, that right here in this concentration of population and industry there was packing house capacity to take care of the entire province for the future. And because individuals have dreams and grow things this would have shown the utter futility of the planning state which wants to plan

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd.) everything from the funeral to the grave. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we propose an arbitrarily high minimum wage rate, that we will stifle all development in the lesser settled areas. In fact, you will even in the settled areas, you will simply give the assistance to the already established business who are mechanized and who are in a perfect position to beat anyone that has to rely completely on hand labour. Then I was amazed -- some more of this inconsistent thinking, Mr. Speaker -- when I heard gentlemen say here that they believed in free trade. Well, I would like to propose to them, Mr. Speaker, through you, that if we threw the import of manufactured goods from Japan, for example, wide open, here we have an odd coupling of high mechanization and very low cost labour there, that we would either in a few months --

MR. PETERS: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the member a question?

MR. LISSAMAN: I will answer your questions when I'm through if you don't mind. You would either in a few months have to close the door again or we would find many of our people out of work, because they are producing a good article, as good as our workers can produce, but they're getting less money than our workers are willing to work for. And don't let me be misunderstood, Mr. Speaker, I am not pleading for low wages, I am trying simply to impress upon members of this House that a beginning business to be competitive must, of necessity, have the right to agree with the workers -- and the worker doesn't have to go and work for him unless he wants to -- (Interjection) -- to get some advantage.

Now we'll talk about unemployment. I'm glad you brought that point up. Let's say we set an arbitrarily high minimum wage. Mr. Speaker, there is always a fringe of people at the lower level when you consider skills and abilities, and energy and drive probably you could include there too, there is always a fringe at that lower level of workers who are literally unemployable. A lot of them couldn't make money for any boss, and under our free enterprise system unless the company makes money the employment isn't provided. But let's suppose we raise this arbitrarily high minimum wage. What do you do? You simply raise that fringe and throw that many more people out of work because you can no longer employ them economically and you place them upon the state. So, Mr. Speaker, on all counts I think we must realize that the only true answer to wage rates is that they must be related to production. Production is the ultimate answer. For example, as many of you know, I'm in the building business. If I get a worker who can hang four doors while another man hangs one, what happens? I can pay that worker more money because he earns it and is welcome to it, the extra earning. I can give my customers a much better deal because they are paying for less labour per unit, and certainly that man is going to help my business thrive. The answer must always be coupled with production. But if, as the Honourable Member for St. Vital, you get thinking about many poor people, and certainly I'm as sorry as anyone for these people and I would urge that all possible facilities be used to give these people in the lower income levels a chance to improve their skills. There's where the question needs to be faced. Try to give these people skills. Try to train them. But when you start coupling welfare in your mind with the production of an economical unit, why then, Sir, we're going to be in trouble. I'm sorry, Sir, I got so wrapped up in this I got away ahead of my notes and carried on. But I think we could come back to this very important point and I think it's important that every member in this House realize it. That if you want to handicap rural Manitoba, if you want to stifle any future development in rural Manitoba, then you want to impose artificially unsound, high level wages upon rural Manitoba. Why poor old George here, his strawberry plantation would never get off the ground if you insisted on \$1.25 an hour. Another thing, Mr. Speaker, there are mental tasks performed by workers who are handicapped in one way or another; old age people who want to pick up a little bit of extra money. Maybe doing a little bit of gardening or so around your yard. Well I would suggest to you, Sir, that if you have a high minimum wage you're simply going to price these people right off the market; for these mental tasks if they become excessive, more than we can afford to pay, you and I would certainly perform many of them ourselves. So that anyone who imagines that raising wages or setting wages at artificial levels, is in any way the cure for unemployment, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that they must take another look at this matter.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question. He talked about artificially high levels. I wonder if the honourable member would

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) do this House a favour of telling us what he thinks a natural good proper level for minimum wages is. Or does he think that 66 cents is a proper and natural level?

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, I could answer that by saying this that there are several of the provinces where, I believe, they have no minimum wage. For skilled people of ability, we don't need to worry about the lower wage level. But I would say this that any wage is artificial when it prices the worker out of a job.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? The honourable member here has been pleading about new industry. I'm very sympathetic about that. But what about the people who have been in operation in business in this province, in this city for the last 25 and 45 years. I think they've been well established and certainly can pay better wages. I can think of a lot of manufacturing industries and I know some of our departmental stores right in this province that aren't paying wages -- that they can afford far more money. And yet because they can get away with it, they're paying minimum wages. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, to use that well hackneyed phrase, "I never, ever intended to get into the debate on this resolution". (Interjection) -- I thought, and I was sorry that it was necessary for me to leave the Chamber for a moment or two while the Honourable Member for St. Vital was speaking. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that we had from the government side of the House one of the most practical speeches on the question of labour that we'd heard since the Conservatives took over the government here in the Province of Manitoba. I want to compliment the Honourable Member for St. Vital on the manner in which he presented his case; for the serious amount of research that he must have done in order to present the case that he did before this House. After listening to him, I thought maybe there was some truth in the phrase that the Government of Manitoba heralded throughout the province as to it being a forward-looking government. I think it would have been well for the government had the matter rested after the speech of the Member from St. Vital, because the honourable member who followed him, I think, has brought my thinking back to what it was before in respect of the Conservative Party. I appreciate and I realize when I say this, Mr. Speaker, that both of these speakers on the government side today were expressing their own personal opinions. But it did seem to me that there is quite a cleavage in the manner in which they are thinking. Now I am faced with the problem of assessing which thoughts might prevail with the majority within the Conservative ranks. I noted that my honourable friend who has just spoken, the Honourable Member for Brandon, gave us an example of what might happen if we had here in the Province of Manitoba a \$1.25 minimum wage when he was referring to the building of Brandon Packers back in 1937. I asked him the question as to when that was, Mr. Speaker, deliberately. I suggest to him that he was absolutely in error in attempting to compare construction costs at that time with what they are today. It's too bad he's not in his seat at the present time, because I would ask him, Sir, whether he would like a return to the conditions that were prevailing here in Manitoba and in the Dominion in the year 1937, when nearly 20 percent of the working force of Canada were without jobs; when we had skilled artisans and mechanics receiving the magnificent sum of 25 cents per hour. I would ask my honourable friend, is that the wages that were being paid on this construction at that particular time? I would suggest that in that there is no comparison whatsoever. My honourable friend mentions the question of the importation here into Canada of goods from Japan. Of course, we're importing goods from Japan. What my honourable friend is doing I suggest in an attempt to compare wage rates between Japan and ourselves is not taking into consideration all of the aspects which result in the wage cost in Japan. He could not have been following the reports which we have recently received from very responsible businessmen who have travelled to Japan and came back here and told us of the situation there. Of course we do not want, as labour or as industry here in the Dominion of Canada, to have our markets flooded with cheap, inferior products from low wage areas. But I would suggest to my honourable friend that he represents a city in the middle of our agricultural industry here in Manitoba, and that it's very vital to Manitoba for our agricultural industry that we do have a reasonable amount of trade with Japan. I suggest that he is following what appears to be the line of his federal counterparts in attempting to raise barriers in the world markets instead of having full and free trade.

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)

My friend was concerned because of the net effect of a possible \$1.25 minimum wage. My friend is in the construction industry. Surely he does not have to be told that under our National Housing Act insofar as purchase of houses are concerned, that no one who is earning less than about \$4,200 a year is enabled to purchase a house. I won't accuse my friend of preaching for a call, but I would suggest that he could well be it. He could well do that, Sir, because in the interests of the construction industry of which he is a member, it's all to the well, so far as purchasing housing is concerned that more people have the resources in order to do it. But of course a \$1.25 an hour won't open it up but it certainly can help. My friend is worried about the effect that a reasonable -- as we suggest \$1.25, or even \$1.00 that the Honourable Member for St. Vital suggests as a minimum wage -- he suggests that it would be to the detriment of rural Manitoba. I suggest in this, Mr. Speaker, he is absolutely wrong. I think here in the Province of Manitoba that rather than continuously look on the rural parts of Manitoba as our poor cousins and suggest, as he did, or inferred as he did, that we have to keep wage rates down and income down in our rural parts of Manitoba, I suggest, Sir, that just the opposite is what we should be doing here in the Province of Manitoba. We should be placing more purchasing power in our towns and villages and communities in the province rather than keeping them down as he would suggest. Surely he does not mean what he says when he talks along this line, because if his ideas keep on we're still going to have the Balkanization of Manitoba and I suggest that that's not right. Surely to goodness fair rates of wages are and should be the rights of our rural people as they are here in the city area. He mentioned, too, of the old age pensioner wanting to make a few bucks to increase his income. Very noble. But is he suggesting that we should take advantage by the payment of low wages to those people? I suggest if it is desirable to have our old age pensioners or those on pension to have their income subsidized or at least added to -- I don't mean the word subsidized because it's not subsidization at all -- added to, that he should be prepared, and we should be prepared if they are going to do any labour at all and work, to pay them a reasonable amount of money so that they didn't have to work continuously throughout the day in order to receive a few dollars. I suggest to my honourable friend that he'd better take another look at the whole picture. We maintain, we have maintained, and will continue to maintain that one of the major problems we are being faced with is the diminishing amount of cash in the hands of consumers here in the Dominion, and the same applies across the line now, too. Rather than take advantage of a situation of surplus labour by reducing or keeping at a low figure real wages, I suggest that the answer is just the reverse. So I say, Mr. Speaker, as I said at the offset, I was pleased -- even though he didn't come along entirely with us to the \$1.25 amount -- I was very, very pleased with the outspoken speech of the Member for St. Vital, and what a contrast when we heard the reply to him from the Honourable Member from Brandon. We have a long way to go, and now that my honourable friend is back in the House, may I suggest to him that rather than advocating low minimum wage rates that he should suggest doubling what even we are offering as a figure in order that under the NHA more people will have sufficient income to purchase the houses that he's building in Brandon.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, on account of the late hour, I don't like to take part in this debate, but the previous speaker -- I was of two minds just what to do with this vote -- but after hearing what he had to say my mind is fully made up now, and I'm going to oppose this resolution. When this New Party that he's a part of don't know where they're going, don't know what they want, do we know that the people need this or just what they want? Just what I say, just what I say. Picked up the paper last night and in the Province of Quebec the Social Credit Party don't know whether they're going to call themselves the New Party; the Labour Party don't know whether they're going to name themselves the New Party -- (Interjection) -- That's just what I mean, that's just what I mean. So when they make up their mind where they're going to, maybe some of us in this House will put some confidence in them. When they can show ability to lead that will be a horse of a different color. And, Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Member from Brandon quoted Japan, I was in a country a year ago this winter, where they're afraid of organized labour because they realize what organized labour has done to other countries where it is. Now I'm not saying organized labour is wrong in Canada, but what I am trying to say, organized labour is wrong in Canada when they allow

(Mr. Shewman, cont'd.) the gangsters in the United States to lead them. That's just my feeling. I say it's a fact; it's a fact and you can't get away from it. If it wasn't a fact you wouldn't be trying to cover up. It's just a policy that comes from a human heart that's trying to help his mankind -- that's just what kind of a policy it is. And, Mr. Speaker, on account of the late hour I hope someone adjourns the debate so I can speak on it again.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak on this debate, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Public Welfare, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Is this an expedient time to call it 5:30?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if no one would wish to begin with just a minute or so to go and if you saw fit, we might now rise until 8 o'clock.

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