

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.
SMELLIE, 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 24th, 1961.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.
Reading and Receiving Petitions.
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

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

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their second report. Your Committee has considered Bill No. 6, an Act to Facilitate the Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgment; No. 7, An Act to Facilitate the Enforcement of Maintenance Orders; No. 48, An Act to Amend the Loans Act; No. 51, An Act to Amend the Civil Service Act and has agreed to report the same without amendment. Your committee has also considered Bill No. 17, An Act to Amend An Act Respecting the School District of St. James, No. 7 and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notice of Motion.
Introduction of Bills.

MR. LYON introduced Bill No. 75, An Act to amend certain provisions of the Statute Law No. 2.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions as noted in the Orders of the Day.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act by providing among other matters: (a) for increases in the superannuation allowances payable to those now in receipt of such allowances and that will become payable to employees who retire in the future, by means of a change in the method of computing these allowances: (b) For payment by the governments of (i) one-half the allowances payable to employees who retire after the 31st of March, 1961; and (ii) All of the amounts by which allowances of employees who have been retired before 1st April, 1961, are increased after 1st April, 1961, in lieu of the government contributing monthly to the fund amounts equal to those contributed by employees; and (c) for other changes ancillary to those herein mentioned; and also providing for fixing the rate of contribution for all employees at 6 per centum of annual salary.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should just add a word that this is the resolution which will introduce the changes in the Superannuation Act based on recommendations of the Mercer Report. I gave the House, I think it was, at the time of the Throne Debate, a general outline of the fact that the Civil Service Employees Association had asked for a review of the benefits available under the superannuation scheme and sought to have an actuary appointed. They chose the actuary. The report has been received and the recommendations are contained in the legislation that is being brought forward.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, the only one of these that I would comment on and I appreciated the fact that the report was made

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) available to members of the house, and I found it quite interesting. The one I would comment on here is the last clause (c) and the last part of that clause: "Also providing for fixing the rate of contribution for all employees at 6 percentum of annual salary." That I think is a change in principle, is it not? Because formerly the contribution both for females and males varied according to the age at which they were taken on the fund. I would think with my very limited knowledge of this subject that that was a sound provision. I have forgotten if the report that has been mentioned, develops this theme to any considerable degree. That one I think, is worthy of perhaps some further comment.

MR. EVANS:if there are no further comments, Mr. Chairman, the provision of the old scheme calls for contributions by employees ranging from four and one-half percent to seven percent, according to the age at entry into the fund. This is a recommendation of the Mercer Report; is adopted and approved specifically by the Employees Association. We accept the expert advice and the recommendations of the employees and have brought in the six percent provision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution to be adopted. Committee rise and report.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Chairman, before the committee rises perhaps I might be permitted to raise a matter that was before us last night, namely, the Interim Supply Bill. I would like to propose that unanimous consent be given to dealing with that procedure before the Orders of the Day are called now, so that we might advance that one stage further. I propose to advance it through to second reading so that we might have Committee of the Whole on Monday for both this and the Supplementary Supply Bill; but I'll need unanimous consent of the House in order to do that because this is private members day. I wouldn't be entitled to do so unless it was agreeable to all concerned. If it is so agreeable then after this committee reports I would make the other necessary motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, so far as we are concerned I'm sure that we'd be willing to give unanimous consent. I might say in explanation of what I was saying last night that I perhaps should have known better than to argue where I knew that the Clerk of the House was on the other side. Both from experience and logic I have found it usually to be profitable to argue with my honourable friends on the front row or any part of the other side of the House, but it's only rarely that I've been foolish enough to get into an argument where the Clerk of the House was on the other side. I can say only in explanation that perhaps I'm not as used to being around at that time in the morning as some of my friends; I usually get in a little earlier than that. The other explanation is that to my knowledge, the last time Interim Supply was voted here it had been voted in the way that I mentioned, but I realize that there were special circumstances because the full estimates of the government were not before us at that time and that did make for a special case. I'm glad to acknowledge that as usual the Clerk of the House was completely right; an exceptionally unusual case; I was partly wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House adopted a certain resolution and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W.G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 72, An Act to Amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Interim Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$9,594,135.20 being one-tenth of the amount of the several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1962.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, it might be interesting just to discuss the point that was raised the other night because these are one of these nice points of parliamentary procedure which are of considerable interest to us. I merely wish to point out that contrary to usual motions to grant supply to Her Majesty, this is not accompanied by a message from His Honour because we've already received the message. We received the message when the original estimates were tabled in the House. If we were to bring down another message it would mean that instead of asking for one-tenth of the supply, we'd really be asking for the original supply plus a tenth, which equals eleven-tenths instead of one-tenth in the ultimate analysis. So there is no necessity of a message from His Honour in that particular question. The estimates for Interim Supply do not come before us in the form of a special schedule as was thought might be necessary last night, for the reason that we've already received the schedule, being the main estimates that have already been tabled. What we're being asked to do now is to vote one-tenth of those as an installment so to speak, in case we should not pass the budget before the end of the fiscal year on March 31st next. So that is the reason for this procedure that we are following here at the present time. As the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition stated, I think where the confusion arose was in the session of 1959 when we were granted interim supply in spite of the fact that no main estimates had in fact been tabled. Under those circumstances it was necessary to bring down a schedule and that's what confused us last night, but that is a very exceptionable case which is not likely to reoccur in the near future, and we can file that away as an interesting parliamentary curiosity. I think at the present time we are reverting to our regular procedure and perhaps it is of some interest to explain the little *contretemps* about it to the members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? The Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means have adopted a certain resolution and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W.G. MARTIN: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education that the resolution referring to Interim Estimates reported from the Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$9,594,135.20 being one-tenth of the amount for the several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1962 laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1962.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of ways and means for raising of the Interim Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1962, the sum of \$9,594,135.20, being one-tenth of the amount of the several items voted for departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1962 laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature be granted out of Consolidated Fund.

MR. M.A. GRAY (Inkster): Is this in order in view of the fact that the House was adjourned yesterday until tomorrow -- or this morning until tomorrow?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. If you will check the votes and proceedings you will find out whether

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means have adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the

(Mr. Chairman, cont'd.) same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Cypress the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Public Welfare that the resolution referring to Interim Estimates reported from the Committee of Ways and Means be now read a second time and concurred in.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1962, the sum of \$9,594,135.20 being one-tenth of the amount of the several items voted for departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1962, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature, to be granted out of Consolidated Fund.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Works that leave be granted to introduce a Bill No. 65, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, be now read a second time.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I move seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour that Bill No. 64, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1961 be now read a second time.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, by leave I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources that Bill No. 65, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, be now read a second time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker before the Orders of the Day I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, but before doing it, as one who has never intentionally broke the rules of this House, I would like your indulgence and your kindness to give me one minute to explain why I am directing this question. I am referring to the bond sale, first time in the history that the administration and the public have tried out the patriotism and the trust which the people have in the security of this province. I remember well, particularly Mr. John McDowell, at that time representing Iberville, always attacked the security and the trust of the province. Now we have realized that the subscription has been over-subscribed, and I am sure that the Provincial Treasurer is also surprised of the success in connection with this bond for which we are having the people of this province to place the trust in the people of the province and its natural resources -- are not afraid to invest their money here, which in my opinion is very historical, it's very successful, and I think the trial has been a very great success. It's true that we have been paying one percent commission to the brokers. My question is now, in view of the great success, and in view of the desire of the people to invest their money in the province, would the administration consider to have a little desk with one person a day in the Provincial-Treasurer's office, authorizing them to sell bonds all year around, whether it's a \$100 or \$1,000, and I am sure that the people of this province instead of receiving two percent interest from the bank, they would like to invest in a just as genuine a security as getting the bonds. My question is directly: will the government now consider the advisability of selling bonds all year around in spite of this periodic campaign to give a chance to the people of the province to express their trust and desire to invest their savings, whatever they have, at the increased interest, and also at the same time express their trust and confidence in the people of this province?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I thank my honourable friend for the many kind things he said about the province, and perhaps I may say by extension about the government. I must say

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) I never had any doubts but that the loan would be successful, but on the other hand I think the degree of success is certainly very gratifying indeed. The difficulty is of course, that we can only use money in certain quantities, and it has been found by far the most advisable plan to obtain your money in a relatively short period of time to finance your investments over the next coming period and then go back again to the market if required for further support. I do not think that we can adopt his direct suggestion, but I can say that we'll give very serious consideration to re-opening the Manitoba Savings Bond subscription lists at some suitable date in the future.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Honourable the First Minister was completely in order because he was answering a question that my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster got to after a long statement. I am not anymore out of order than the Honourable Member for Inkster when he makes a statement, and so I would ask that the same courtesy be extended to me as was to him. I rise only to say that my honourable friend from Inkster should not, in my opinion, misquote a former member of this House who is not here to defend himself, because what the Honourable Member for Inkster said, and I haven't his exact words, but it was to the effect that Mr. John McDowell, former member for the constituency of Iberville, always took the position that there wasn't security and faith in the bonds of the Province of Manitoba or words to that effect. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's not the position that the former member for Iberville took. His position was simply a question of business as to whether certain trust funds and reserves and other accumulation of reserves should have as large a portion as they had of government bonds or bonds of the particular utility whose reserves were being held. There was never a question as far as Mr. McDowell is concerned about the soundness of the bonds themselves as the security they represented. It was just a question of whether they were the proper thing to have in specific accounts. Now I think that the Honourable Member for Inkster simply should not misquote him on a matter as important as this.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order that my honourable friend has just raised, I must say that I think he did right to raise it, because I think that his version of the facts are a little closer to what took place here in days gone by than the previous statement, but I feel sure that the Honourable Member for Inkster did not do this in any malicious manner. Probably it was inadvertent rather than otherwise, but I think it is well that the matter's been brought to attention.

MR. GRAY: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, if I have misrepresented the honourable gentleman I apologize and withdraw the statement, but I do know that for years and years our group have suggested the sale of bonds over the counter; it was always supported by that gentleman.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to draw to you attention and the attention of the members of the House to the gallery on your left -- I notice they're gone -- but there was in that gallery a few minutes ago a class of students from Glenwood School in St. Vital.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could direct a question to the First Minister. I wonder if the House could be given some information at a later date possibly. The bonds which were sold -- I'm interested in getting some detailed information in the kind of amounts they were sold in. In other words how many were hundred dollar sales; how many were thousand dollars; how many were twenty-five thousand and so on?

MR. ROBLIN:an interim answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, because naturally it's going to take some time to get the statistics compiled to give an accurate answer, but our impression is from the reports received from the seller is, that this issue was very well received by the small individual investor and that a very wide-spread support was received from individuals who are making this investment in the province rather than say the large financial houses and people of that sort. That is exactly what we hoped for and we believe that will be the outcome of it. I just give this as an impression of what is taking place so far but, will be glad -- probably it will be some time -- will be glad at some future date to give the breakdown of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. J.B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to take this opportunity of advising the House that we have heard

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) from the Federal Minister of Labour who informs us that the Federal Government have made a decision to extend the municipal winter works incentive program from April 30th to May 31st of this year. We have commended the Federal Government for this decision and have advised them that Manitoba will participate in this extension. I think too, perhaps it might be an opportunity for me to report to the House on the present status and present success of this federal winter works program. To date we have had approved 260 projects as compared to 83 as of last year. Thirteen further projects have been approved and are in transit to Ottawa for their approval. The total of these programs will involve a capital expenditure of \$7,224,201 as compared to \$3,589,000 as of this date last year. It involves direct payroll expenditures of \$2,200,000 approximately, as compared to \$1,200,000 as of last year. The number of men that will be involved in this federal program 3,277,000 as compared to 1,409 of last year. The total man-days 162,696 as compared to 95,824 as of last year. This relates only to the federal program, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, did I understand you to say 3 million men or was it dollars right at the end of your report there?

MR. CARROLL: Excuse me Mr. Speaker, I sometimes get carried away with these big figures and don't know when to stop. The number of men - 3,277.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I directed a question to the First Minister yesterday. Is he in a position to give me an answer today, regarding the tenders on the four mobile schools?

MR. ROBLIN: No, I'm sorry Mr. Speaker, I have not that information as yet.

MR. GUTTORMSON: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. I have since learned that no tenders were called on those four schools and I'd like to direct another question as to why they weren't put on tenders and given Manitoba manufacturers a chance to build these four schools; and how much did these cost?

MR. R.O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a very pleasant little task to perform. I have been requested by the President of the Manitoba Winter Fair, Mr. George McArthur, to invite the members of the Legislature up to see the Manitoba Winter Fair. As members know, this is an annual fair of far greater interest than to Brandon and the immediate surrounding districts. It has been in operation for years; in the years gone by older members will recall that the members did visit the Winter Fair at Brandon. They have a very excellent show this year with a good list of entries. The bulls are down somewhat from last year but there are 260 entries in that class. Commercial cattle an all-time high, at least for thirty years, of 170 animals. Calves, boys and girls calves - 29; market hogs 58; heavy horses 81; light horses 194. There are 200 grain entries from 114 exhibitors and 80 bred sows, and then of course the old favourite, six-horse teams -- there are six entries. And in the four-horse team classes, 9 entries. I am sure that the members if they will be able to avail themselves of this invitation will have a most enjoyable time. It has been suggested that Thursday might be an excellent day. In the afternoon, of course, there will be the bull sale -- the animals will all be in the barns for members to wander through and visit and have them examined, and then there would be a dinner luncheon and then back to the building for the evening performance which I can assure the members is well worth seeing.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, has the honourable member -- oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that I speak for members on all sides of the House when I thank the Honourable Member for Brandon for the kind invitation that he's extended on behalf of the Winter Fair. This is one of the events in the Province of Manitoba and it has been our custom on various occasions, although not a regular custom, that we might sometimes perhaps take the day off from the labours of this Assembly to go to Brandon and to enjoy the program that he has just outlined to us, and it might be agreeable to the House, Sir, if we were to do that this year. If the members thought it good, I for my part, and on behalf of the government, would be quite happy to suspend our session Thursday, April the 6th, so that we might go to Brandon and join in this outstanding agricultural occasion and a very important provincial occasion. I thank the member for his kind invitation and do express the hope that we will be able to be in Brandon on April 6th.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker,

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) before the Orders of the Day, and on this subject I would like to say that we have made some inquiries as to accommodation from the railways in order that no member from the Legislature would have the excuse that he didn't want to take a long trip of this kind and get himself all tired out so he wouldn't be on the job on Friday. As far as I know at the present time there is excellent accommodation by train; the members of course can all make use of their pass and I would urge all the members here to take advantage of this opportunity to visit one of the best shows in western Canada and find out what's really going on in agriculture.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Honourable the First Minister and the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and Conservation, in thanking the Honourable Member for Brandon for the very kind invitation, and through him, the president, director and members of the winter fair. I think it would be an excellent idea if we could accept their invitation. I'd suggest it would be beneficial if the Whips could get together and see what could be arranged. I'd hope it would be possible to agree to take a day off in order to visit this outstanding agricultural fair. If it should be that such an arrangement for any reason can't be made then perhaps we could do what we have done on other occasions and representatives of each group at least go. I would say that if that's the alternative that we endorse, then for goodness sake let us see that the two outstanding agriculturists in this House; the Honourable Member for Inkster and the Honourable Minister of Health and Public Welfare represent the House.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to apologize to the Leader of the House for his unkindness to us last night in keeping us here so late. Now that he has softened and agreed to take a day off, I apologize for my criticism of last night. As far as our group is concerned we'll try that we all go there and take a rest and facing the members unofficially rather than in this House.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might beg the indulgence of the House, first of all to thank the First Minister for his very gracious acceptance of the invitation from the Winter Fair Board, and the kind words of the Minister of Agriculture and the Leader of the Opposition. However, I would like to make one -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask that Monday I would like to circulate among the members a paper on which they might indicate whether they're going or not, in order that we might make certain arrangements at Brandon. The members will have the week-end to think it over and at that time they might signify whether they would be willing to attend or not.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health & Public Welfare) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I would welcome all members to visit the mental hospital farm and see our prize herd of cows on this occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. HUTTON: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to report on the findings of the Flood Forecasting Committee at its last meeting on March 22, 1961. I will give a short summary for the Red River on the basis of their present information and conditions, they forecast 10 to 13 feet city datum, which is considerably below the 18 feet level normally to be considered the first flood stage in Greater Winnipeg. For the Assiniboine River flows throughout the watershed will be confined to the channel at all points and well below the top of dykes at Brandon and east of Portage la Prairie and therefore no overflow flooding is expected.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Questions. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E.R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead) Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, the following questions of the Ministry: No. 1, Have the Towns of Selkirk and Morris granted franchises to a natural gas distributing company? 2. If so, could copies of the franchise agreements be tabled?

MR. SPEAKER: Questions submitted by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead: 1. Have the Town of Selkirk and Morris granted franchise to a natural I might say that we don't move questions, it becomes an Order of the Day if we move it. Orders for Return, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that an order of the House do issue for a return showing: 1 (a) What amount has Winnipeg and Central Gas Company and/or Greater Winnipeg Gas Company paid to Stone and Webster for

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) consulting services; (1) during 1958; (2) during 1959, (3) during 1960, (b) Has the Utility Board ruled that the above expenditures were prudently spent in the interests of the consumers of natural gas? (c) If not, what amounts have they disallowed?

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

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an order of the House do issue for a return showing: 1. the order or judgment of the Utility Board, (a) justifying the change in natural gas rates in Brandon during the fall of 1960. (b) setting the rate base for the natural gas distributor in Brandon. (c) The order or Judgment of the Utility Board handed down in connection with the recent rate hearings for Portage la Prairie.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain and the amendment in addition thereto proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. E.I. DOW (Turtle Mountain) Mr. Speaker, having spoken on this resolution now for three or four times, I find that there are some of the members confused in the purpose of my resolution. It seems that they are confused with this fact that the resolution and the amendment is proposed with the idea that we're advocating that more money be spent on schools. I wish to correct that, Sir. That is not the purpose of the resolution. The Honourable Minister of Education last year gave us figures, quite justified, on the building of the schools in 1959, which came within the approved costs of per building. But the information that I had at that time was that in certain areas that \$15,000 per room would not build a schoolroom to the requirements that the Board of Trustees, that the Building Board wished to have. Now, Sir, in view of the fact that we did have 16 divisions vote on by-laws which were approved by the Building Board of the department last year, it was quite interesting to have the figures given to us by the Honourable Minister of Education. First of all, Sir, I'd just like to recap the results. There were 16 divisions voted. Two of the by-laws were defeated. One division had not called for tenders. Two divisions, the information on the cost were not available. Now we come down to the actual figures and we find that one division came out with their schoolrooms under \$15,000; two, give or take a dollar or two, were the even \$15,000 per room; and eight of the divisions.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin) Am I to understand that the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain is quoting from some information which I gave to the Honourable Member for Selkirk?

MR. DOW: That's right.

MR. McLEAN: Then you cannot base an argument on that. I was asked to give the figures for certain school divisions quoted by the Member for Selkirk. There's nothing to suggest that they were the only divisions in 1960, indeed I don't believe that to be the case. I gave him the information for the divisions which he asked me, he gave me a sheet with certain ones on. So I think if I may that the remarks will have to be confined to those particular ones. They do not represent all of the divisions that had by-laws or built buildings.

MR. DOW: There were 16 divisions given on the sheet, Sir, that were voted in 1960 and the recap of those are these figures. Now the eight divisions that were over the amount of \$15,000 a room, and I would like to read into Hansard the ones that I have the figures on. St. Vital School Division of 44 rooms and the cost determined by tender, given to the low tender in each case, the cost per room was \$12,985 and odd cents. Now that's the low one. Fort Labosse with 40 rooms, their cost, by tender again, was \$16,539. Seven Oaks School District was \$17,934. Turtle Mountain was \$17,991. The Morris-MacDonald Division was defeated. The Hanover Division tenders had not been called. The Pelly Trail Division information is not available. The Midland School Division was \$17,966 per room. Red River School District was \$16,097 per room. Transcona-Springfield was \$17,692 per room. Agassiz School District \$16,666 per room. Beautiful Plains by-law was defeated. Turtle River was \$15,081 per room. Souris Valley was \$18,000 per room. Rolling River was \$15,014 and it included, the information is not totally available. Interlake, the tenders were not closed at the time this report was made up. And Charleswood School Division was \$15,500 per room. Now Sir, my argument to support this resolution is the fact that if the cost of schools can be built as I think this set of figures will

(Mr. Dow, cont'd.) prove -- can be built for \$12,00 nearly \$13,000 a room, then Sir, I maintain that there should be some connection between the Board of Reference and the School Division Boards to see that the schools do not cost over that amount. But if they have to go over the amount for reasons as stated by the Honourable Member for Selkirk for various reasons as to geographic conditions, transportation and so on, then I maintain, Sir, that there's a certain amount of penalty added to the taxpayers in those divisions. As a matter of interest, of the figures that have been given that are over the \$15,000 per room, there's an aggregate amount of \$800,000--odd dollars that is a direct tax to the ratepayers in the school districts mentioned. I maintain, Sir, that going back to the basic thought behind the introduction of the new School Divisions Act, and the public I believe expect, that equality of taxation was one of the predominant factors that everybody was quite desirous of accepting. I can't give you the answers:I'm not prepared to give the answers. But I am suggesting to this House that there is such a wide discrepancy between the costs as they have risen. In 1959, if my memory serves me right, the Honourable Minister of Education give the figures, and I don't think there was one of the schools build in 1959 that came to the \$15,000, maybe just close to it, but most of them were much below it. And now we see these figures of the information available, and as I mentioned before that we have one division that has built under the fifteen, and two are even fifteen and the balance -- the other eight that's in the process of building are all over the \$15,000. So again I would like to urge that the department and the government would take into consideration the fact that, in my opinion, Sir, the divisions that have so voted and are building, and whether it is the fault of the board of building through the department for not bringing their plans down, or whether it's the School Trustees of the divisions want too elaborate schools, I don't think we are being fair to the general ratepayers to not have some means of being standard and set at around the \$15,000 or less. Now if we have got to go over that then I think these school boards should have to justify their position, and if for reasons they have to go over it, then I suggest that it's the duty of the department to consider giving a 75 percent grant on the total cost.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk to a motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Turtle-Mountain which reads as follows

A standing vote was taken the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Campbell, Gray, Prefontaine, Wagner, Orlikow, Tanchak, Molgat, Hillhouse, Guttormson, Schreyer, Reid, Peters, Harris, Dow, Shoemaker, Desjardins.

NAYS: Hon. Messrs: Evans, Carroll, Johnson, McLean, Lyon, Thompson, Witney, Messrs: Lissaman, Shewman, Alexander, Martin, Scarth, Groves, Corbett, Christianson, Watt, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Stanes, Smellie, Strickland, McKellar, Weir, Seaborn, Johnson (Assiniboia), Baizley, Bjornson, Klym, Hamilton, Froese, Mrs. Morrison and Mrs. Forbes.

MR. CLERK: Yeas: 17. Nays: 32.

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

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Same division, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. ALEXANDER (Roblin): I would like to have this stand, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GROVES: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member I would beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

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

MR. ORLIKOW: I would like this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd.) for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Roblin. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. L. HARRIS (Logan): I'd like to speak on this resolution, Mr. Speaker -- unemployment. Full employment should be the number one objective of the government at all levels. Recession unemployment calls for a remedy which will produce quick results. The best one available is tax cuts. That will raise the consumer purchasing power and business activity faster than anything else. The long-term, chronic unemployment is a problem of growth -- clearly. Defence cannot be relied on -- as it was in the Korean War period -- to give the economy the massive push it needs. Nor can private investment be relied on. This growth rate can come only from a big new massive expansion in the public sector of the economy which has been badly neglected in the last half-decade. We would like to see a long-term expansion of our social capital, of our public services, of investment in the development of our human capital. There is room for a big and sustained increase in expenditure on health, education, child welfare, low rental housing, slum clearance and urban redevelopment, parks and roads, development and conservation of natural resources. Education alone provides an enormous field for expansion. A rapidly changing technology also demands extra educational services to provide vocational training for youth, to retrain workers in depressed areas and depressed industries. Industry can and should do part of the job itself, but it cannot do it alone. Much of the money, perhaps most, will have to come from the public authorities. There can surely be no question of the need for extra public investment in more and better health services, for much more low-rental housing, for much more slum clearance, for much more vigorous conservation measures. Expansion in the public sector means also more schools, means more construction, more work for the construction workers. More construction work means more business for building material firms; more work for building material worker. More work for construction and building material workers means more business for the food and clothing industries. In other words we have more construction and also vastly more services. There is the effect of people in one industry creating jobs for other workers. Clearly, this expansion of the public sector cannot be done by the Federal Government alone; much falls within the jurisdiction of the provinces. But the National Government will have to provide the leadership and most of the money. No province can do it alone. Some provinces are too poor to shoulder even a moderate proportion of the cost. The National Government alone has the necessary financial strength.

How can we expand? Obviously not by taxation; the only way is a certain amount of temporary deficit financing. How much? Enough to restore full employment; but no more and no longer than is necessary to restore full employment. Limited and temporary deficits do not mean inflation. Why not? Because our economy is not running at capacity, or anywhere near capacity. We have idle plants and idle men. So when we put the idle plants and idle men to work it can produce the extra goods and services to meet the extra money demand created by the deficits. The increased growth which would result from this suggested limited and temporary deficit financing would automatically bring in larger tax revenues, even without any change in tax rates. Some situations call for deficits, some for balanced budgets and some for surpluses. Deficit financing during the inflationary 1950's would have been a mistake; so is the attempt to balance the budget in the deflationary early 1960's. There is no need to be afraid of the limited and temporary deficit financing which we believe is necessary to produce adequate and sustained growth. But before we wholeheartedly recommend deficit budgeting, let us face at least two facts: investment capital leaving Canada must be reduced considerably. A system of control of foreign capital earnings similar to the Abbott Plan is strongly recommended. A closer check of insurance companies and banks should be kept to ascertain that such institutions are living up to dominion regulations concerning the proportion or percentage of such earnings being made available for reinvestment into Canadian industry.

To counteract seasonal unemployment the government has established and now expanded the winter works incentive program. I was quite pleased to hear our Minister of Labour proclaim today about what they were doing with the winter work's program, but that is just a drop of water in the sea as far as our unemployment is concerned and we have to do a lot more than what we are possibly talking about today. The trouble with a lot of us today is we do a

(Mr. Harris, cont'd.) lot of talking but that's all there's to it. There's no action - "heap big smoke but no fire". This is all to the good but it doesn't go nearly far enough and it still is not announced early enough.

Consumer demand depends primarily on consumer income. If we want to increase consumer demand we must increase consumer income. What the national accounts call "personal income". Labour income is a large part of personal income; but what has been happening to labour income? The best one can say is that it's been holding fairly steady. I suggest that the time has come for Parliament to declare formally, by statute, that full employment with stable prices and maximum production is a national economic purpose. We need a more aggressive policy for dealing with regional pockets of unemployment. We need definite proposals for helping secondary industries hit by import competition. We need improvements in the national employment services; we need to restore our built-in social security defence against recession; we need to strengthen the economic position of agriculture. Those are the proposals for raising the growth rate of the economy. We must stop the recession. We must get the growth rate up. We must conquer seasonable unemployment. If we can increase consumer demand and consumer income, we create more jobs. If we can do these things the rest of the unemployment problem is manageable. If we cannot do them, the rest is hopeless. I thank you ladies and gentlemen.

MR. CARROLL: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I might ask a question? There was some suggestion that wages were holding steady. Is that over a period

MR. HARRIS: They have been holding fairly steady. Yes.

MR. CARROLL: That they haven't been going up in your opinion over the last few years?

MR. HARRIS: They have been going up but so has the cost of everything going up so the wages are just about steady.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this resolution, but I thought that the Honourable Member for La Verendrye had the Well I can

MR. EVANS: permissible now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether you would rule Sir, that you had proceeded to take the vote or whether this is just a misunderstanding. If it were by leave of the House perhaps the honourable member might be allowed to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: It might be acceptable to the House if the honourable member spoke now, and then we would hold the resolution in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye if he wished to speak.

MR. CAMPBELL: As far as we're concerned, Mr. Speaker, just whatever suits the convenience of the honourable member himself. We're quite willing to have the adjournment stand in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye if the member prefers it that way. If he prefers to go on, we've no objection.

MR. GROVES: Well I could go on. I thought you were going to put the question Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on this resolution on unemployment we heard a very interesting address the other day by the First Minister and I listened with a great deal of interest to what he had to say, and I agree with all that he said with respect to the long-range programs that he suggested to provide full employment in conjunction with efforts that would have to be made by the federal authorities. And I think that this government should get all of the credit which the First Minister asks for what they have done in the past three years. The amount of money that they have invested in schools, hospitals, roads, etcetera, and their policy generally of public investment has certainly had its good effects. But even after doing all these things, Mr. Speaker, we still have roughly 30,000 unemployed people in the Province of Manitoba and I think that this is our immediate problem. All of the things that the First Minister suggested, if we were to receive both the interest and the co-operation of the federal authorities would help to reduce unemployment, but they would be long-range projects, many of them would take years to put into effect. They will not help those people that are unemployed at the present time and those that we expect to become unemployed within the foreseeable future.

Unemployment, Mr. Speaker, I think is going to get worse, and there are many reasons for my saying that, and I hope to bring out some of them in the course of my remarks. I think too, that we should reject the theories of the economists that say that 3% or 4% or 2% of our

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) working force must be unemployed. Perhaps these theorists are right, and perhaps it does boil down to that or some percentage close to that if we take into consideration illness, people that are changing jobs, etcetera. I think that our objective now, Mr. Speaker, should be to do everything we can to relieve unemployment as soon as possible in order to meet this present emergency. I think that we as legislators, should devote all of our efforts to ensure opportunity of employment to all of those who are able to work, and I think that before we can tackle this program we must know what unemployment is. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics from time to time issues a figure that they call "unemployment". The Unemployment Insurance Commission also has a figure for unemployment which they arrive at by the number of people that they have registered for unemployment insurance benefits and available for work. Both of these figures that are supposed to give us an indication of the seriousness of our unemployment problem, are different.

Now the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association put out a booklet and I would like to quote from page three of that in respect to this matter. It says "Unemployment is serious in Canada today. More serious than it has been and more serious than it should be. There are many obvious defects and gaps in the statistics and there is good reason to believe that the unemployment insurance system tends to increase the statistical total of unemployment insurance." This is true, Mr. Speaker, that our unemployment insurance system does tend to inflate the number of unemployed. Can't we in Manitoba make an analysis from perhaps the unemployment records of those who are unemployed and find out how many there are and in what categories they are, so that we can find out how many people there actually are in this province that are unemployed and available for work. There is every reason to believe that the statistics that are issued by the Unemployment Insurance Commission include married women that are applying for part-time work. They include married women that are not intending to work but are applying merely for the purpose of drawing out their benefits. And they include retired persons that are not actually looking for work but are also trying to withdraw the benefits that they've paid into the fund. Proposed intentions of the Unemployment Insurance Commission to tighten up their regulations, I think will do a great deal of good in this regard, but I think that Manitoba must try to get an accurate figure of their unemployment and an actual breakdown of who the people are that are unemployed so that we can direct our efforts towards putting these people back to work along the lines of this survey. And again quoting from the book that was issued by the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association - they state in this respect that: "For more immediate, and it is hoped temporary relief of the distress of existing unemployment we need to know how much more than is now known, concerning its nature, extent and location. We need to know what men and women are unemployed; what ages they are; what skills they have and where they are. Today we know none of these facts in specific and local detail. We feel certain that a serious national problem exists but we do not know its dimensions. The details are lost in the statistical totals. A national unemployment census is required if we are to do anything practical to relieve the problem quickly and effectively." This is true Mr. Speaker, and I think, although this refers to the national scheme, that we need in Manitoba, first of all a census of unemployment and a breakdown of those that are unemployed and what skills they have and where they are located.

I think Mr. Speaker, that the unemployment insurance scheme is a good one and that it has done a lot to relieve the hardships of unemployment, and I would be in favour of gradually raising the benefits that unemployed workers can get from these funds, and I would be in favour too, of increasing the minimum wage as the honourable gentleman says. I would also think, that coupled with an increase in unemployment insurance benefits these benefits should be restricted only to those who are genuinely unemployed and available for work. We must agree also, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, that our unemployment insurance system has aggravated to some extent our unemployment problem -- and I'm not saying this in the slightest manner to indicate that unemployment insurance is not a good thing. It is a good thing; it's a necessary thing and I'm in favour of it, but it does to some degree aggravate our unemployed problem. Again quoting from this book: "The unemployment insurance scheme has recently been subject to considerable criticism. This criticism is direct -- to some cases of abuse amounting perhaps to fraud, and to many more cases of legal claims on the fund which do not seem to fit into the proper conception of what unemployment insurance is supposed to do." And it goes further, "It is true, however," -- and this is referring to the pulpwood industry, -- "that in earlier

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) years when pulpwood supplies were short, and demand for pulpwood was high, the cutting season was extended into the winter months. But since the addition of these seasonable workers to the unemployment insurance scheme, this has been proved in practice to be impossible. Many workers who have worked long enough to be entitled to unemployment insurance benefits prefer to leave their jobs and take their insurance rather than face the physical rigours of working during the severe winter months." We have had some experience in recent years with attempts to extend the cutting seasons past Christmas. In one case an operator who planned to keep his camp open at the request of the Provincial Government to provide winter employment in the area, found it impossible to do so. He had to close the camp because he could not find men to operate them. So the good features of our unemployment insurance scheme none of us deny, but I think that it does, I think as I have shown, aggravate to some degree our unemployment problem in this province.

The Honourable Leader of the CCF the other day mentioned married women and I agree to some extent with the remarks that he made in this respect. I am sure that there are many married women working to supplement low incomes of their husbands -- and I don't blame them -- and I don't think that we should do anything to take away their right to do so. But many of them particularly those working on part-time jobs, are working for lower wages than if they were working full time; which encourages employers to hire this type of help and to shy away from providing full-time employment at higher rates of pay. If we were to raise minimum wages as I have argued in previous debate, this would provide higher incomes to some of these low income groups and not make it necessary for some of them to send their wives out to work in order to supplement their income. We would also force employers to concentrate their employment practices on full-time employees at higher rates of wages rather than have them seek out married women who are prepared to work for lower wages in order to work on a part-time basis to supplement incomes of their husbands. I'm informed that the Civil Service of Manitoba had at February 1st, 1961, some 998 married women working. In February of 1959 there were 820 married women in the Civil Service of Manitoba. So this is increasing. How many we have in the Dominion Civil Service I don't know, but there must be many thousands. There must also be many more thousands working for private industry and in business. I wasn't particularly interested, Mr. Speaker, in a further breakdown of these figures because I wanted them merely to illustrate my point. And I want to emphasize again, or to agree rather, with those who will dispute some of the things that I have to say, that many of these will be widows; some will be widows or married women supporting invalid husbands, many will be working to supplement low incomes of their husbands, and many may be working in order to meet emergencies in the home, such as sickness, etcetera. I have no objection to this, but many of these, I am sure, must be holding down jobs that could be filled by those that are presently unemployed. They're holding down jobs for boys and girls that are coming out of our schools and have no jobs to go to. Arguments, of course, can be advanced against this. They say that married women are more stable and that they're more dependable and therefore do a better job than the younger girls that are graduating from our schools. Perhaps our schools are failing in this respect and I commend this to those responsible for the education of our boys and girls in this province, because if this is a problem then I think it's up to us, particularly since the province has an interest in education, to get through to these boys and girls that they must be prepared on graduation to go out and be stable and dependable and fill in these job opportunities. The other argument that we hear in connection with the employment of married women is that people can't get trained typists, stenographers, clerical workers, and what have you. And to some extent this may be true. If it is true then I think that we have a job of leadership to do here as well. The unemployment census that I referred to earlier would show us where the shortages of jobs existed and once provided this information the government could then encourage, by scholarships, bursaries and an educational campaign in the schools, students to enter these fields where opportunities for employment were most favourable, just as they're doing now with their unemployment retraining program. I think that the government leadership in this field within their own staff, with the co-operation of other governments, and with the co-operation of business and labour, could do something I'm sure to help our present and immediate unemployment problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, unemployment in Manitoba and Canada, is, I suggest, a very serious

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.).... and a problem that is almost an immediate emergency. We read in the Tribune just the other evening that unemployment had reached 719,000 in the month of February, 1960, and that it's a record, and 120,000 more than a year earlier. Between January and February the number of persons in Canada's labour force declined by 33,000 but the number of employed Canadians fell even faster by 59,000. For the prairie region the number of unemployed in thousands has increased from 64,000 in February of 1960 to 76,000 in February of 1961. One of the things that is seriously aggravating our unemployment problem is the number of boys and girls that are graduating from our schools that have no jobs. And I'd like to quote in this respect from the Financial Post of a few weeks ago dealing with this problem, where their headline is: "Where are the Jobs for the Teenagers?" "Take for example the great surge of teenagers, the vast number of post-war babies soon to flood into the work force in annual numbers 15 to 20 times as great as in the earlier post-war years. Canadian businessmen are counting on the many demands of these youngsters as they come to the time of marrying; buying cars and houses; raising babies, etcetera, to produce another big boom probably in the mid 1960's. The fact is that without large growth in employment opportunities there won't be much growth in consumer spending; no jobs, no money and no purchasing power. Plainly the surge of young people into the work force provides Canada with a magnificent opportunity for growth and prosperity, but it would be tragic if the chances were missed, because the government, which after all is the pace setter for the economy, is too loaded with archaic ideas to do some free wheeling and pragmatic thinking."

Also in one of the earlier issues of Canadian Business they quote some very interesting figures from the Gordon Report on "Economic Prospects for Canada." "It's expected that our labour force in the prairie provinces will increase from 1959 at 1,091,000 to 1,160,000 in 1965; to 1,280,000 in 1970; an increase of 17.3 percent." Then it goes on to breakdown the growth of the labour force by age groups and it shows that between 1959 and 1970 in the age groups between 14 and 19 it's expected that there will be an increase of 59.6 percent. And in the total labour force an increase of 29.2 percent. Now the first figures that I quoted represent those children that will be coming out of school during that period, and jobs must be found for these graduates to do, and yet we find if we look into the situation closer that many of the policies of our business communities are rather than helping to create jobs, are contributing towards the creation of unemployment. With respect to the increase in our labour force coming out of our schools, the day is coming, in fact if it's not already here, when good steady jobs are going to be available only to those with a good education, and everything that we can do as legislators to encourage students to stay in school and finish at least grade XI, should be done. This point should be driven home to the students that are now in our schools; to encourage them to finish their Grade XI; and to encourage as many as we can to even go further and complete their Grade XII, and many of those in turn should be encouraged to go further on into university. There are shortages, Mr. Speaker, right at the present time in many of our professional fields; social workers, dentists, medical doctors, chiropractors, technicians of all types and teachers are in extremely short supply. I think that we should be extending even more than we are doing at the present time our efforts in the schools by means of bursaries, or educational programs to encourage these students to complete their matriculation and to go on and fill the shortages in these professions. The children in our schools should be told that there are shortages in these fields and they should be encouraged to go into them. I think the government should make a real drive to do this. We shouldn't pay lip service as we do so often to the fact that we're short of these professional people and yet not put on a real drive in our schools to encourage the graduates to fill these shortages.

Automation, Mr. Speaker, is another problem these days that is helping to create unemployment. Our railways and large manufacturers are the ones most affected by this problem. Its effects, however, are now reaching into smaller factories, retail clerks and offices. These latter class of workers, too, are facing threats to their jobs from this thing that we call automation. Encouraging efficiency and lowering the consumer costs, these things and other efforts towards progress, I don't think that we can stop them, but labour and management in co-operation and with the leadership of government bodies, I think, can do a lot to ease the changeover that is taking place in many of our industries. Otherwise we have a situation of management wishing to proceed quickly with automation in order to reduce costs, causing some degree of aggravation

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.)...in unemployment. Labour, on the other hand, is trying to keep these men on the job as long as they can. Governments get blamed for the unemployment situation and, therefore, I think that the government should provide the leadership to these two other bodies and work closely with them in order to bring about a smooth changeover in these various processes.

Another development that is going on in private industry, Mr. Speaker, that I maintain is contributing to work unemployment, is the trend towards bigness. Now this is going on at quite a rapid rate, even in our own city, and Mr. Leonard Earl some time ago had an article in the Financial Post in which he outlined the seriousness of this problem, particularly as it affected our own city -- I've got the wrong file, excuse me for a minute. I just can't find it for the moment, but he, in his article, quoted the many companies in the City of Winnipeg that were amalgamating or being bought up by larger companies in the east. Now just to give you a few examples of that, here are some of the things that Mr. Earl said in his article. "Businessmen fear that Winnipeg may be turning into a branch office city. Over the last six years, six corporations from eastern Canada and the United Kingdom have swallowed pioneer Winnipeg firms, and the trend bothers Winnipeggers. Home grown enterprises gave the city prosperity, size, social life and social services. One by one they are losing their western identity." And then, he goes on to quote many examples and he quotes: "Stovel Advocate Press sold out to Latham and Jones of London, Ontario. The large saddlery and leather merchants who helped to give the west transport before the railways, have either disappeared or passed into eastern control. Shea's Winnipeg Brewery, whose business was taken over by Labatt's in 1954. Similarly Drewery's Brewery, started by E. L. Drewery and his brother in 1877, ultimately became a unit of Western Canada Breweries and since April, 1957, has been doing business as Carling Breweries of Manitoba." He goes on to point out that Fort Garry Breweries have been taken over by Sicks; that Manitoba Gypsum and Western Gypsum have been absorbed by English companies. In truck transportation, control of some powerful Winnipeg units has passed to outside interests, and he goes on and on. Crown Corporations, Mr. Speaker, as well as government departments, are certainly following this trend. In private business these deals that I just read about from the Financial Post certainly don't auger well for the consumer nor for our problem of unemployment, for by using efficiency as an argument for this trend to bigness, these actions do concentrate power to dictate prices in the hands of fewer people, to the detriment of many of our consumers; and the amalgamation of these various companies certainly are creating fewer jobs in Manitoba. It cuts down job opportunity and it reduces the chances of present employees for promotion and, in the long run, is making fewer jobs available for our people. These trends that are reaching even into our local industries are, in a way, a development towards monopolies and cartels. I would like to quote from the book of Dr. Ludwig Berhardt, the Minister of Economic Affairs of the German Federal Republic, and what he said in connection with the creation of these huge corporations and unemployment, and I quote: "There has never been as many unemployed in German history," he recalls, "as in the period when cartels flourished most strongly. Cartels always have had to be paid for by a lower standard of living."

Now all I'm wanting to make clear, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the governments are spending many millions of dollars trying to put people back to work. Governments are spending more millions of dollars on re-training programs, trying to solve this serious unemployment problem and yet we have, on the other hand, in our business community, developments going on that are in many instances putting people on the streets unemployed faster than our government programs are putting people back into the work force. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there has to be much more co-operation between governments and private enterprise in this respect. If our unemployment problem becomes more serious, as there is every reason to believe that it will unless private industry or business is prepared to co-operate with governments in meeting this challenge, then I think it's up to governments to warn the leaders of industry that if they can't or won't give this co-operation voluntarily, that governments will have to step in and dictate policies, to what are now private employers, that will help us solve this serious problem of unemployment. Winter works programs are good and they have provided much new employment, and, as the Minister of Industry and Commerce told us the other day when he was speaking on his estimates, has done much to create employment in Manitoba; but despite all of our efforts

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.)....to date, we still have serious unemployment in this province and something must be done about it -- must be done about it fairly soon or we are not doing our job as representatives of our people.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I must, in closing, make this final appeal to this side of the House, particularly to the government and also to the Official Opposition. I can't make this particular appeal to the CCF for reasons that will become obvious in a few moments, but unemployment is a blot on, and a threat to our free enterprise system. This appeal that I am making could also be made to many of our business and industrial leaders who, in my opinion, have not shown the concern that they should, or shown any serious inclination to shoulder their responsibility or their part of the responsibility for our problem of unemployment. I think that we must lick unemployment and that we must lick it fairly quickly, because not to do so will be to deliver to our socialist planners the free way of life that we have enjoyed for these many years. I have to quote in closing from a magazine that came all the way from England, dealing with the situation in Canada. It states, and the name of the article is: "Another left-wing party for Canada," and it closes by saying this: "However, the new Party, if it ever does get off the ground, may be spurred into a commanding position in Canadian political life by two economic factors. If the Unions swing behind it they will do so with financial contributions from weekly wage packets to make it the richest political party in Canada; and if unemployment worsens, and many economists talk of a worsening recession starting in 1961, then the new Party may have a real issue on which it can grow." I think, Mr. Speaker, that our challenge is to meet this serious emergency of unemployment. I think that it's up to the government to show leadership in meeting these problems, not from a long range point of view, which I admit is necessary, but trying to devote their efforts to meet this problem that is existing now, that is with us at the present time. I think that they have to provide the leadership; they have to ask for the co-operation of our business and industrial leaders; and they have to ask for the co-operation of our labour leaders. This problem is so serious that if the government doesn't get the co-operation from these two groups, then it's going to have to apply an element of compulsion which is something, I think, Mr. Speaker, that we all abhor. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution stands in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: I give assurance to you, Sir, and the House, that I shall go on with it on Tuesday. I beg leave of the House to have it stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. D.M. STANES (St. James): In the absence of the Honourable Member, may I ask the indulgence of this House to allow this matter to stand.

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

MR. PETERS: In the absence of the Honourable Member, I would ask the indulgence of this House to allow this resolution to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. H. P. SHEWMAN (Morris): With the indulgence of the House, I would ask permission to have this resolution stand.

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

MR. G. W. JOHNSON (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand.

.....continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, having come to the end of the private members' portion of the order paper, I propose to ask that you would call the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 39. Is that agreeable to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition at this moment?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to proceed with that this evening. I would rather not at the present time.

MR. EVANS: I believe there's a little bit of a quandry. I respect my honourable friend's position in this matter and I would not certainly want to press it. I think, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department VIII. Item 3.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, yesterday I promised to get some information for the honourable members and certain answers to questions I wasn't able to give forthwith. The Honourable Member for Burrows mentioned the Child Guidance Clinic. I just wanted to answer his question. He wondered if this \$35,000 grant to the Child Guidance Clinic helps the Health Units to bring guidance to these children. The long and short of it is that the Child Guidance Clinic is run, of course, by the School District of Winnipeg with contributions from eight suburban school districts, and the provincial allotment to the salaries of the operation of that clinic is \$108,000 and we get about 75 percent of this. We can only spend 75 percent of our allotment for salaries under federal health grants, so we have to subsidize what we get in health grants by provincial contribution, and I thought that would answer that question.

The other question -- the Honourable Member for Neepawa asked, was good enough to give me a copy of the Chamber of Commerce resolution, that the Chambers of Commerce urge the government to permit the inclusion of the insurance premium as a legitimate item for income tax deduction. In view of the fact that the federal authorities are paying 50 percent they, of course, have decided that a person cannot claim the premium as an allowable expense, for income tax deduction, of course, for the payments which the plan makes on behalf of the resident, because they've already paid half of the actual -- around 43 percent of the actual cost.

In the annual report -- I was not too well organized last night as the members were referring to it -- but in the annual report for 1960 there were a few questions asked. One overriding question was the estimated excess of expenditure over revenue based on the previous rates of 2.05 and 4.10. The deficit at the end of '61 would have been \$4,269,000. This was including increased federal contribution. The members of the committee should realize, or it should be made clear, that the federal contribution is related to cost and not to premium. The increase in federal grants in the past year is \$1,860,000. This was the increased contribution in the past year from the federal people in actual costs. As costs go up their costs go up. Another question was the deficit at the end of December 31, 1960, as printed on page 22 of the annual report, \$1,675,000. Of course, honourable members will realize that the day the plan came into being the end of 1958, the plan was \$5,893,383 deficit which was brought on by the free, so-called, six month premium period. However, that's just a dead weight deficit type of financing, I'm told.

Another question was, why the discrepancy between pages 22 and 23 -- \$3 million and \$2,982,000. The answer to this is that \$18,000 difference is included as part of the accounts receivable of \$81,000 shown on the balance sheet, and is to be paid to the plan prior to the end of the fiscal year from consolidated revenue.

Another question asked of me last evening on this report was the \$2,400,000 at the bottom. Looking through page 23 of the annual report, at the top of the page, I've answered the \$2,982,000 -- the premium collected as to the end of 1960 was \$16,398,000. A total of \$34 million was the money being used to pay bills. At the bottom of the table it says -- "On deposit with Provincial Treasurer - \$2,465,000." This is really the cash on hand to operate the business, and probably will be paid out during the coming months. The report, as you get a few

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) facts, is quite clear. The question that was asked of me was the percentage of federal contribution to shareable costs under the plan. In 1960, 46.08%; 1961, 46.17%. We anticipate in 1962, 46.71%; 1963, 46.59%. But the Federal Government, of course, does not share in capital costs or administration, and I think that's where the honourable member, the figure of 42.69% is really the total, the federal contribution taking into account capital 1961, 42% of costs; 1962, 43.31. So there is that approximately four percent difference which is really your administration.

The Honourable Member for Neepawa also mentioned that on December 9th, I think it was, one-fifth had or had not paid their premium to December 9th, 1960. At the end of January 93.04 percent of the premiums had been paid. I thought I would just clear those questions up.

One other question which the Honourable Member from Neepawa brought up concerning welfare and Medicare. I think the question was to state the maximum allowance and the minimum allowance and the average allowance of those in receipt of supplementary allowance. There is no maximum set under the regulations other than the maximum being the total of the basic necessities as they are priced in the regulations, and the staff went over the enrolments for the month of March, and the largest single supplementary allowance was in the amount of \$91.31 plus V. O. N. services plus Medicare. This case could also be described as a home care case, which I believe is most proper use of social allowance. To give the committee an example of this type of case where we go to a maximum of -- this is really a maximum type of case, but is where you have, as this case was, the actual case -- a 68-year old gentleman, his wife 60, they tried for years to give full care to the gentleman with an income of \$55.00 a month plus a small insurance benefit, which is now terminated. The woman's health was steadily deteriorating and under the program, one month we hired a housekeeper to look after the husband while the woman herself went into hospital for needed surgical attention. The woman is able to look after her husband with some attendant help and generally it's this assistance up to \$20.00 a month. The attendant helps with the heavy laundry; takes over when the wife does her shopping, and enables her to get some free time from the heavy duty of caring for her husband. The Victorian Order of Nurse Services have been arranged when required, and under the instructions of the physician, attempts to prevent bed-sores and give baths, injections and so on.

The budget varies from month to month depending on the amount of homemaker and V. O. N. services required, and I thought I would illustrate this case to give the committee the picture, because here's where rent was \$40.00 -- this is actual rent; utilities \$5.50; food \$43.00; clothing \$10.00; household and personal needs \$15.00; fuel \$14.56; telephone \$3.25, because he does have to have a telephone. He's sick and may require attention at home. An attendant \$15.00 a month. It comes to \$146.31. Now, the amount granted of \$91.31 with a grant of \$15.00 to \$20.00 for V. O. N. services paid directly when needed, and Medicare is granted, this is as an example when introducing my estimates I was pointing out to the honourable members -- this is probably the maximum type of case we run into under the program, where we have a gentleman or a partner over the age of 65, especially where the husband is in that category and is disabled and has no other resources, and in order to keep the family unit together an allowance of that amount is paid. Now my honourable friend mentioned that -- asked the minimum of supplementary allowances. Of course, in many cases that I tabled, the only thing that's necessary is a Medicare card. However where the cash is granted, the minimum amount granted is \$2.00 per recipient. One of these cases taken from the enrolments for the month of March -- I asked for this this morning -- an example here is a couple over-65 drawing \$110.00. The health of the couple is fair but they do have regular drug needs. The budget was as follows: rent \$40.00; utilities \$4.00; food \$43.00; house and personal needs \$15.00; clothing \$10.00; for a total of \$112.00. Here the allowance at present is \$2.00 a month plus a Medicare card for benefits for drugs. These I thought I would give to the committee as examples of describing maximum and minimum allowances under this Act, as the honourable member had asked me that question.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister tell the Committee the psychological effect on human beings when they have to apply for relief under the means test. In other words the inquisition they have to go through on signing the application, on the investigation and so on. In other words are they somewhat -- I'm not mentioning the candidates -- for psychopathic examination?

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, sometimes I wonder if the Minister and I talk the same language, because when I listen to the Minister I'm always in some doubt as to whether he's talking about what the Act promises, which may not in most cases -- and I'll come to this question a little later -- may not yet have been proclaimed, or what the Act is actually giving. To me it seems that there is a vast difference between what was promised and what we have now accomplished. I wouldn't mind if the Minister and I disagreed on what ought to be done. This is standard. We have for many years been accused of believing in giving everybody assistance and giving assistance to many people who really are not entitled to get assistance. But here we have a situation, this is a bill which, when the Minister introduced it, was a bill which was one of the -- not one of, it was the best bill of its kind in Canada. It was one of the most important bills, if not the most important bill ever introduced in this House. It would give assistance to all the people who are in need. And it wouldn't do it some day in the future, Mr. Chairman, it would do it today. Right away. As a matter of fact, the Minister and the government were in such a hurry to get on with the job that just two years ago they dissolved the House because we on this side were holding up this job of getting assistance to all the people who needed it right away. There couldn't be any delay; there ought not to be any delay; it was a disgrace to hold the people who need assistance up; and they had to get on with the job. And so they dissolved the House and the Minister and the First Minister were travelling up and down this province telling the people what horrible people there were in the Opposition; how they were delaying the job. The government had the plans; the details. They were ready to go; to give the assistance to everybody who needed it. And I wonder if the Minister remembers the speeches which he made on this subject. They were wonderful speeches. One wonders what happened to the Minister. It would almost seem -- one of the reporters was wondering if this was a swan song the Minister gave when he introduced his estimates yesterday. It couldn't have been a swan song. It's a different Minister, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to remind the Minister, in case he's forgotten, some of the things that he said and when he said them. And let's have a look at what he's done about these things. And these aren't things -- if they were things that I said should be done, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister hadn't done it, I wouldn't be surprised, because most members in this House think I'm an impractical guy anyway, and certainly, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and I want to give assistance to all sorts of people who aren't entitled to it. But the Minister made these promises. I didn't make them. He made them. I hope he meant them. Let's have a look at what he's done about them, Mr. Chairman. Now, the Free Press reports that on March 17th, 1959, the Honourable Minister made a speech in which he said that the province will take over the responsibility for the aged and infirm persons in institutions, and this has been done. For child welfare cases -- and this has been done. For long term cases of family assistance -- has this been done? No, Mr. Chairman, and this is two years since the Minister promised this. For family assistance where the husband is in prison -- has this been done? No, Mr. Chairman, two years later. For assistance for Indians and immigrants -- has this been done? No, Mr. Chairman. And I remember, Mr. Chairman, we just had a debate the last couple of days, and I know many members thought that I was being impractical when I defended the rights of the Indians. And when this was brought up by the Minister two years ago I pointed out to him that while I certainly agreed that the Indian population of this province is morally entitled to the same standard of living, and the same standard of assistance as everybody else, that from the provincial point of view it didn't seem practical to me that we would guarantee assistance to the Indians, and the Minister mentioned the figure last night, 25,000 Indians on the reserve who are the constitutional responsibility of the Federal Government, not this province. Who made the promise to them? The Minister in his bill. Now, on March 20th of 1959 the Minister reported again, and here are some of the things he said; the province would take over the case of all long-term welfare cases from the municipality -- have they done it? Of course they haven't. The province would provide cash allowances and medical and related services to needy old age pensioners. This has been done, but Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Minister that in the opinion of a large number of -- not in my opinion, but in the opinion of a number of very competent people working, professional people in the welfare field, not for the province but for some of the agencies and municipalities -- the regulations are very stiff. I am told, Mr. Chairman, that it takes three months after an application is made to the province for assistance before a

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) case is finally put on the roll. This is what I've been told, and if I'm wrong I will be glad if the Minister will tell me that this is wrong.

Now, the Minister said the responsibility for placement and maintenance of the aged and infirm in institutions would be transferred from the municipalities to the province. This has been done, but he said that mother allowances, as such, would be abolished and long-term family assistance cases would become a provincial responsibility. This has not yet been done. Further, he said that amendments would be offered to the Elderly Persons' Housing Act to stimulate low rental housing for old people and, "in a hurry". Now the amendments came in and we had a bit of a splurge in the field of old age housing. But what happened recently? My impression is, certainly as far as the urban area is concerned where the largest concentration of old age people is, that we have come almost to a complete halt. And I would like to hear what the Minister has to say about this. And further he said that amendments, The Old Age Assistance Act and The Blind Persons' Allowances Act would remove the buck-passing aspect left in them by the former government. Well I agree that the former government passed the buck, but these amendments which the Minister talked about two years ago, when he was in such a hurry, have still not been made.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the speech to end all speeches, the speech which should be inscribed on the wall over the Minister's desk, the Minister made on July 13th, 1959. And I want to read just a few sentences from what he said then, and I quote. The Minister, in case he's forgotten it, will find it on page 877 and 878 of Hansard of that year, and I quote: "I feel it's probably the most single important piece of legislation to come before this session, and I think that members of this Legislature are of the opinion that certain pensioners have needs and that these needs should be met as effectively as possible within the resource of the province." Later; "The Principle behind this bill is to bring at least the minimum standard of living to every citizen of Manitoba who, because of age or disability, physical or mental, is in need, and in the case of children where neglect, desertion or death of the father creates the need. It is designed to provide 100 percent provincial responsibility for the following types of cases where the standards of living conditions demand that the needs be met. The 100 percent provincial responsibility, then, in care of aged and infirm in institutions; neglected children committed by the Courts to the Director or to a Children's Aid Society; social allowances for the aged, blind or disabled by way of cash allowance and/or health services; social allowance to the Mother's Allowance type of case. By this I mean that we are taking over under The Social Allowances Act, Mothers' Allowance as such. Now this means complete provincial responsibility on the basis of needs for: all widows, mothers and children; mothers and children where the husband has deserted over one year; mother and children where the husband is in gaol over one year; mother and children where due to physical or mental disability or incapacity, or due to disability after 90 days creates need; also unmarried mothers with two or more children. We also would extend this to immigrants and to the Indian people whom we consider as Manitoba citizens. This bill will make provision for cash allowances and medical and related services to pensioners in need", and so on and so on.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Acting Director, I think he was at that time, of the Public Welfare of the City of Winnipeg, Mr. O'Brien, not being a politician, just being an ordinary civil servant, an ordinary social worker, took the Minister at his word, that the Minister meant business. He was going to do this. And so, three days later on July 18th, he makes a report to the Welfare Committee of the City of Winnipeg, in which he says that the City expects that the province will, and I quote from the Free Press of that day, "That the province will take care of physically and mentally incapacitated people who are now only a city responsibility. Winnipeg is now caring for over 600 such people at an average cost of \$80.00 a month, and the number is going up constantly." Well, this was in the Act. Have we done it? Of course we haven't. Unless a person is mentally ill, unless that person is in a mental institution, the province accepts no responsibility for him, as far as social allowance is concerned. That part of the Act has not yet been proclaimed. That kind of assistance, Mr. Chairman, is now and has for a number of years, been available to people in the Province of Ontario. And I mention this only because, Mr. Chairman, I think there is a vast difference between what the Minister promised us and what the Minister has done. Now Mr. O'Brien said that the Provincial Government, as he interpreted the Minister's speech, would care for neglected children. And this is being

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) done. "When the Act comes into force the province will shoulder the responsibility for families deserted by husbands and fathers for more than one year; and families where the husbands have been in prison for more than one year." And he pointed out that the city at that time supported at least 250 such families each year at an average minimum cost of \$1,800 per year. Well, Mr. Chairman, this is in the Act, and every other province is doing it. But unfortunately for those people, and for municipalities, this part of the Act has not been proclaimed. We are still living with the most archaic rules in the Dominion of Canada. Here a deserted wife has to wait for four years before the province will accept the responsibility. Mr. O'Brien said that the province would assume the cost of elderly persons who, though not ill, require welfare help, as well as the cost of supporting families of unmarried mothers of more than one child. This has not been done, as far as the last is concerned, and elderly persons are only entitled to assistance after they are 65 years of age.

Now on the 25th of November, 1959, the Honourable Minister made a speech to the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, and I quote the report which was given in the Press, and the Minister's quoted as saying, "Three groups of needy citizens will have to wait to come under the provisions of the government's Social Allowances Act. Sections of the Act covering aid for unmarried mothers, deserted mothers and children, and the wives and children of men in gaol will not be proclaimed until several months later. November, 1959. I want to emphasize that. The Minister says several months later. We're now 16, or is it 18 months from November, 1959, and that part of the Act has not yet been proclaimed, and the Minister is further quoted as saying, "The government will have plenty to do in the first few months in dealing with applications from needy persons, pensioners and from the aged and infirm. As soon as we've been able to digest this bite we will then take on the remainder of the provisions by a further proclamation. Well, the process of digestion is taking a lot longer obviously than the Minister expected, and a lot longer than the Minister gave the public to expect it would take, and I think that the Minister should have given a good deal more consideration to the time and to the planning before he made the promises.

Now let's look at some of these sections which have not been proclaimed. First -- (Interjection) -- Well, I don't sit at the Cabinet meetings so I'm not certain who's to blame. I only know what the end results are. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, he's a nice guy. It's tough to argue with a nice guy, but his program is still important.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister made a statement and I'm sorry that we haven't got Hansard yet, but as I remember it last night, and I tried to listen very carefully, he was anticipating, I suppose, this speech which I'm making today, because I said the same thing last year. I chided the Minister last year because he had only proclaimed 25 percent of the provisions of the Act. Well, he's done a little better. He's brought in the Medicare program, and our group will be saying something about that, but there's been nothing else, and so what did the Minister do last night, as I remember it? He said, "Well, we have only proclaimed 25 percent of the Act but this covers 80 percent of the potential people". He says this in the face of the fact that he, himself, said that there are 25,000 Indians on the reserves and 22,000 people of Indian and Metis origin off the reserve, who theoretically are entitled to assistance. So where the 80 percent comes in the light of that, I can't understand it. Neither can any other person interested in this field whom I have discussed this with.

But let's look at some of the other people who, under the Act, are supposed to get assistance. I have mentioned one of them. The Act says that a person who, and I quote, "by reason of physical or mental ill health, or physical or mental incapacity that is likely to continue for more than 90 days, and is unable to earn an income sufficient to meet the basic necessities of himself and his dependents, if any, is entitled to assistance". Well, people, as I pointed out a few moments ago, people who are not in institutions are not entitled to assistance. The Province of Ontario has been extending coverage to these people for several years at least. Well, widows with a dependent child or children are covered by the Act. This is true, but this did not extend benefits to anybody really. All it did was transfer the people who were getting Mothers' Allowance assistance from the Mothers' Allowance Act to The Social Allowances Act. Actually it meant no real difference in the number of people or in the benefits, unless the benefits were adjusted up, and if they were adjusted up they certainly weren't adjusted up very, very much. Now the present Mothers' Allowance policy extends coverage to those mothers

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) deserted for a period of four years or more with the additional stipulation that they must have been in receipt of municipal assistance for a considerable period of time prior to the application. I am told, Mr. Chairman, that the regulations are extremely rigid and the four-year period or the period of desertion only commences from the last date that there was any contact with or knowledge of the husband's whereabouts, and not from the date of the actual break-up of the marriage. Presumably these same rigid definitions will apply in the future, creating a real hardship on the family, and I am told that this is the only province in Canada which is now enforcing this four-year regulation.

Problems to a family deserted by the father usually come to the fore in the most critical sense at the point when the break-up actually occurs. Pressures are then the greatest for the mother in trying to cope with her situation, and she brings this feeling of utter despair and anxiety for the future to either the Family Court worker or the social worker in -- (Interjection) -- where? Not in the province but in the City of Winnipeg or in the municipality where she is residing. Immediate financial need must be met by the Municipal Department as well as whatever steps socially must be taken to help the woman plan for the future. This involves reconciliation with the husband where possible, and if not, a plan for the future, including self-support if this is found, or a public welfare fund where this is not. Now the local municipality can't wait four years so they have to take the job on. The job which we were led to believe would be taken on by the province, and the job which should be taken on by the province, except this section of the Act has not been proclaimed at the present time. The Act also says that where a mother of one or more dependent children who is the wife of a man who has been sentenced to imprisonment for one year or more, that that person shall be entitled to assistance, but this has not been proclaimed as yet and in fact, I think that the one-year period should be reduced, because people need assistance and they need it when they are in trouble, not at some future date. Another class who supposedly were to get assistance -- an unmarried mother caring for two or more of her children in her own home and unable by her own efforts to provide their basic necessities. This section, I understand has not been proclaimed, nor does it permit the working unmarried mother, who might wish to board out her children in someone else's care, to get assistance; nor the unmarried mother of one child. And I think that people who are in difficulties are entitled to assistance. I still cannot understand why we insist that a woman make two mistakes before she be entitled to assistance. I'm not condoning the mistakes, but we say to the woman, "If you've made one mistake we're sorry we won't help you, but if you're foolish enough to make a second mistake then by all means you can come on our rolls". Now, where the common sense or where the morality of this lies, Mr. Chairman, I find it difficult to understand.

Now The Social Allowances Act only provides aid to dependent children -- that is, to those under 18 years of age, regardless of circumstances. In practice, the Provincial Welfare Department does recognize the need for maintenance of certain children 18 years of age and over where they are in school, in training programs, or unable to locate suitable employment. However, since there is no provision for assisting beyond this age, the family is referred to the Municipal Department for the assistance needed for the 18 and over child. Now, Mr. Chairman, we've heard a number of speeches about the fact that unemployed people usually are untrained, and it would seem to me that if there are special circumstances, if a child is going to school, that the aid from the province ought to be continued, not indefinitely, but until the education or training program is continued.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time there is no provision for assistance to divorced persons in Manitoba as there is in Ontario where, and I quote from their regulations: "An allowance may be paid to a mother for the support of her children if she has divorced their father and has been granted custody of the children in proceedings which did not provide for maintenance. If such provision was made an allowance may be granted if the father has failed in his obligations and has not been heard of for at least one year." This coverage is further extended in Newfoundland, Quebec and British Columbia to separated parents. Now, Mr. Chairman, here are just some of the deficiencies in the program which this government promised the people of Manitoba, and which have not yet been instituted. Now the Minister said this was the best Act when he introduced it -- this was the best Act in Canada. That may be true on paper, Mr. Chairman. I want to suggest, however, that in practice it is not at all true. I want to suggest,

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) Mr. Chairman, that the Province of British Columbia, the Province of Ontario, the Province of Saskatchewan are, in fact, today doing substantially more to provide for the needs of the needy, as the Minister so aptly calls them, than this province, and I wouldn't object, Mr. Chairman, to this on the part of the government, if it weren't for the fact that the Minister had been so definite and so specific in his promises both to the people in this House, and more important, to the people who are in need throughout the province. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, before I sit down, that we have a long way to go before, in this province, the people who are in need have been given what the Minister promised them, and I want to conclude with just one last remark that a very competent person in the field of welfare today told me, that even if you exclude the Indian and Metis -- and I, for one, never took seriously the suggestion that we would be looking after them in the foreseeable future -- that the number of people who are being looked after at the present time, as a result of the fact that the Act has only been proclaimed in part, the people who are in need, who are getting assistance from the province, is not the 80 percent that the Minister spoke of last night, but is much closer to 50 percent than the 80 percent, and I think for this, Mr. Chairman, the government and the Minister need to be criticized.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, last night we were hurrying along so fast that I didn't get the chance to speak on one item I was going to mention, but since the Minister in his opening speech mentioned the Welfare Services, and he also mentioned dentures, I would like to put a few questions to him. At the last session -- last year we had three bills before this House, one by the denturists and there were two by the dental people, and Bill No. 82, I think, An Act to amend the Dental Association Act, was accepted, and I suppose since then that something has been done about it. I would like to know from the Minister how many dental clinics were established in Manitoba since the bill came into effect; how many people are on the staff of these clinics, and what is the cost of dentures. Because at that time we were given to understand that the cost of dentures would be reasonable and that people would be able to get dentures from these clinics at about the same cost that the denturists were giving them at that time. I would also like to know how many people availed themselves of these services in these clinics, and also whether the Welfare Department is putting these clinics to use by referring patients to the clinics. I think the bill also provides for dental hygienists, and I would like to know how many of these people are working in these clinics, and also whether the Act is being followed in respect to prescriptions and so on, as provided for in the bill. I would like to have some information on this matter.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Denture Clinic, as I understand it, is certainly run by the Dental Society themselves. I haven't got the figures on their usage. I am told, and the government through Order-in-Council has appointed two members to their committee, lay members, and in speaking to these lay members they have advised me that there is no means test at the denture clinic in the Boyd Building -- the opening of which I attended, was invited -- and dentures are being sold, uppers and lowers, for \$85.00 a set. The problem that I have been most concerned with, of course, has been the provision of dentures under the Medicare program where, as the Member for Neepawa mentioned last night, he mentioned the fact possibly we haven't given the profession enough credit for their co-operation in this program. I just want to say that certainly I've repeatedly expressed my very great appreciation to the various professional groups who put their shoulders behind this very unique experiment in Medicare. I think there is a great deal can be said, but I have been particularly heartened by the response of the public and the dental profession in the past year, and I say this sincerely, I think somewhere over -- the last figure I heard, January figure, was somewhere over 780 sets of dentures had been provided to recipients of Medicare cards, and that program seems to be going along quite well. I should share with the committee that one of the members of that profession phoned my Deputy Minister one day to tell him the kick he got out of participating in such a scheme. He said that a recipient of Mothers' Allowance and her daughter had been able to come into his office; they both needed extensive work done; dentures were provided under the Medicare program, and he said the change in attitude and appearance of these people was most heartening to him and made him feel quite enthusiastic about the contribution being made by the profession in that area.

The Denture Clinic, of course, is run by the Dental Society. I could ask and get, I'm sure, the figures for the honourable member, which I shall be glad to do at a later date. While I'm on

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) my feet, I have been accused at times of speaking at length, and speaking at length therefore means your argument is weak. I think my honourable friend from St. John's was getting a little lengthy too. I said it all last evening. The problem is simply that we have a very excellent Social Allowances Act, Mr. Chairman. I think Manitoba can be very proud of it. We can also be very proud that we were the first in Canada to put it down on paper. We can also be most proud, and I notice my honourable friend from St. John's has moved east. He's back in Ontario, and I always share with my honourable friend this concern for the welfare area generally, and I think we can take singular pride, and I want to make it stick, that I am firmly convinced that the future welfare in this province will go down the road of a needs test. I think this committee should know that the Province of Saskatchewan intend this summer, on June 1st next, to adopt Manitoba's program. I understand they're going to hire 70 students and go out and visit the old age pensioners, and take an application on the basis of a needs test. Alberta is doing it, and it's only sensible, Mr. Chairman. I'm not criticizing Saskatchewan. I think they're wise, and I know they're going to be doing the right thing, and I know they're going to be spending a lot more money when they get this underway.

MR. ORLIKOW: more than that now.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): They spend \$1.2 million this year for 17,000 recipients of old age security over the age of 70 which averages \$6.00 a month to a total of a little over \$1 million.

MR. ORLIKOW: What else are they doing? More than

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): If municipalities give old age security recipients extra cash allowance they share in the reimbursement. I'm not criticizing Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman. I'm just saying that they're smart to get on the Manitoba bandwagon. They're becoming Robtized like, and this is only sensible. Ottawa will share 50 percent in this deal but not unless they put it on the basis of need. Now lots of people like to shoot holes through the Medicare program of this administration. But it is on the whole receiving the very enthusiastic support of many of the professions, and it is receiving the support of the public, and it has filled a real need. Now I can go into, as I said last night, many aspects of the present act. My honourable friend has access to his experts. I have access to my experts in this House. I have my staff. The past year these men and the senior supervisors -- and it is difficult, as my honourable friends know, to get an adequate supply of highly-trained social workers that are so necessary, and believe me, I believe more and more they are the key to the breakthrough. We see the need for the right man in the right job especially in the welfare area to truly measure need and really meet that need, and as we are going forward in the program, I must commend my staff tremendously. We have approximately -- figures were tabled -- the number of workers in the field, fairly substantial over previous years, a total of 55 with their Bachelor of Social Work and 41 with their Arts Degree and 23 workers. These people have just worked their hearts out to get on with the job of meeting individual need. Now, I'm slow. I'm going probably a lot slower than I would like to go. There are these categories that are spelled out, and we're going to get on with the job, but first things come first. We've looked at the negative side with my honourable friend. And mind you it's his job to oppose. It's his job to point this out to the Legislature and to berate the Minister. That's what he's here for. But as I say, the longer he talks the weaker he gets, so I'll not try to be too long, but I do say, I have an application right here in front of me and I could read many very interesting cases. I'd like to talk of an immigrant family from Paraguay who wrote us a personal letter. Old couple, over the age of 65. "With the sum we now have and couldn't qualify for old age assistance, and we now have for daily living, you've given us complete material independence -- what we never dared to hope for. We ask our sincere appreciation for the assistance of" -- this was addressed to the worker.

We have a good story. We have 1,900 aged and infirm in institutions in this province, of a case load of approximately 2,700 whom we're supporting at a per diem rate, supporting in these institutions with an average expenditure of \$90.00 a month, Mr. Chairman. But this is very necessary, as I've pointed out in introducing my health and welfare estimates, when you build that acute hospital bed you've got to build that alternative care bed. You can't go ahead too far this way or else you leave a pocket, and the municipalities have welcomed us moving into this field, and of course you've been asked to vote a few extra dollars because the rates went up. We went into these homes and we set per diem rates, Mr. Chairman; through the City Health Department paid for the supervision, the medical supervision of all these people in these

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) institutions, in addition to the Medicare program where we have to have supervised care. We have moved in these areas. It has not gone as fast as I would like, but I'm assured, Mr. Chairman, we will get on with the job. I can only take my staff's word for it when they say to me -- "Once we get under our belt this great need of getting behind in applications for the many senior citizens who are applying for assistance, and do the job properly, with re-visiting because we want to build it solidly and on sound principles, and we can't declare further sections, unfortunately, until such time as these are thoroughly absorbed.

In the field of elderly persons' housing, as I said in introducing my estimates, we must always be aware of our changing environment in many ways. It seems if you move too fast, especially in the field of welfare, and too quickly, into any one area, changes occur in the meantime which alter your plans somewhat. But I don't think in the past year there's been any more enthusiasm in the province in the area of elderly persons' housing as there has in the past year and a half. And with the field of alternative care developing as rapidly as it has, in the past year we appointed one of our boys -- he used to be a senior sanitary inspector with the civil service -- was made full time director of elderly persons' housing. We've had architectural consultants for six months. We've explored the program from provinces to the west of us, whom I readily admit are ahead of us. They're ahead of this province. They were on with the job 10 years ago. Some of them. This year Alberta is building 50 of these in key points throughout the province. As we've gone into this, and as I personally have had the pleasure of going out to meetings for one and two days at a stretch in rural areas, to talk to people and meet with municipal groups and public bodies to talk housing, we more and more realize that these hostels or residences for the aged or housing projects themselves will only be as successful as the community wants them and gets on with the job of making them a truly community effort. We want to give them all the help we can. We have the grant structure. We subsidize with the instrument by which we assist them further as for all provincial cases. We assist in meeting the per diem rate with a social allowance and extending Medicare benefits if they, of course, receive social allowance. And this is going forward, and monthly I receive a list of the number of projects under study. I would just point out that under construction are 57 beds in Swan River; there's 48 housing units being developed in Greater Winnipeg plus another 15 at Morden. We're now talking to -- awaiting sponsors' decisions on 18 projects, and we have very good statistics now. We see the need, and much has been held up in view of the Willard Report, the designing of pattern and care for the future -- and elderly persons' housing is a very vital link, and we're very -- the department, and certainly as Minister and as a government -- we're very keen on assisting in every way we can in this area.

However, I just thought I would make one remark further concerning the Honourable Member for St. John's, about the question of Indians on reserves. I quite admit the statements I've made in this regard. I think in time this will come to be. I think it's very important that we recognize the fact that we are working through community development, mostly with Indian Affairs, in approaching the overall problem. It's not good enough. The philosophy in approaching this problem is that stretcher-bearing in this area will be no good. My honourable friend from St. John's knows that. The answer here is to move in and have these people -- assist them in helping themselves. And I think we are making headway here. And I think in the meantime the Indian Affairs are most anxious to play their roll in extending assistance to people on reserves. What do the people themselves think? They welcome the provincial participation; they welcome us being another resource to them and recognizing them in this way. And while certainly money is necessary to continue these programs in the future, money and service are both required in ever-increasing degree. And I'm afraid governments in the future will have to measure up to this area. However, that's all I can

MR. GRAY: Would the Honourable Minister reply to my question which has been put forward in a very sincere way? And I think this is a very important question, at least for the public to know, and those who participate in that Social Allowance bill.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): My honourable friend -- I think the Honourable Member from Inkster would like this question answered. I didn't get your question clear, Sir. Is it the threat of indignity to the patient who has to apply for assistance?

MR. GRAY: Well, the question is, each and everyone of those who are compelled, compelled I say, to apply for additional help. These people who had their homes, their family

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) standing; they were at one time important members of the community; they served the people; they belonged to certain organizations; they were something. And through circumstances of no choice of their own they had to apply for pension. Then it's not enough, and they cannot exist on the \$55.00 a month; they may not have additional help from anyone; are compelled to apply to Social Allowance, in which case they would have to declare entirely their proof that they belong to the means test class. My question is, psychologically or otherwise, will this means test procedure interfere with their mental attitude and friendly relation to the state if they are compelled to go under a means test and ask for three or four dollars' additional allowance?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): When we go to Brandon to the Agricultural Fair, I'm going to make it a point to travel with my honourable friend from Inkster. Because I'm going to have a long talk with him. I know that he means very well and he feels that it's an indignity for a person who has been someone of some stature in the community to have to apply for assistance and go through a so-called rigorous means test. A letter written to the department, just a note expressing concern or need, or asking us to come and visit to discuss this situation, constitutes an application, and will be followed up by the worker who will go and visit the person. Because I'm sure, if my honourable friend could read the many, many documents here, case histories, culled out of the last two months, he would see that in most cases when people need help, they need it. And these people are not psychiatrically depressed in any way. This is also the view of the experts in the field, and is why we have schools of social work and give bursaries every year to help these people learn and become better psychiatrists themselves, so that they do not offend people, and deal with things very carefully, and keep the patient's dignity. Now, I think if you pay straight across-the-board allowances, Mr. Chairman, you don't necessarily meet need and you tend to keep the person at that low level of five or -- say you gave five or ten dollars extra -- and you discourage them often. These are people who are often sometimes too willing to fall back possibly into a lethargic state. We must find ways and means. We don't want to force people through meagre payments to fight their way back. The other school of thought -- this school of thought, I think, that says across-the-board allowances, doesn't really help people. And that's what you're trying to do. Another ten dollars to some of these people, Mr. Chairman, wouldn't be a bit of help. It wouldn't really help them. A man who is crippled at home, 68 years old with a 60 year old wife, that I described. What he needed was some concern and interest by somebody. And he welcomed that. He was very pleased to think that you and I thought enough of him to send someone out to see him, spend the afternoon with him, get an attendant to help him with the daily chores around the house, and give him enough money for him and his wife to live and continue to live together in their own little abode. This could not be met, could not be met by across-the-board. I think that would be psychologically depressing and make a fellow feel we really didn't care -- that we were a bunch of cheapskates. This way we look good; and the state looks good. And it's intelligent; it's sensible. Otherwise that man would be in a nursing home and we would be subsidizing his wife. We couldn't under the present Act unless she was disabled. She'd be on City Welfare, going down to see our honourable friend from St. John's friends, the Welfare Department. No Sir, we believe in keeping the family unit together. This is good preventative medicine. The doctor comes to the house and gives him his needle. He doesn't have to go down and be "indignitified" by begging at a door somewhere. Our experts tell us this is right. And British Columbia's bought it. Alberta's flying the flag that they started it. Saskatchewan's coming into the fold. Ontario, New Brunswick has it. Nova Scotia's passing it. So I think it is an evolution in our thinking, and I think it is sound evolution.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if the honourable member would permit me just to make an announcement before the 5:30 hour. I am pleased to announce that as at the close of business to-night, the sales of savings bonds amounted to \$19,722,300.

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