

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



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 4th, 1961.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.  
Reading and Receiving Petitions.  
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.  
Notice of Motion.  
Introduction of Bills.  
Orders of the Day.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Before the Orders of the Day I would like to draw the attention of the House to a matter in which the province is involved. I hope I shall pronounce the gentleman's name correctly, but His Excellency Asgeir Asgeirsson, President of Iceland, has received an invitation from the Canadian Government to visit Canada in September of this year, and has accepted. He will also visit Manitoba as a guest of the Government of the Province, where there has been an Icelandic settlement for the longest period. After his official visit the President may visit other Icelandic settlements in western Canada. I thought the House would wish to be informed of this visit.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 25 persons from that great educational and sports centre of Hamiota. They are located in the gallery to your left. They comprise twelve team members, eight cheer leaders and are accompanied by five outstanding persons in our local community, the Reverend and Mrs. Clark, Mr. McKinnon, the principal, teachers Miss Fulton and Mr. Brown. This team is the Western Manitoba Champions of the High School Girls' Basketball League and they are here taking part in the Provincial Finals. I'd only like to pick out one of the group, Mr. Speaker, and that's Miss Linda Kidd who is in Grade IX and age 14, and she has the great score of 191 points in 12 league games. I think for any student of that age coming from that community this is a most outstanding point. I know that this was a most educational outing for them and that they will profit immeasurably by their visit to this Assembly. Thank you.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to call your attention, Sir, and that of the Members of the House, to the presence in the Speaker's Gallery of a group of 36 members from the 4-H Clubs of Petersfield, Teulon and Gunton, accompanied by Mr. J. S. Fraser, Mr. Maurice Aime and Mr. Blake Donohoe. These youngsters have been engaged in this work for a number of years and it is hard to pick out any individual among the group as being outstanding, because they are all outstanding in their particular field. And through you, Sir, and through the Members of the House I would like to express to them our welcome and the thought that their visit here today will be entertaining and instructive.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the welcome of the Honourable Member for Selkirk because some of these young people and those accompanying them come from part of my constituency. The Honourable Member for Selkirk and myself can take pride together in the flower of our youth here in Manitoba in respect to this particular area. I want to join in his good wishes to them, and I know that these clubs have different activities on their agenda for the year, and to some extent the success of their program is judged by those activities that they take part in, and I do hope that their visit here to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba will rank high amongst the activities that they will undertake this year.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, I also want to join with the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and the Honourable Member for Selkirk, because there are a few boys from Teulon. The way I hear we are tearing these boys apart here, one to Selkirk and one to Rockwood and one to Fisher. However, I would like to extend my remarks to them too. Regardless in which constituency they reside, we're all behind them, and on my part I would just like to tell them that, possibly I'm a stranger to them, but I live 70 miles away from the town and I must inform the group that my father used to go to Teulon to town to pick up the mail. So you people up there are further advanced than we are in the north, and they are coming from one of the finest areas in Manitoba. Therefore, I associate with the honourable members extending them an invitation. I hope they have a good time.

MR. MORRIS A GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I don't like to see members who are not responsible for the intellectual and the culture of the children from the school taking for themselves credit for it. I think perhaps the children -- they are not responsible for their behavior; they're not responsible for their education; they are children of their own. And why members fight over the credit for them, I cannot see.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders for the Day, we've been privileged to have a few introductions in the Chamber this afternoon. You've heard from the rest, now hear from the best and see the best. I'm deeply honoured and privileged, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 18 Girl Guides from the Town of Transcona, which incidentally will soon be a city, accompanied by their leader Mrs. Blaquiere. They are seated, Mr. Speaker, to the right of your gallery. I'm sure that you will join with me in wishing them every success, both for the future and also for this afternoon. As is well known, Mr. Speaker, the Girl Guides Association of Manitoba and Canada is a part of a world-wide federation of young women who have as their ideal the basic fundamentals of good living, of aid to humanity and progress for all nations. I hope that the girls who are here this afternoon will gain some knowledge, at least, with their presence here this afternoon, and I wish, Mr. Speaker, to welcome them to this Assembly, and may I suggest to the ladies and gentlemen of the Assembly this afternoon that they behave themselves because these girls live by example.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to introduce to you and the members of this House 12 charming young ladies from St. Joseph's Academy, you see to your right, Mr. Speaker, in the first row. These girls are in Grade X; their teacher, Rev. Sister Francoise de Marie, is busy with a convention so one of the group is in charge of her friends, Miss Suzanne Muller. It is also an added pleasure for me to introduce them because my eldest daughter Caroline is amongst the group. This reminds me of the story: It seems that a cat was avidly watching a tennis game when another cat came along, and noticing that, the first cat said, "Well you're pretty interested." "Oh, it's not that," said the second cat, "It's just that my old man's in the racket". I hope that this is not the main reason why she is here; I think she is also interested.

Monsieur l'orateur, j'espere que vous me laisserez souhaiter la bienvenue a ces jeunes filles de l'Academie Saint-Joseph et j'aimerais pouvoir leur dire que nous sommes bien fiers de voir non seulement qu'elles ont profite de l'occasion pour visiter cet bel edifice mais aussi pour montrer l'interet de venir ici voir le systeme parlementaire democratique en action et j'espere que les debats sont assez mouvementes pour leur plaire. Merci monsieur l'orateur.

Translation: Mr. Speaker, I hope you will allow me to welcome these young ladies from St. Joseph's Academy and I would like to tell them that we are proud of the fact that not only did they take this opportunity of visiting this beautiful building but also for the interest shown in seeing our democratic parliamentary system in action. I hope the debates are lively enough to please them. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to lay on the table of the House the reply to a question of the House, dated March 17th, in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party. Mr. Chairman, last night in committee there were a couple of questions raised by the Honourable Member for Selkirk with respect to the water haulage contract let by the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board. I would like to advise him at this time, and the other members of the House, that the invitations to tender were extended by advertisements in the local Winnipeg papers on March 12th, March 14th and March 15th of 1960, and the copy -- I don't have actually a copy here of the advertisement, but the copy contained in this display advertisement reads as follows: "Sealed proposals in duplicate will be received until 12 o'clock noon central standard time, April 14th" -- this is one month but a day after the first publication of the invitation -- "for the handling of transportation and miscellaneous freight via Lake Winnipeg water navigation between Selkirk and Grand Rapids, Manitoba, during the summer seasons, 1960 to 1963 inclusive. Proposals shall be enclosed in a sealed envelope marked "Proposal for Water Transportation Grand Rapids Development", shall be addressed to D. M. Stephens, Chairman and General Manager of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board, Post Office 815, Winnipeg, Manitoba. Approximate quantities 1960 summer 20,000 tons; 1961, 25,000 tons; 1962, 50,000; 1963, 53,000 tons. Copies of specifications

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . . may be obtained upon application to the Purchasing Department, Box 815, Winnipeg 1, or may be picked up at 650 Harrow Street, Winnipeg, after March 15th. The Board reserves the right to reject any, or all, proposals, and the lowest proposal will not necessarily be accepted." This is the copy that was contained in the original display advertisement. In addition to this they did send out notices to be put up in the post offices in Selkirk, Gimli, Winnipegosis and The Pas. They had intended at one time to advertise in these various rural weeklies but there was some conflict with the publication dates that would conflict with the ads that were running in Winnipeg, so that they did not publish in these rurals, but there were 26 people who picked up the copies of the specifications, 26 firms. Several of these have Selkirk addresses. I would read the list if the honourable members require it, but if not, I do feel that it would be unnecessary. There's one, two, three, four, five -- there are at least five that have Selkirk addresses here. I would like also for the information of the members of the House, they did receive actually tenders from Patricia Transportation Company, Brown and Rutherford Limited, Pearson and Drake Construction jointly, Selkirk Navigation and Purvis jointly, Selkirk Silica Company, J. S. Quinn and McNamara Marine Limited. I believe there were seven tenders received and the lowest tender, I am informed, was the one that was accepted and is the one that is being utilized to transport goods now to Grand Rapids.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Would the Minister be kind enough to furnish me with a photostatic copy of your proposal.

MR. CARROLL: The proposal is quite a lengthy document. I'd be pleased to let you see it. If you feel you would like a copy I'd attempt to get one for you if that's okay.

HON. S. E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, some years ago I believe the practice was started of distributing to the members of the House the annual report made by the President of the University of Manitoba. This report is now at hand and is for the session, the University session of 1959-1960, and I wish to inform the members of the House that I have asked the Clerk to provide each member of the House with a copy of the report. This is not a report that is to be tabled; it is only being distributed in accordance with a custom which I believe was established some years ago.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a minor question of privilege to bring to the attention of the House, I suppose more particularly to the attention of the press gallery. It was brought to my attention that news stories appeared in the Friday editions of the two Winnipeg daily papers concerning the second reading of The Liquor Control Act, and because of erroneous material contained in these news stories there has been some misimpression among the public as to the effect of certain of the amendments. I would call your attention, Sir, and the attention of those who may be within my hearing, to these minor points and would hope that they would see fit to make any corrections based upon the statement I now make.

In the Winnipeg Tribune of March 31st, in dealing with the question of the second reading of The Liquor Act, the statement was made that "option votes to be held in municipalities under the control of local government district administrators. Presently persons wanting licenses in these areas simply go before the Commission." I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that that is referred to in Section 7 of the proposed bill, and you will find by reading the section and the explanatory note that option votes are not provided in local government district areas -- I think probably there was just a misinterpretation there. I think the omission or the erroneous impression that caused the most trouble was the statement in the Winnipeg Free Press of March 31st wherein it was stated that "permission for Cocktail Lounges and Dining Rooms to remain open until 1:00 a. m." There are a number of people who saw that and who have contacted my office, and I know perhaps other members of the Legislature. This of course should have read, "permission for Cocktail Lounges and Dining Rooms to remain open until 1:00 a. m. on New Years' Eve, unless New Years' Eve falls on a Saturday or Sunday," and I would appreciate it if those within my hearing could make that correction.

There was one other minor correction I would make in the story of the Winnipeg Tribune of the same date; third last paragraph they stated, "Another amendment put the onus on physicians to prove that liquor they prescribed for patients was bona fide and for medicinal purposes". Actually the amendment removes the onus presently on physicians to prove that the liquor they prescribed for patients is bona fide and for medicinal purposes, so I would raise this point and

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . I would hope that those within my hearing would see fit to make the corrections indicated.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I was asked by several of my friends to find out when the Budget Speech will be delivered. It may be of interest to know whether they got to try and get some more money to pay additional tax. I don't know their reasons, but anyway I would like to know when this will be delivered.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I will be unable to make any statement on this occasion. Doubtless the First Minister will be back before the afternoon is over and he might be able to tell you before the House rises.

MR. HUTON: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House, answers to questions put by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose with respect to crop insurance. I would also like to lay on the table of the House, maps requested by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose in respect of the right-of-way for the Greater Winnipeg floodway.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Selkirk, that the motion of the Honourable Member from Brokenhead be amended by deleting all the words after the word "and" at the end of the second paragraph, and substituting the following: "WHEREAS physical fitness is of little value without mental fitness as the two should go hand in hand; and WHEREAS mental and physical fitness depend in a large measure on co-ordination, supervision and leadership as well as on facilities for recreation, all of which are presently inadequate; THEREFORE be it resolved that the government give consideration to the advisability of establishing an inter-departmental committee which would study (1) the advisability of setting up a Department of Youth and Recreation to deal with all phases of mental and physical fitness, leadership and training, sports and recreation; (2) the need for more and better recreation facilities.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. GRAY: . . . . . same as the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg your pardon.

MR. GRAY: Is there any amendment to the original motion?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe it brings in mental fitness, doesn't it? Yes, it's mental fitness in the . . . . .

MR. GRAY: The word "mental".

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, mental fitness.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . . . was my reason why I read the motion before, because last year we had a little trouble on the same subject and you declared it was in order. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, while speaking on this subject, told us that while looking around the Chamber, he felt that in his opinion no one lacked physical fitness. I might say that he must be blind, or at least he's not blessed with the eyesight of my honourable friend the Attorney General, and I might say that without being critical at all if we seriously look around the Chamber we'll see that at least half of the members are certainly lacking in this physical fitness. -- (Interjection) -- No, I don't feel that this is impolite or rude for me to say this, because obviously I would be leading the pack. The honourable gentlemen should have no fear. I will not mention anyone. This I would leave to my honourable friend, my most honourable friend who seems to be more interested in these sort of things, and after his first remark the Honourable Member from Assiniboia said, and I quote from Hansard of March 28th on page 1370, "Perhaps should a psychiatrist at times be sitting in the gallery, he may not say equal with me that that would apply mentally". Now, Sir, I am sure that he was only being amusing; at least I hope so. But nevertheless his first reaction was to associate mental fitness with physical fitness. This, Mr. Speaker, is precisely my point. This is the point that I have been trying to get across to the members for the last three sessions and this is the point that I am still trying to make today.

I think that a short story might help clarify my thoughts in this matter. This gentleman and his wife ordered a taxi in New York City; they gave their destination to the driver, who started like a shot; he went careening, swaying and bumping all over the place and causing anxious moments to his passengers. Noticing that, he turned around and said, "Oh don't worry, I certainly won't end up in the hospital again, especially after spending a year overseas." "How

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . . dreadful," said the lady sympathetically. "You must have been very seriously wounded." "Oh no," he said, "not a scratch. You see, I was a mental patient." Well, the most fit body would not help this man. It is quite a coincidence that on the same day on which the Honourable Member for Assiniboia was telling us that the fitness was the responsibility of municipalities, on that very same day screaming headlines in the daily newspapers were telling us that the community clubs were threatening to close their doors if they weren't getting any money from the City. Now we can see things are not improving. I don't think we could blame the municipalities for this. After all the new Metro Government imposed on us is very costly, and the citizens of Greater Winnipeg are faced with a record tax increase.

Now my honourable friend from Assiniboia gave a lengthy explanation of the fitness program now existing in these schools, but, Sir, he did not tell us everything. If you would permit me to read at this time what Dr. Frank Kennedy, the Director of the University of Manitoba Physical Education Department had to say on the subject, and I quote from the Tribune of March 10th, 1961, "School program revisions sought. Manitoba's physical education program in the schools Thursday was condemned as a waste of effort, money and little satisfaction for teachers who supervise it. The province's stubborn refusal to better the program flies in the face of known facts and needs expressed by the public", said Dr. Frank Kennedy. "Today the regulations respecting physical education are neither enforced, recognized or encouraged", he told the Manitoba Conference on Physical Education and Recreation. "The Federal Education Curriculum for schools requires revision and is now in the hands of teachers not adequately trained to instruct students," he said. "Public money is made available to promote tourism but a government program to train supervisors for youth and adult recreation doesn't exist," Dr. Kennedy said. "Manitoba is one of only two provinces without a government-operated physical education and recreation scheme." Dr. Kennedy headed a Royal Commission in 1958 recommending one, but nothing has come of it. "Costly schools have sprung up with gyms so poorly planned that recreation and physical education programs can't be properly run," he said. "Basketball isn't allowed in some gyms for fear the ball would chip the plaster." No co-ordination. "There's no co-ordination between physical education and recreation programs of public and private agencies for both school pupils and adults," he continued. "Manitoba's physical education program has a director who runs both Phys-Ed and Civil Defence. By such an arrangement physical education couldn't survive under the best of circumstances," he said. It was not however unexpected that the . . . . . would run out the starter's gun with the official's whistle. He said the result of such an arrangement is no secret. Manitoba currently has no physical education director. Under such a proposal, said delegates, the province would promote, supervise, administer and help public and private agencies handling physical education and cultural recreation of school children and adults. They said Manitoba doesn't have the physical fitness in recreation programs of other provinces which foster or promote such activities ranging from summer drama, music, sports and other cultural camps for both adults and youths."

Mr. Speaker, I agree with practically everything that was said by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and the Honourable Member from Kildonan. I know that physical fitness is very important, and I know that I could say more about the need for physical fitness. I could say that the government is not being as progressive in this important question as it might be in others. I know that the government has started a small program but this is far from adequate. I know that the government is building fine gyms in new schools but this could also be a waste if we do not take advantage of it. Let's remember that a nation should not spend all its money on buildings but on building leaders, and we still lack this co-ordination, this leadership. Physical fitness is vital to a nation, to any nation. I am sure of this, and I am so sure that I don't have to sell anyone on the subject that I do not intend to labour this any further, but, Sir, I would like to impress on the members the importance of associating a good healthy body with a good healthy mind. The Honourable Member from Kildonan, while speaking on this subject, was speaking on fitness only, and before closing he read this beautiful poem by Kipling. Sir, did you notice what Kipling said? "Be fit, be fit in mind and body," he said. Sir, I don't think that we should be interested solely in physical fitness but in total fitness, and the requirements for total fitness are emotional stability, mental security, social adequacy and physical fitness. All four are very important. If one is missing we cannot achieve total fitness and I think it is clear that physical fitness alone will lose some of its importance.

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

Again, Sir, I would advocate that a special Department of Youth and Recreation be started before it, and when I speak of youth I do not mean only the young citizens of Manitoba, although it is clear that the bulk of the responsibility of this new department would be for these younger citizens, because after all, when we talk of forming leaders we all know that formation starts at an early age. At the moment we have a special Department of Labour, Industry and Commerce, Welfare, Mines and Natural Resources. Why not "minds and human resources"? Why not "recreation, preventative care"? What have we got for youth, Mr. Speaker, outside of the school hours? What have we in physical fitness programs; in crime prevention, mental care, recreation, art and culture, alcohol education, safety driving? And what do we do to find leaders? I'm afraid that not enough is done and certainly we lack the co-ordination. At the present, almost every existing department has a little of this responsibility of some of the projects I've just named. Grants come under the Department of Treasury. The Department of Education takes care of physical fitness, building of gyms, vocational education, alcohol education. Even the Department of Agriculture has grants for 4-H Clubs and fairs. The Attorney-General is responsible for crime prevention, rehabilitation, youth committees, advisory committees on youth, censorship, juvenile and family courts. Health and Welfare -- the mental health, child guidance, preventative medical services, alcoholism rehabilitation programs, etcetera. Mines and Natural Resources -- summer resorts, recreational developments and others. Motor Vehicle Branch and safety program comes under the Public Utilities, as does the Censor Board of the province. Even Public Works has indirect contact with mental hospitals, Teachers' College, Home for Boys. The Municipal Affairs Department has little to do directly with this, but it is responsible for all municipalities and cities directly connected with these different programs. The Labour Department has its apprenticeship training division. Industry and Commerce seems to be responsible for the new training program of physical training instructors. It also looks after Travel and Publicity Branch.

Sir, one might say what am I complaining about if I can find all these different items. Well, I do agree that presently something is done, and I certainly am not advocating a costly program for this province, but I'm saying that the most important thing is the thing that is lacking. We should reorganize this administration of all these youth services. What is sadly lacking, Sir, is this co-ordination and again this development of leaders. I would like to read just a paragraph or so of a speech I made last year from Hansard of March 1, 1960, on page 1089. "Mr. Speaker, I feel that in society the democratic government does not do enough to encourage, to find, and to train leaders. I happened to read a certain article on leadership a few nights ago and I think we must agree that we are definitely spending too long a time studying the wrong people. What would happen if we turned our microscope away from studying the selfish, the crafty, the lazy, and focused them instead on the industrious, honest and morally strong? Let's think of the millions and millions of dollars we have spent to find out what makes a delinquent a delinquent. What is being said about non-neurotics, non-alcoholics, non-delinquents, non-screwballs? Even the breeders of animals know better. They know that you do not develop a winning race horse by studying a loser; that you will not develop prize pigs by studying runts. The people of this free world are at their greatest when they have a cause. All of us are better, tougher, less selfish, finer people, when we have a cause. Today we seem to have nothing to do. We are no longer building our house; we are not defending it; but what else can bring out greatness in people? Leaders. Even in time of peace real leaders can set a nation aflame with enthusiasm. In democracy we need a hundred, a thousand of them at all levels, in every village, town, school, factory and farm. We should make sure that every boy and girl, every gifted boy and girl is given as much attention as our better criminals, and we might in time develop leadership at all levels that would make it smart to be hardworking, honest and unselfish." -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it's too bad nobody paid attention to it, or at least the government . . . . . That's why I thought I'd read part of it again.

Sir, what I am saying is that we lack co-ordination and that we should co-ordinate all these services together. Right now they are divided; they are under different Ministries and being under different Ministries they are not -- they don't seem as important, and they're certainly not as effective. The different Ministers feel that this is just a minor part of the total project, and often their part does not seem to fit with their department. The Minister is often over-worked,



(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . . and he will rely on other departments to complete this particular program. Sir, I realize that all items mentioned should not be taken away from the departments concerned. This is not what I'm advocating at all. Mental health certainly is the responsibility of the Minister of Health. Delinquency cannot be divorced from the Attorney-General -- I mean from his department -- but certain aspects, though, such as -- too bad he missed that; he wasn't here -- certain aspects such as crime prevention, mental fitness should be co-ordinated, Sir, and under this proposed Department of Youth and Recreation these are very important especially for the formation of leaders. The former Chief Justice J. E. Adamson, when interviewed had this to say, "What we need is more hard work, less mollicoddling and greater moral teaching of the young as the means of strengthening the moral fibre of society." He said that crime was increasing and warned that penal reform was not the answer. That's just dealing with those who are and have been in trouble. There ought to be a concerted effort especially in homes, and to some extent in schools, to inform young persons of the great necessity of obeying the law in all things. There is where the leaders are so vitally needed, Sir. We are all familiar with the ancient maxim that "prevention is better than cure." I think also that if cure works, preventative should work even better.

While studying and reading many reports on crime prevention I read a few opinions of very qualified people that I think are very important and here are some of them. "It is widely acknowledged that remand homes and similar establishments for boy criminals have a high rate of success in reclaiming the boys as decent citizens. There is nothing punitive about the training, and it is normally based on learning useful jobs. Plenty of hard and purposeful exercise with individual help, attention and example. The basis in fact of every voluntary youth organization since the Boy Scouts showed the way." I think it is reasonable to suppose that if the criminals had been exposed to the cure in the first place they might have been kept out of trouble. At the moment, Sir, it costs about \$1,200 to keep a man in gaol, about \$100.00 to keep him on probation, and I think that if we spend just a few dollars in the right direction we would save this, and of course we would save all the human suffering that comes in with crime.

In the past I have talked many times, probably annoyed the Assembly Hall here with different examples of criminal juvenile delinquents, and today I have but one to read but I think this is a special one. I think that it might show what could be done without the proper leadership. This comes from Time of November 7, 1960. "The teenagers in jeans, flashy shirts and black leather motorcycle jackets surrounded the trembling old man and jeered as he stripped off his clothes at their command. When his underwear was gone and he stood naked, the kids grinned, turned and strutted away. Suddenly one of the gang, 14 years old and illiterate, spun around and stalked back. "Here's something for you to wear," he snarled, brutally stabbing the old man twice and leaving him critically injured. Packs of out-of-control teenagers out for kicks or cash are terrorizing Santiago, Chile. They are called "Colericos", or "Angry Ones". Their costume -- jeans, plaid shirt, jacket -- is their trade mark. Those who can afford it ride sputtering convoys of motor scooters complete with snug-sweatered girl friends perched behind. Besides the slashers and the hold-up artists there are the bobby-soxers and song faddists, who burst into Los Cerrillos Airport last month to greet Canadian Rock-n-Roller Paul Anka, causing \$25,000 worth of damage before airport crew cooled them off with a riot hose. "On the right wing there is a group of introspective jean-wearers who have found themselves, and are busy analyzing the drives and motives of "Angry Ones" still lost. Like others of their kind around the world they blame the aimless drifting on the lacks of a creed or an ideal to believe and work for. To the left is another group who have found themselves. This ardent band meets almost nightly in an old two-storey building in downtown Santiago only a block away from Congress and three blocks from the presidential palace. They dance to rock-n-roll music like the rest, but they have a purpose and a trade mark, a sport shirt of blazing red. Their parties are held to raise funds for the Communist Youth Movement, and they confine their rumbles to time of social uproar when they take to the streets to lead bus-burning, window-smashing attacks on the government."

This article, I think, Mr. Speaker, shows the importance of training leaders. The first group that I mentioned is like a pack of wolves; they want to feel important; they want to feel needed and loved -- maybe they're not getting that at home, so they carry on, as this group. The second one has a special interest so they are not too worried about damaging property and

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . . so on. The third one has a special cause, but this cause is for crime, for evil. Now if we could funnel all this energy of the young people of a nation for the good of mankind, you can see how much stronger this nation would be. Before concluding, Mr. Speaker, I want to read what the Honourable the Minister of Education had to say when the subject came last year. This is in Hansard, March 1st, 1960, on page 1091. "Mr. McLean: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has made a useful contribution to the debate on this resolution, and I know that we all share his concern that we should have in Manitoba, good training, best circumstances in which our boys and girls might grow up. I feel, however, that the amendment which he has proposed is verging on the border of being out of order, because it does seem to go off at a completely different angle from the original resolution and amendment, and that it is impractical in that it proposes the establishment of a new department, or a branch of a department, and carries with it the contemplation of the expenditures of public funds. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to vote against the sub-amendment which has been proposed by the honourable member."

Well, Sir, a year passed since then, and I don't know if the government is -- it doesn't seem the government is going to do much about it. I think that it is kind of wrong to worry about it if I am verging on the border of being out of order when the Honourable Minister tells me that I have given some contribution, and also when the Speaker has ruled that I was in order. He also said that it was impractical because it proposed the establishing of a new department. Well I think that it is clear that what is practical is the way these youth services, if I may call them that, are administered at the moment. I think that is the thing that's impractical. And also he mentioned that I am advocating that we spend money and I haven't the right to do this. But the motion, which is the same as last year, claimed that "therefore be it resolved that the government give consideration to the advisability of establishing an inter-departmental committee which would study; 1, the advisability, and so on. Now I certainly don't think that it is impractical. It has been done in different provinces. For instance, in the Province of Quebec they have reorganized there and Mr. Wilson, W. A. Wilson, of the Montreal Star, wrote an article, a series of articles on this and I'll just read the first paragraph of this first article. "Officials of Quebec Youth Protection Services foresee a steady expansion in the facilities available for dealing with juvenile delinquents and young people in need of protection from their environment. They consider that great progress has been made in the last two years through its improved handling of these problems, dating from the day that all the services were brought under the Ministry of Youth and Welfare instead of being split with the Attorney-General's Department. They insist, however, that there remains need for equally great improvement during the next three years." Well, Sir, I hope that the members of this House will think very seriously of this; if nothing can be done this late in the session, that this is definitely something very, very important. It is, I believe, looking after the future of our province and of society, and I hope that you will see fit to vote for this motion. Thank you.

MR. STRICKLAND: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, the provision of better housing for our lower income people is a very important subject. It is important to the well-being of our City; it is important to the welfare of those concerned, and it is important with regard to expenditures in looking after the people who cause us problems because of living in this poor housing. The Member for St. John's has given us very many examples of the need for better housing and I will not go further into that part of the subject. Survey after survey has shown that where you have poor housing you have greater juvenile delinquency, a greater amount of sickness, a greater number of fires, a greater number of police calls and greater expenditures for welfare.

In one very important respect the Manitoba Government takes the lead in Canada with its Elderly Persons Housing Act. For the amount required by a sponsoring organization no province gives such a large grant for the construction of self-contained housing units for elderly persons as does the Province of Manitoba. In Manitoba the sponsoring organization or municipality only

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.) . . . . has to put up five percent of the cost and the service land, and the project is quite feasible. The Provincial Government gives a grant of one-third of the cost up to a maximum of \$1,667 for a double unit and up to a maximum of \$1,400 for a single self-contained unit. In addition, the Province of Manitoba leads other provinces in the fact that it will make grants for almost every type of elderly persons housing. It will make grants in respect of housing that is converted from old housing; it will make grants for the hostel type of housing, and it will make grants where the bathroom facilities are to be shared, or light-housekeeping rooms. In British Columbia the organization has to put up about 10 percent of the cost, and the government assists with a grant of about a third. In Saskatchewan, which comes next in line, the organization has to put eight percent of the cost and the province gives a grant of 20 percent of the cost.

In Manitoba also there is a government architect to assist sponsoring organizations, and with the Central Mortgage and Housing Loan that is available over 40 years at 5-1/8 percent interest, these projects are quite feasible. The Canadian Legion is just now completing its second project, and the first 12 tenants moved into the second project last week and the other 12 will move in next week. These are the first houses for elderly persons, self-contained, built on the prairies with the assistance of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. So you see, in Manitoba we do take the lead in some respects with regard to housing. We have found that if we can build self-contained suites for many of our elderly persons, that they certainly appreciate them; that they can remain independent for quite a long time; and that the cost to the government for maintaining them is very small compared to the cost if these persons should go into hospitals, or should go into an old folks' home where board and room are supplied and where a large number of employees have to be hired and paid. Also, we have found that it is a very satisfactory type of accommodation to build a row house type where each one has a front door; where they can sit outside their own front door; have their own back door and their own back yard and front yard. You can build these houses quite a lot more reasonably than single family houses and they serve the purpose very well and the tenants are very happy in them. In the Legion project our rents for couples are \$43.00 a month, which includes full taxes and all services excepting electricity, and the rents for the self-contained single suites, complete with bathroom and other facilities, is \$35.00 a month. In each case we pay full taxes. It is quite true that in some other provinces the rents are lower but in those provinces in some cases they don't pay any taxes and in other cases the amount of tax paid is very small. And in that way we -- that might be a good idea, but still we must remember that when one group don't pay taxes it makes a heavier burden on the rest of the people in the community. And also the burden is on the municipal taxpayer not on the Provincial or Federal Government.

One other point I would like to make is this, that in the Legion project no one has been turned down because they didn't have enough money, and we can take advantage of the Provincial Government's Social Allowances Act. We have in a single person's project a lady who has only \$55.00 a month, and you will say "Well, how can she pay \$35.00 rent out of her \$55.00 Old Age Pension?" But because of the provisions of our Social Allowances Act, this is quite feasible. The Social Allowance officials consider that she is able to pay \$17.00 rent out of her \$55.00 and they give her an additional payment of \$18.00 per month so that she can pay the \$35.00 a month rent and move into our project and have the advantage of a lovely little home. Our tenants, I might say, because of the fact that there's such a need for this type of housing and because of the fact that the down payment was put up by Legion members, we give preference to veterans and widows of veterans, and as a consequence we have veterans and widows of veterans in all the suites. We had seven Boer War veterans. Unfortunately two of them passed away and another had to go into hospital for the rest of his life. We had another chap that for three and a half years he had never been out of his upstairs rooms, he was so crippled with arthritis, until he was carried into our project. We had another couple who were both blind; the husband was stone blind, the wife had about ten percent vision. They lived on the third floor which was a very hot room in the summer, and they had to come down to the second floor for water or to go to the bathroom and they found it very, very inconvenient living up there, especially because of their loss of sight. We had another couple where they had lived for 16 years in one room, and were paying \$35.00 a month rent. Our oldest tenant will be 95 next September. We had another couple where the woman was confined to a wheelchair with a stroke, and the husband, although

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.) . . . . he was 83 last February, he looks after her completely. He dresses her; he does the cooking; he feeds her; he combs her hair even, and the place is spotless. We have had three chaps who have had both legs amputated. We had another couple who were living on \$70.00 a month. Their circumstances were such that they only had the single person's War Veterans Allowance which was \$70.00 a month. Out of that \$70.00 they were paying \$30.00 for rent for their rooms and they were providing the rest of their needs out of that \$40.00. We did not charge them \$43.00 a month rent; we charged them \$25.00 and we were able to find other assistance to look after the additional \$18.00 rent.

Then we had another couple, where the man had a stroke, and was blind, and was living on the second floor; he seldom got out. Another man living in a third floor suite who only got out when he was carried out when he went to hospital; and another couple who lived behind a store where they couldn't keep the premises warm, even though it cost them more than \$40.00 a month what with rent and fuel and they only had \$80.00 Old Age Pension to look after their living expenses, and we have found others that were paying \$65.00 a month rent and so on. About 40 per cent of our occupants, of our 40 suites for couples, are in poor physical shape in one way or another in addition to being elderly. Many have had strokes and many have heart trouble, and so we see these projects are quite feasible.

Another organization to which I belong, the Cosmopolitan Club, has started construction on another 29 suites for couples on Nairn Avenue in Elmwood. They started only last month, and so we find that we can have quite a good employment program. We could have quite a good winter employment program if more organizations and more groups, more municipalities, would take advantage of this help that is offered by the government. It is very good help and it is available, and it means in effect that you can build a suite; an organization can construct a suite if it can find \$300. for a couple, and about \$250 for a single person. Projects have been as small as six units, and so each one of us in connection with employment or in connection with the idea of bettering the housing conditions of our people, we can do something to get these projects started by urging organizations, churches, trade unions, service clubs and so on to which we belong, to enter on one of these projects.

In Manitoba also we have another type of project to which perhaps not a great deal of publicity has been given, and that is limited dividend housing for families; that is, constructed without Provincial Government help but received quite a lot of help in the way of a long term loan from the Federal Government. In the Greater Winnipeg area we have about 800 of these units. Most of the suites are two bedroom units which rent for about \$71.00 a month to include all services and stove and fridge, which is quite a considerable amount less than other new two bedroom suites that are constructed for rent in this area, but the low houses and the suites that have been constructed here are not limited to two bedroom accommodation and there's some that have been built with three bedrooms and four bedrooms, and a few bachelor suites, all of which are available to people with moderate incomes or low incomes, and which have helped the housing conditions in this area. Too, we have the fact that the Federal Government recently announced that on valuations up to \$12,000 in connection with houses built under The National Housing Act, five percent down payment is sufficient, and that the balance of the loan will be financed over a period of from 25 to 35 years.

The Government of Manitoba has undertaken many progressive steps, and as some of the members have pointed out, they agreed with the government in this respect; they think the government has done well in starting its helpful program by helping the aged and the disabled, and now we find in the budget of the Minister of Industry and Commerce that money has been allotted for surveys in connection with housing for families. Winnipeg has submitted two plans to the government. One -- in spite of all the publicity which would indicate that a lot of plans have been submitted to the government, when I understand that only two plans have been submitted -- one in connection with the construction of some 68 units in the Burrows-Fyfe area which has been abandoned by the City, and the other in respect of a project that was only passed by the City at a meeting on March 16th last. This plan prepared by the Urban Renewal and Rehabilitation Board of the City of Winnipeg has three distinct parts. The first part provides for new housing, 165 units to be constructed in the Burrows and Keewatin area. This is to be used largely for the purpose of providing housing for people in the second project, who are now living in the second project, which is a slum clearance project, and which provides for the acquisition and clearance of

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.) . . . . : about 50 acres of land between, roughly speaking between Sutherland Avenue and Flora Avenue, Salter Street and the lane behind Main Street; and then the third part of the project consists of selling some of this land for industry and commerce and building 700 housing units on the balance.

The first part of the project for 165 units is estimated to cost \$1,657,940, and the units are estimated to require a monthly subsidy of \$21.34. The government, I think, should take a very close look at the second project calling for the acquisition and clearance of about 50 acres. The estimated cost is \$9,877,588, or, we might say \$10 million excepting for \$123,000, and that is a lot of money just for the purpose of acquiring and clearing land. In this area there are 256 residential buildings, and I think that that is largely the purpose of the program, to clear out the slums, to clear out these residential buildings, and if you divide 256 into the \$10 million you will find that it's going to cost about \$38,000 to acquire and clear each of these residential buildings, which is quite a lot of money -- \$38,000 a building. Some of these buildings are very small, one or two or three-room houses, and there are two or three apartment blocks there. There are 346 buildings altogether, 90 being commercial or part commercial and part residential, and if you divided the 346 into \$10 million you'd find a cost of about \$28,000 a building for acquisition and clearance, and this doesn't give you any new housing. This just acquires the land and clears it. The Federal Government pays half and the other half is to be paid by the city, or by the city and the province together. The project is estimated to take about six years to complete and they hope to start on the 165 units quite soon. But in Winnipeg the poor housing is not limited to this rather small area of this city. This particular program will not help to get rid of the slum houses in the other parts of Winnipeg. A fair amount of good housing too will be destroyed by this project. In the report it is stated that from outside appearance it is estimated that 75 percent of the buildings are seriously blighted. Now, it may be that 75 percent are blighted, but it may be that some of those just need a good paint job or need some of the verandas jacked up and some of the other outside features looked after. For instance, these houses, some of these better houses -- and we can all go and see them -- are in the two blocks bounded by Flora and Dufferin, Robinson and Charles, and if we go and see the houses in these blocks, I think we will all be well satisfied that these are pretty good houses and that they compare very well with other houses in older sections of Winnipeg. Just because -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): When did you look at them last?

MR. COWAN: On Sunday.

MR. ORLIKOW: You need new glasses.

MR. COWAN: I said in the blocks bounded by Flora and Dufferin, Robinson and Charles, just west of the school, and just because a house is old, it doesn't mean that it isn't any good. As a matter of fact in New York they are conducting a Housing Rehabilitation Program now among houses between 60 and 80 years of age, and among the brownstone houses they figure that about 93 percent of them are in a sufficiently good state that they can be rehabilitated, and we have in the eastern States many frame buildings 200, 250 years old which are still good buildings; they have been kept in a good state of repair and if they have been kept dry a frame building can last an awfully long time.

One other thing with regard to destroying or demolishing good houses, we need every good housing unit we can find in the City of Winnipeg. There is a shortage of housing here today, and it seems too bad to destroy good housing. It is quite true that in this area there are many dumps; there are many very poor houses, and we should certainly get rid of every one of those, and we should get rid of every one of the poor houses that exists in the City of Winnipeg. We should try and clear our city of slums. In this area there are quite a lot of commercial buildings. For instance there is one block, practically the whole block, the whole of the square block, is occupied by MacDonald Sheet Metal and Roofing. It's been built since 1910 and it is a large commercial organization; it is a large set of buildings, not very attractive buildings, it is true, but evidently serves the company quite well, and these are to be demolished along with a number of other commercial buildings. There is also in the area a number of junk yards which one would like to see the end of, but I'm afraid that some people are always going to be in the junk yard business and we'll have to have them some place, and perhaps it is better to have them all together than have them scattered throughout the city. Recently, unfortunately, the city gave permission for a new

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.) . . . . junk yard on Talbot Avenue and another one on Elgin Avenue, and this is the place, an area of the city that's been zoned industrial, and has quite a lot of industrial buildings in it. Perhaps it's quite a natural place for industry, being next to the railway tracks.

The proposed project for this area is for 700 housing units, three of them to be in high rise buildings of 80 suites each. There are some housing administrators that don't agree with the proposals set out here; they don't agree with the idea of destroying good buildings. Mr. Brady, the Director of Housing for Metropolitan Toronto, says that large scale clearances are comparatively easy. It is comparatively easy to put a bulldozer in and lay everything flat, but what is more difficult and perhaps what is better for the community so far as cost is concerned, is to destroy and demolish those buildings which are poor buildings, and make use of the good ones. Mr. Brady also told us in Winnipeg last week that in their opinion no more housing projects should be constructed that consisted of more than 300 housing units. In Toronto they have three very, very large projects, and they make for problems that you don't have with the smaller housing units. Also, Mr. Brady told us that they have told their provincial government and the federal government that they don't want anything more to do with high rise apartments, that they provide too many problems for them. The extra cost of maintenance is \$11.00 per month per suite and also families in the high rise apartments, once they leave the suite the mother loses control of the children, whereas if the mother was living in a row house or in a single family dwelling, the children would likely be playing rather near the house and the mother would be able to maintain control over them. Also of course, they have trouble with the children in the elevators and in the hallways. Also, when you have a large housing project you break up the community, and even though the community may not be the very best, yet over years people have made friends, they have gone to the local churches, and they have belonged to the local organizations, and with a large slum clearance project, you break up the community which is not a very good idea.

We should get rid of all our slums in Winnipeg; we should get rid of all our slum houses, and I am sure that if this \$10 million was spent in a program to get rid of the dilapidated houses, was spent in the rehabilitation program, that we could do a great deal in this city. We can have spot clearances where small areas are cleared, and in that way we don't disrupt the community, and in that way we don't set aside a large number of people living in a subsidized housing project. We make them more part of the community and they live with others who perhaps have higher incomes and have a different interest so that the people in the project are not set off by themselves.

The National Housing Act was amended last year by the Government of Canada to assist in such a program as this, for now under The National Housing Act the Federal Government will put up 75 percent of the cost of buying old buildings in urban renewal areas for the purpose of renting these older houses to tenants at low rents. This is something new and is something that would help in a program to better the housing conditions in this area. Incidentally, there are many people who own some of these poor buildings who can better afford to pay for the demolition costs than many of the taxpayers who will pay the taxes in this area. Perhaps you remember an article that appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune on October 14th, 1959, when the Director of the Public Welfare Department of the City of Winnipeg reported on the four landlords that own a lot of this slum housing in Winnipeg. He pointed out that landlord "A" paid \$7,442.93 in taxes on 13 buildings and it was estimated that in one year he collected \$75,405 in rent. Landlord "B" paid \$3,597 in taxes on 21 buildings and estimated rent collections for one year were \$35,124. Landlord "C" paid \$7,675 in taxes and collected \$70,890 in rents on 18 buildings in one year; and landlord "D" paid \$2,048 in taxes on 29 buildings and it was estimated he collected \$29,282 in rents in one year. A great many of these slum houses, slum buildings and terraces are owned by these four landlords. I know of one case myself where they bought a 20-unit terrace for \$1,050 a unit and three or four years ago -- I didn't check on the rents last year -- but three or four years ago they were collecting \$660 rent each year from each housing unit which had cost them \$1,050. In other words if they didn't spend money on repairs they would get back the money they paid for the building and their taxes in two years. A pretty good investment.

We find that other cities are having rehabilitation programs. Winnipeg has a limited one through its Health Department, and last year we gave power to the City of Winnipeg to have houses demolished which had been placarded as unsanitary for over one year. Unfortunately

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.) . . . . the city hasn't make as much use of this amendment as it could. I guess a little bit more energy is needed in one of their departments. We find, for instance, that in Los Angeles they have a real program for housing rehabilitation. Mr. G. E. Morris, the General Manager of the Department of Building and Safety of the City of Los Angeles in an address to the Downtown Businessmen's Association on February 6, 1957, had this to say about their program: "On July 1, 1955, we entered into Skid Row with a force of 18 inspectors. Since that date these inspectors have inspected over 1,500 buildings in the Skid Row area which includes most of the extremely dangerous and sub-standard hotels and apartment houses. Hearings have been held before the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners concerning approximately 350 of these. Many of these buildings were run down, poorly maintained, and had been allowed to down-grade into tenement types, overcrowded apartment houses or flophouse hotels. They were a disgrace to our city, a burden to our society and a public shame. All 350 buildings have been ordered demolished by the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners because it was not economically reasonable to repair them, and further, that they could not be allowed to remain standing as architectural monuments to greed. Over 300 sub-standard dwelling units and more than 1,400 flophouse hotels have been eliminated in the Skid Row area in a year and a half. Permits have been issued to repair 505 dwellings which can be brought up to safe, decent and healthful living standards. Of the estimated 45,000 violations found over 10,000 have already been corrected. The effects of these corrections have been far-reaching. It is my opinion that once building violations are corrected health and sanitation problems are reduced as well as fire hazards. This, then, leaves the human problem which has been extensively investigated by social planners. However it is my firm belief, confirmed by our experience to date, that improved environment automatically results in improved social conditions; good housing makes good citizens. What we are doing in Skid Row is good business. Eventually everyone will benefit from this program. We have collected figures which show that in the past it has cost the city in excess of \$5 million a year to furnish fire, health, police and other services to one square mile in Skid Row. An average square mile of the city costs about \$111,000. This, then, is the ratio in excess of thirty to one. I estimate that these costs in the downtown area, devoted to mixed uses, should not exceed \$2 million a year. Thus our program has the potential of saving the taxpayers of Los Angeles \$3 million a year in the one square mile of Skid Row, and I think this is being accomplished."

And we have the same thing in other cities. In the booklet entitled "Urban Renewal Notes" published by the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the Urban Renewal Administration in Washington, in its November-December 1960 issue there is this statement: "Niagara Falls. In four years of concentrated housing code enforcement, this city of 101,000 people has brought about the up-grading of over 2,600 housing units in the community. An additional 294 are in the process of being brought up to code standards and 206 have been demolished. In four years it has not been necessary for the city to go to court in order to obtain compliance with code or demolition of structures beyond repair."

Another item in this same booklet from Birmingham, Alabama, shows that from April, 1958 to September 19th, 1960, 1,215 houses have had work completed on them; 447 buildings have been vacated and demolished, and 475 have work under way, and so we see that we could, instead of just having a slum clearance program that would do away with the slums in the comparatively small area of the city, we could have a slum clearance program which would do away with slums as slums have been done away with in some of the Scandinavian cities. We have in Winnipeg many areas where we have a lot of good houses and poor houses next to them. Most people have a lot of pride in their homes and they keep them up, but it is the poor houses that are perhaps often owned by absentee landlords, that bring down the values of their property and bring down the desirability of the neighbourhood.

Only recently I had occasion to try and get a mortgage for a man with a brand new bungalow on a house in the west end of Winnipeg, and there were other new bungalows on the street. It was quite a nice street excepting that right next to this new bungalow was a very, very poor house that came right out to the street line. And because of that the man could not get a mortgage loan. So we find that the poor housing brings down the values of the adjoining properties; brings down the neighbourhood. And the reverse is also true; if you start a rehabilitation program it brings up the neighbourhood, and many of the owners, many of the residents will see what the neighbours

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.) . . . . were doing — and in other cities it has been shown that such a program without any court proceedings at all brings up the whole tone of the neighbourhood and the whole usefulness of the neighbourhood so far as housing is concerned. So I'm glad to see that our Provincial Government is going to make a start with regard to housing and I will certainly urge upon the government to the best of my ability that we should contribute to the help of new housing construction in the City of Winnipeg which requires subsidy and which is being built for low income tenants. I would hope that we would be able to develop a program in Winnipeg where-by we could get rid of all our slums by a rehabilitation program and by demolishing those houses that are beyond repair.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has taken us on quite a trip but I wonder would he tell us how many units have been built under the terms of The Elderly Persons' Housing Act in Manitoba?

MR. COWAN: I don't know exactly how many in Manitoba, but in Greater Winnipeg there's 88 in St. James, 80 in West Kildonan, 64 in Elmwood and another 12 in East Kildonan, and if more members of this House would try and get the organizations to which they belong, we could get more constructed, because the government help is there, all we have to do is find an organization that will put up five percent of the cost with the serviced land.

MR. SPEAKER: Ready for the question?

MR. ORLIKOW: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: With the permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this matter be allowed to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand? Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to say how really pleased I was to see the CCF and the Honourable Member from Brokenhead bring in this resolution, because this gives us in this Provincial Chamber an opportunity to discuss and to debate, possibly in general terms and sometimes in specific terms, the matters that concern the Federal Government. I think we should make this clear that this is what we are doing, and I also feel that regardless of what possibly the Member from Brokenhead or myself say on this matter that we aren't going to resolve all the problems of agriculture in the Dominion of Canada. I do regret, however, that the CCF didn't take the opportunity of thoroughly discussing all aspects of this farm question. Instead of that they -- in a manner which I think is quite typical of the CCF Party and its supporters in Manitoba -- approached this subject on a very narrow track, and I find that quite often not only are they on a very narrow track, but sometimes on the wrong track and if they do get on the right track they seem to have a faculty of heading in the wrong direction.

Now I'm not going to review all the things that the Federal Government or the Conservative Party have done since they came into office. We could mention cash advances, acreage payments totalling over \$82 million; changes in PFAA which made that Act more equitable to Manitoba. But I would like to deal specifically with some of the points that were raised on The Price Stabilization Act by both the Honourable Member from Brokenhead and the Honourable Member from Fisher. I'd like to say this, that it is quite true that The Stabilization Act provides a basic price support. I do not think myself, however, that it should be used as the only vehicle, or the only means by which subsidies should be paid to farmers. The price support principle that is inherent in The Stabilization Act provides an actual stabilization of prices throughout the year and from one year to the next. It takes out a lot of the ups and downs that in the past have been quite radical out of our marketing system. But it also provides a minimum price for future development, and this is very important for farmers who are undertaking feeder cattle plans and who are also undertaking hog enterprise plans. They now have a guaranteed price that they know they can depend on for years to come and that they can gear their production and lay out capital money in knowing that they are going to receive this amount back throughout the years to come, and this has been a great deal of help in the future planning of some farmers' operations. Now, the



(Mr. Alexander, cont'd.) . . . . Member from Brokenhead also, and the Member from Fisher, mentioned the fact that Western Grains didn't come under the Stabilization Act and I think they both know, as well as I do, why they don't. They don't because western farmers and farm organizations and grain handling groups, of which I think Manitoba Pool Elevators is one, asked that they didn't, because the general opinion was that grain in western Canada could not be marketed under both systems. It couldn't be marketed under The Price Stabilization Act as well as the Canadian Wheat Board, and the decision was reached that the Canadian Wheat Board was the marketing system and the best marketing system for western Canada and for western Canada grain. And that, I must say, I agree with wholeheartedly. Now we went on from there to discussion on the 80 percent formula of the ten year average and the Honourable Member from Brokenhead continually said that we are going to have a sliding scale downward of this. This is only going to result in a continuing decrease of the ten year average because it's going to be set at 80 percent every year and then every year it's going to be less, therefore the average is going to go down every year. And he went on with this refrain. This sounded very familiar to me, Mr. Speaker, I've heard it before. But I think if the honourable member would take some advice from me, I would advise him to change his agricultural adviser, because this is very familiar to me; I've heard this story before and before -- over and over again. -- (Interjection) -- He had the shortest-lived political career of any M. P. in Springfield that I know of.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring out some of the facts of how The Stabilization Act has operated since it came into being in 1957. And they are this, that at the present time rather than the minimum 80 percent -- you'd think to listen to the Honourable Member from Brokenhead that we had a maximum of 80 percent -- it's a minimum that can be set. The present figures are this: butter is presently supported at 107 percent of the 10 year average; cheese is presently supported at 101 percent of the ten year average; eggs 85 percent; wool 113 percent; honey 102 percent; sugar beets 100 percent; sunflower seed 93 percent; hogs 80 percent; steers 80 percent; and lambs 80 percent. Now I think, Mr. Speaker, we have admitted in this House before that we aren't satisfied with the way The Stabilization Act has worked as far as hogs and eggs are concerned and as far as those prices are concerned in Manitoba. I think the Minister of Agriculture made our position very clear last year and again this year. Now I'd like to say a word on cattle. I noticed one of the honourable members over there smiling when I said that cattle, which is a very important part of Manitoba's agricultural economy is only supported at 80 percent. But let's look at the prices of cattle. The 1960 national average for cattle in Canada was \$20.32. The 1960 average price in Winnipeg was \$21.70 from the figures I've been able to get. In 1959 the ten year average price up to that date, which is the last year we have the ten year average price up to, was \$18.25. That means in Manitoba at the present time that cattle is \$2.50 roughly over the ten year average. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead I'm sure will be interested in knowing that in 1957 the ten year average in Canada, upon which this price support is determined for cattle, was \$17.83, and in 1959 \$18.25 -- correction, that should be '58, not '57. In one year the ten year average increased from \$17.83 to \$18.25. So that's not quite as bad as the Honourable Member for Brokenhead suggested. It's not the sliding scale that he was worrying about. It's not as bad as all the gloom and doom he had for us as far as the way this has worked out.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): . . . . . high cattle prices is the result of the price support program?

MR. ALEXANDER: And, Mr. Speaker, I certainly think it is not the farce that the Member for Brokenhead and his agricultural advisor thinks this is. (Interjection) There speaks a good packing plant man. Now Mr. Speaker, we went on from there to the publicity the farmers get, and the publicity of the general farm situation, and this is a matter of a great deal of regret to me. I have talked about this and pointed up the importance of this to every farm union meeting and every farm organization meeting that I have had the privilege of speaking to in the last couple of years, and here again, I am afraid, I have to lay some of the blame, if not the majority of the blame on my honourable friends, the members of the CCF Party and their supporters in the Province of Manitoba, because I don't think they could have if they had tried to do it deliberately, given the public a more wrong impression of farming in Manitoba. The Honourable Member from Inkster spoke last year about the large grain manufacturers going down to Honolulu for winter holidays; this was a problem in Manitoba farming conditions. I pointed the fact out to him . . . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is deliberately trying to distort, of course he can refer to that short statement by my colleague; but if he wants to deal with the statements of those who work . . . . .

MR. ALEXANDER: Am I out of order Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege?

MR. SCHREYER: Well just don't distort it now.

MR. ALEXANDER: Your definition of distorting and my ideas of stating a fact could possibly be two different things. Mr. Speaker the statement was made, I think it is wrong, and I think that any time in this House that wrong statements are made concerning agricultural conditions in Manitoba that it is the right of a member of this Chamber to get up and bring that point forward and point it out. Not only was it done last year, and when I did point it out, the Honourable Member from Inkster, and I am sorry he's not in his seat again, was so unkind as to say in this House that I had hit him below the belt and that at his age it hurt. Now, Mr. Speaker I do not at any time intend to hit anybody below the belt. That was not my intention. But it is my intention to point out facts and to point out the error in statements that I think are made by honourable members in this House if I don't think they have a bearing on the case and if they do not give what I think is a true picture. I do not think that is hitting below the belt, because the statement was made again this year and I still think it's not true.

I would also like to go on to a statement or an article that was written by Mr. Hugh Garner and Mr. Stanley Knowles in an issue of the Star Weekly Magazine this summer. I am sorry I didn't clip it out at the time; I wish I had of, I thought I could get a copy later on and I haven't been able to get a copy of it, but the article was, a question by Mr. Hugh Garner, a self-confessed supporter and a member of the CCF Party -- I say self-confessed, and he was questioning Mr. Stanley Knowles on: "Is the new party really necessary?" I am not going to go into that aspect of it, but I do want to refer to what Mr. Garner had to say about agriculture and farmers and what Mr. Knowles reply was. If I can recollect correctly Mr. Garner said that in his opinion farmers were a bunch of cry babies wanting hand-outs, were going to become wards of the government, and in like vein. Now I wasn't surprised to hear that that was his impression, but what I was surprised about Mr. Speaker was the fact that the great organizer and the great man who is supposed to be bringing into being this great new party which is asking for the support of the farmers, didn't say a word, he didn't even correct this impression. Now I -- this to me. . .

MR. SCHREYER: Again I must rise because I think the honourable member is suggesting that Hugh Garner is a member of the CCF, which is not the case.

MR. ALEXANDER: I made my point very, very clear and if the honourable member wants to keep getting on his feet -- I don't mind interjections when you're sitting down and byplay, because I love that thing myself. But I don't like people getting up and interrupting unless they are speaking on a point of order or a point of privilege. Now if you want to have a few interjections, that's fine.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I am merely asking the honourable member if he states that Mr. Hugh Garner is a CCFer?

MR. ALEXANDER: I said that Mr. Hugh Garner was a self-confessed member and supporter of the CCF Party, which he stated in his article.

MR. SCHREYER: At the present time?

MR. ALEXANDER: I don't know -- the way he was writing he wasn't going to support the new party, but he said he was a self-confessed supporter and member of the CCF Party. Now Mr. Speaker, I think that the way in which some members of the CCF have presented farm problems have done a lot to build up a resentment -- and resentment is the proper word -- in some of our urban population. (Interjection) Would you like me to talk about my own constituency? I can tell the honourable member that I sat in on a small town council meeting in my own constituency and because of the activities of certain supporters of the CCF Party in that area, I couldn't find a friend of the farmer on that whole board and on that whole council. I think the honourable member knows what town as well as I know what town, but in due fairness to the council I am not going to mention which town, he can take my word for it because these things did happen. I think Mr. Speaker, what the honourable members of the CCF Party in this House need are a few more farmers to talk about agriculture, not shop foremen, not school . . . . . not shop foremen, they've only got one right now. He does a lot of talking, I'll admit. Now not shop foremen, not school teachers -- (Interjection) -- well he's got a chance after I'm finished--

(Mr. Alexander, cont'd.) . . . .but farmers, because as far as I am concerned Mr. Speaker, it takes a farmer to know what it's like to be out in a nice dry day with a bit of wind, harrowing down wind. It takes a farmer to know what it's like to stand out in a field of barley worth three or four thousand dollars, and in half an hour stand out again in it later and see it flat on the ground and his money gone. It takes a farmer to know what it feels like to watch for that shower coming up that doesn't come, that shower that can make 10 bushels to the acre or five bushels to the acre difference to you on a 300 acre crop and difference in money of up to \$3,000. It takes a farmer to feel that and it takes a farmer to be able to present a farmer's case as far as I am concerned, and I am very pleased to be able to say that when it comes to farmers in this Legislature that this Conservative Government doesn't have to take a back seat to any other party in this House -- (Interjection) -- including volume and quality, not including myself in the latter calibre.

Now Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about the mention that was made of a higher guaranteed support price, guaranteeing a 100 percent of the cost of production, and there was a great deal made of this. But what do we find when we come down to cost of production? Whose cost of production? These are things that we have to think about; the small farmer, the average farmer, the large farmer, the bad farmer, the good farmer or the above-average farmer. The farmer in this zone and the farmer in another zone, the farmer in this province, the farmer in the other province. The cost of production when you have ten bushels to the acre crop, or the cost of production when you have 30 bushels to the acre crop. There is problems in presenting this, and this is the thing Mr. Speaker, that gets me when the CCF are presenting the farmers' case because for heaven's sake, we all know, we all know that the farmer has a case and he has a good case and it's a shame that some of our members, both in this House and some of the farmers outside the House make such a poor presentation of it. Our case is simply this Mr. Speaker; I feel we need support and we need help, not because we're broke, not because we've got no money, not because we are living on a sub-standard of living as compared to the rest of the province. These aren't the reasons; these are the reasons that are given too often, in my opinion. The reason we need help Mr. Speaker, is because we are trying to operate in an economy where other segments have tariff protection, where other segments have trade policies which protect them -- Interjection). Do you mind if I say it as well and agree with you -- (Interjection) -- okay. (Interjection) We'll get there, don't worry -- (Interjection) -- and also we need to remember the fact that these things including an inflated economy in this country have a very adverse affect on our cost of production. Now you might have thought it but you didn't talk very much about cost of production; you were too concerned on talking about price all the time and more money. Now this thing, Mr. Speaker, has to be emphasized and emphasized again, because we've been living with tariffs in this country for 100 years and it's a proven fact that once you've become accustomed to something you don't notice it any more, or you don't notice it as much as you should, and although some of us that are vitally concerned and working with agriculture all the time realize this, I don't think the general public remember it very often. I don't think it should make any difference to a man whether he pays an extra \$5.00 or \$10.00 for a suit because of tariff protection to help somebody else out, than if he has to pay that extra amount to pay for a subsidy to help somebody else as well. The same thing is there; we've got so used to one. But this has had an adverse affect on our cost of production, to protect Canadian industry and Canadian labour. A lot of people say this is a good thing and possibly it is to a certain degree. I've got to admit though that myself, basically at heart am a free trader. But, we also have on the other hand, the people who are protected by these policies, which are detrimental to our cost of production and the cost of our standard of living, receiving the benefits of our production at the price that cheap labour forces over in importing countries have to pay for our product. So they get it both ways and this point has to be continually made. Now also in cost of production Mr. Speaker, I think we should mention what I don't think has been mentioned often enough, and that is what effect has labour costs in Canada had on our cost of production and the cost of our standard of living. I would like to point out that in 1945 the average weekly wage in manufacturing in Canada was \$30.47; in 1960 the figure is \$72.00. In the trade side or services, in 1945 the average weekly earnings were \$26.85; and in 1960 the figure is \$65.16. Now I know the members of the CCF when this is brought up, immediately jump up and say, "oh no, no, no, no, this has no effect on the price of the product at all."

(Mr. Alexander, cont'd.) . . . . (Interjection) -- " what about the profits," the honourable member says. "There's where it is; there's where it is." He didn't say "some of it" he said "there's where it is;" and boy have we ever heard that before.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the honourable member that I am sick and tired as a farmer, and I'm speaking as an individual farmer now, of this continual passing the buck between -- (Interjection) -- I'm not talking about you. Will you hold your tongue for a minute and your patience along with it -- (Interjection) -- okay. I'm not passing the buck, Mr. Speaker, because if the honourable member would wait, what I'm going to say is that I'm continually tired of this passing of the buck -- it's nothing to do with my honourable friends, between labour and management. We have paid as consumers, I feel, the results of the wage increase in this country. The honourable members over there say that they are trying to get the extra profits from management. That is the reason for higher wages. Well as an ordinary Joe Blow consumer, I hope that they soon can find a different way of doing it. I hope that labour and management can soon sit down and find a different way of sharing these profits of management without having the continual rise in the increased costs of that product because, Mr. Speaker, if any man in this Chamber thinks that we can sit back here and see this continuing spiral of costs of material goods going up and up and up and up every year; and if they think that we can make up for this by continuing government subsidies every year, up and up and up; then there's something the matter with their thinking because it can't happen and it can't go on, as far as I'm concerned.

.....continued next page

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, as the honourable member can know, that labour has offered management many times to not take an increase if they would hold their prices down and keep the level, and they've told us to go to grass.

MR. ALEXANDER: I think I'd be very pleased, Mr. Chairman, if both labour and management could get together say on a profit-sharing plan and make sure, and make sure that the profits and the results, but mainly the profits of management get to labour in some other way. It is very strange to me, Mr. Speaker, when I see that agriculture has increased its efficiency of production over and over again. We've had to, to stay in business, because the price of our product has stayed the same; and because the price of our product has stayed the same, the benefits of this increase and efficiency has gone to the consumer. In industry, they have increased their efficiency as well but the benefits of that has resulted in higher wages and increased.....

MR. PETERS: Leave it at higher wages.

MR. ALEXANDER: I think if they'd operated the same way as we have and passed some of these benefits on in manufacturing, increased efficiency, passed this on to the consumer in lower prices that we wouldn't have a lot of the unemployment that we have today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we're talking about high support prices, the Honourable Member from Brokenhead asked the question of production controls and he "pussy-footed" around this a little bit, I feel. He was talking about intestinal fortitude awhile before, but didn't give too direct an answer on this question. The Honourable Member from Fisher did. He said that he wasn't adverse to price controls -- to production controls, and I want to say this, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection)-- to price controls, is that not what you said? To production controls? You were not too adverse to having production controls brought into the farm economy if we had to.

MR. WAGNER: I never made such a statement.

MR. ALEXANDER: Well I want to state, Mr. Speaker, categorically, that I hope I never see the day when any government imposes controls on the production of the agricultural economy of this country, because what we need.....

MR. WAGNER: Sir, is the Member for Roblin implying that I said that?

MR. ALEXANDER: I think I can quote from Hansard, Mr. Speaker, where the member made a little statement on production controls. Are you opposed to production controls?

MR. WAGNER: Are you on the stand or I am?

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I hope that we never see the day when any government imposes controls on the production of our farmers because what we need today is more and more and yet more production of our Manitoba farms, and we can do it. We can do it if we have a market for our goods. This brings up a very vital point that wasn't too well emphasized on the CCF brief on this subject. Here, I'm very pleased at the progress and at the work that has been done by the Minister of Agriculture of Manitoba in promoting this emphasis on marketing. Surpluses aren't our problem. Surpluses never will be our problem. Surpluses never were our problem. Marketing is. Marketing is, and if we can find ways and means of marketing our products and marketing our work -- (Interjection)-- the honourable members seems to have the funny impression that I'm blaming somebody. I'm making a statement. I'm making my speech now. Marketing is what we need because if we can market, we can produce.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on -- before I leave I think I would like to say on that topic, I think I would like to say one more word on this idea that we can continue to subsidize or continue to give farmers support based on his cost of production-- his full cost. As I say, I think the reasons we need support is because we have to have money to make up for the value of assistance that other segments of the economy get and to make up for the effect that this has on our operations. When we as a government, or any government try to get the idea or people try to get the idea that a government can subsidize anybody and guarantee him his cost of operation, guarantee him his full cost of operation, I think it is impossible. It's impossible to do in the first place because, I think, of the high cost, and also I think it is wrong in principle because I don't think that we should be put in the position whereby we are guaranteeing people, all people, a certain standard high enough to guarantee them their cost of operations; guarantee them their profits; guarantee them their cost of production completely; because, Mr. Speaker, if we do, in my mind it's absolutely wrong. A government should give people the

(Mr. Alexander, cont'd.)....opportunity, give them the economic well-being, the economic atmosphere whereby they can make it themselves. I never want to see the day when we still don't need hard work in this province. I still don't think we want to see the day when everybody loses their individual initiative and the desire to progress, and the desire to improve themselves and to improve their well-being, and you don't get this when you start guaranteeing things at too high a level to the people. This is when this is destroyed; and this is why I say a lot of the socialist philosophy is bad for the individual. We still have to have individual responsibilities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just say a few words on the -- (Interjection)-- Some day, Mr. Speaker, when I have the time on the Throne Speech debate, I'll be very glad to debate with the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, my definition of socialism. Unfortunately, I haven't got the time or I'd be ruled out of order at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: .....the Honourable Member for Roblin have the opportunity to make his speech.

MR. ALEXANDER: Don't cut them off too much, Mr. Speaker. I enjoy a little bit of this. I'd like to talk a bit about the food bank and the give-away food program that has been mentioned, first of all in this session by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and then, I understand, by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. I'm going to take a little different approach possibly from the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, but a very different approach from my socialist friends of the CCF, because they stated that the government should do this and the government should pay for it, pay for the costs, and I say "no". I say "no" for two reasons, Mr. Speaker. First of all, what happens? We have a fence-straddling politician like the Honourable Leader of the Opposition -- I think I've let the Liberals off too long -- we have a fence-straddling politician like the Honourable Leader of the Opposition who will get up and in great ringing tones make a great speech on this. This is a wonderful thing. This is good. This we have to do. This I'm going to support. This I'll vote for, and the government does it. Next year the bill comes in, and this is a terrible thing. This is costing too much money. This we can't afford. This is going to put taxes up. I don't like this at all. So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I think we should try and keep government out of this if we can. I have another reason. Canada has the second highest living standard. In some cases maybe the highest; but definitely the second highest living standard in the world. I think that we, as individuals of this country who are enjoying that standard, should voluntarily dip into our pocket to help the hungry people of this country and the hungry people of the other country. Help them as individuals. Be willing to say that we have and we enjoy a very high standard of living. The majority of us in Canada do. You can always point to examples where there are people in Canada who are hungry, but we can say that a lot of us enjoy a very high standard of living. And why -- (Interjection) -- you can always go and buy a loaf of bread. It would help the farm surplus. But why, Mr. Speaker, why should we let the government do this for us. I think we are shirking in our responsibilities as individuals when we continually ask for the government to do something that we can do as individuals ourselves. I think this is something that could be organized along the lines of a country-wide, dominion-wide community chest idea, to collect the money for this. - (Interjection) - I know you want the government to do it. Also, Mr. Speaker, I think the farmers could do their share by having the grain raised. I see the two Honourable senior Members of the Liberals are very very interested in trying to help out the hungry people of this world, and it's very very typical of their attitude in this House, particularly this session -- (Interjection) -- Hungry? They're going to be hungry for more than food.

Mr. Speaker, this matter seems to be treated with quite a bit of levity across there but I'm very very serious about this, because I do think this is a challenge facing us today as individuals, as to whether we're going to help our brother who is more unfortunate than us; whether we're going to do it as individuals; or whether we're going to have to pay high taxes to do it. I think in this case we can do it as individuals. I think the farmer will help by taking a lower price for a special quota of grain which he will deliver for this purpose. I think the people of Canada can and will pay for it on an individual basis because their brother in some parts of this country, but mainly in other countries, are hungry. This, I think, can be handled through the United Nations so that we have no government facilities, no governments whether they be right, left, medium, pink, red, green, or any other description involved in it. I think

(Mr. Alexander, cont'd.).....it can be done, and I think it has to be done.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say this. The CCF continuously contend that they are interested in the plight of the small farmer. They then proceed to argue that the interests of the small farmer can best be served by high prices. It seems elementary indeed that income is the result of multiplying volume times price, and even the CCF should be able to see that the problem of the small farmer is the lack of volume. It is for this reason that this Provincial Government has embarked upon such a far-reaching program as crop insurance and farm credit. It is much more in the interests of Manitoba agriculture to provide, or help to provide, an atmosphere in which farmers can adjust the farming operations in the light of the world economy. Our farmers must be able to compete in a world market and we must spare no effort in helping to find and create the markets which are necessary. In short, our farmers must be allowed to use their productive capacity in the interests of mankind. We must make every effort to ensure that programs undertaken by the Federal Government compliment rather than oppose those of the Provincial Government. The potential for Western Canada's agriculture, the potential is greater now than at any time in the past. We must be sure our program and policies ensure the development of that potential. We must keep in mind that Manitoba and Western Canada is not a vacuum but a part of a whole world-wide community, therefore, our policies must bear a relationship to other segments of Canada's economy as well as other nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Dufferin,

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question before the amendment is moved?

MR. ALEXANDER: I think I'll -- go ahead.

MR. GRAY: If the name of the mover of this resolution would be raised and put your name on the top, would you support the original motion?

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, if there are no more frivolous questions, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable -- (Interjection) -- Will you hold any further questions until after I'm finished please.

MR. GRAY: O.K. Sir.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Dufferin, that the resolution be amended by deleting all after "Stabilization Act" in the first line and substituting the following: "WHEREAS The Stabilization Act of Canada cannot provide a fair share of the national income to western farmers, inasmuch as western grains are excluded from his application; and WHEREAS it is apparent that in spite of substantial subsidies under the said Act, while it has proved useful in the stabilization of the price of some farm commodities, it has fallen short of providing parity prices for designated products to all farmers; and WHEREAS the cost of commodities and services the farmer must buy have risen steadily; and WHEREAS the deficiency payment method of price support as presently applied does not compliment Manitoba's Agriculture Program; and WHEREAS the members of this House subscribe to the principle that farmers should enjoy a fair share of the national income; and WHEREAS it is in the national interest that farmers be encouraged to exercise their ability to produce; and WHEREAS their ability to produce can be used as an instrument of goodwill and for the economic development of the under-developed nations of the world; and WHEREAS a permanent and sound basis for a prosperous farm community is a bona fide demand for farm products; and WHEREAS this bona fide demand can best be created if people in other lands have the opportunity of developing their economy; THEREFORE be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba urge the Government of Canada to undertake programs which will encourage a buoyant and vigorous farm industry; and further be it resolved that this government urge the Government of Canada to undertake the following programs: (1) Food for Canada's needy citizens; (2) A program to utilize our productive potential as an instrument of goodwill and to further economic development of underdeveloped countries, such as, Canada's present food pact proposals; (3) To continue and increase their present effort to expand marketing opportunities for Canadian farm products; (4) To ensure that the administration of deficiency payments compliments rather than hinders the efforts of Manitoba to encourage the development of a strong and sound farm economy; and (5) To provide adequate financial assistance to the provinces to ensure the successful implementation of the proposed Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Honourable Member for Roblin will take his seat, I'll put the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I suggest this to Your Honour if you will. Now the other day we had a long amendment to an unemployment resolution which was handed to the House. You held the matter, then we saw it printed on the Order Paper. I'm wondering rather than presenting the motion at this time, and I'm not suggesting that it may not be in order, Mr. Speaker, but rather than reading the amendment at this time, if we just allow it to stand until such time it appears on the Order Paper and then somebody carry on from there.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it your wish that I take it under advisement?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I'm prepared to do that. I don't see anything wrong with that.

MR. PAULLEY: Fine, Mr. Speaker. I might say, Mr. Speaker, in saying to take it under advisement, I think it was indicated by you going to present it that it was in order in your opinion, but my suggestion is to take it under advisement in order that we may see it in print on the Order Paper and then carry on the discussions from there.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party on the proposed motion and amendment thereto by the Honourable the First Minister and a further amendment to the amendment by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. This is the one that I took under advisement, and after perusing the amendment to the amendment, I find that there's not too much wrong with it. It certainly is an alternative proposition and it's the second one that has been attached to the original motion. The only peculiarity I see about it is that according to Beauchesne, the debate on the amendment to the amendment can range over both the motion and the amendment, and that is also true of the amendment to the motion if we reach that amendment. Are you ready for the question?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, having made your ruling on this, and before you deal with this sub-amendment, one of the members of the House, the Honourable Member for Wellington, has asked me to suggest that it might suit the convenience of the Committee to deal with his Bill No. 20 on the Margarine Act now. That is, to insert it several stages ahead of its proper place on the Order Paper as a courtesy to him as he is not able to be here tonight, and there's a possibility of concluding the debate this afternoon. It would, of course, mean that other private members would have to wait until that debate was finished before their own resolutions could come forward. It is, of course, one that requires unanimous consent. I don't know the feeling of the House, but in courtesy to the honourable member I agreed to put the proposition to you, Sir, and see whether it was agreed. What I'm suggesting is that we now proceed to debate Bill No. 20, An Act to Amend the Margarine Act, and then when that debate is concluded then we revert to the regular order of business. Now my Honourable Friend from Wellington has asked for that courtesy and I recommend it to the House, but I would be interested to hear whether it's acceptable.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition)(Lakeside): I understood the First Minister to say, Mr. Speaker, that if this were done that at the conclusion of that debate that we would revert to where we are now on the Order Paper. As far as I'm concerned, and I think I speak for the group in this, provided the whips have agreed -- I think this is a matter on which the whips have been trying to keep pretty closely in touch with their various members. I'd like to feel sure, not only of our own group but of the others, that everyone is here that wants to vote on this. It is understood, I think it's generally agreed that it's a pretty close vote and I wouldn't want either side to take any advantage of the other at this time. I've not been keeping account of where everyone is, but providing the whips are agreed that this is all right, it's fine with me.

MR. ROBLIN: I think, Mr. Speaker, that I don't really believe the whips have consulted on this. The proposition was just put to me a few minutes ago and I don't believe the whips have consulted. I recognize the fact that the question of the vote is rather important and we want to be very careful about what we are doing, so I am a little bit at a loss to know how to proceed here. Perhaps it might suit that if we proceeded with the next order of business to give the whips time to consult about this, that when that was finished, we could then see whether we were agreed on it. It is a rather ticklish and delicate matter. I appreciate that and perhaps we could have a discussion of the next item of business and, in the meanwhile, the whips could



(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.).....consult. If they thought it was agreeable, then we could do that, but it would depend on what they said. So if that would be agreeable then, Mr. Speaker, if you'd call the sub-amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, and there would be a short debate on that no doubt, then we could decide on this other matter.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, just before we leave this point I would like to point out that the Honourable the First Minister did mention the fact that this would require unanimous consent. He's right in that because as the rules of the House are established, once the Order Paper is established on Private Members' Day, then of course we have to follow the routine of the Order Paper. I have no objection to my honourable friend raising it, but I would have liked it to have come from a private member rather than the First Minister, although I can understand that too. I agree with the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that the whips, I believe they are all here now, do get together and I think that the suggestion of the First Minister is one on which we can agree upon. Then if the question of margarine is resolved, we'll revert back to our private resolutions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Portage la Prairie): No, he has spoken. You're putting the question on this amendment. In rising to take part on this debate in unemployment, I'm motivated as much by what has not been said previous to today as by what has been said, although I think that the speech by the Honourable Member from Roblin is one that had more points cogent to the problem of unemployment than some of the speeches we've heard from other members in the House. I am not an economist, Sir, but I do hope to offer some new material and perhaps to re-state some of the good old ideas that of late seem to be falling into disrepute. Now firstly, Sir, we in Manitoba are in a relatively favourable position, our unemployment rate is somewhat higher than the rest of Canada. Now I know the members of the opposition will certainly disagree with me if I suggest that this is due in no small measure to the policies of this government, but it is rather difficult to accept the suggestions of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that we should do so much more in the light of the complaints from his group earlier in the session, that we were spending far too much money. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this government is spending all the money it can prudently spend and that the programs now in hand, in winter works, utilities construction and in vocational training, have had a substantial effect on unemployment here in Manitoba, and together with the efforts of the Department of Industry and Commerce, we have made Manitoba the province with one of the lowest, if not in fact the lowest rate of unemployment in Canada; and I know there will be no slackening in the efforts of our government in this field. Just in this regard, Sir, I would like to read to you from a piece that appeared in the Tribune a few days ago. "The Dominion Bureau of Statistics report that Manitoba led all provinces in gross of department store sales during the week ending March 4th, compared with the same week in 1960. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics Report shows all provinces recorded gains, but Manitoba's sales were up 32.4 percent in value from last year; Alberta's sales were up 25.1; Ontario 14.7; Quebec, 5.4; British Columbia, 4.5; the Atlantic provinces, 5.8; and Saskatchewan, 1.4." I suggest, Sir, that this is a very strong indication that matters in Manitoba are in better shape perhaps than in some other areas in Canada not too far away.

Now much has been said about the high percentage of unskilled people in the labour force, and I think we all realize and agree that the training of these people is a matter of prime urgency. But another startling fact that emerges, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, at the end of 1959, 13.9 percent of the labour force was in the age group 14-19 years. To me, Mr. Speaker, this indicates very strongly that not only must we accelerate our efforts to improve secondary school education, but we must also give considerably more emphasis to elementary school work as well. It's quite clear, I think, that in today's technical society there just is not room for the under-educated, nor is providing training in manual skills to an increasing number the whole answer. We do not appear to be doing enough by way of stimulating in our young people the desire to learn, lack of which, I feel sure, is at the root of most of our young people's troubles in the classroom. Nor do I agree, Mr. Speaker with those who say that only a small percentage of our school population is bright enough to absorb a university or a highly technical education. In this regard, I think we should hear what the principal of the University of Alberta, Dr. Malcolm G. Taylor, had to say to the Manitoba Conference on

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd.)....Education in Brandon. He says, and I quote: "I am convinced that we place far too much emphasis on the idea of adapting the child to his environment. The real task is to make him a thinking, creative and critical human being who will try to improve the society, not simply adapt to it." We have done much in the last few years to improve our educational system here in Manitoba, Sir, but I feel we must do more. Greater sacrifices are needed.

Now both the Member for St. Vital and the Member for La Verendrye spoke very approvingly of the state of affairs in Germany. However, neither one of them seems to have understood the central fact that emerges from the story of post-war Germany. They ignore the real lesson that it holds for us here today. How did Germany, in 13 short years, arise from the shambles left by the war into the third trading nation of the world and the nation with perhaps the strongest economy in the world today? Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that it was done by planning; not by bureaucratic planning, Sir, and not by socialist style five-year plans or any other grandiose schemes; the planning, Sir, was done by the average German citizen. And how did they get this type of planning? Well, Sir, they got it by setting the people free. Now we all know that Germany had for years been a dictatorship. In August, 1948, the mass of wage and price controls that were strangling the German economy were swept away. Germans, for the first time in their history, were free politically; but what is more important, Sir, they were free economically. Now the flood of human effort that this freedom has unleashed is spreading through all of Europe.

Dr. Ludwig Erhard, the Minister for Economic Affairs in West Germany, outlines his philosophy in his book, "Prosperity through Competition," and I would recommend this very highly, Sir, to all members of the House, particularly to the members of our group and those of the Official Opposition. In his book he states the first objective of any economic system must be to increase the total wealth of the community. The second objective, to distribute that wealth fairly. As the Honourable the First Minister has pointed out, there's little point in arguing about re-dividing the economic pie; the problem is to increase the size of that pie. Now how did Erhard propose to accomplish this? Well he proposed setting up a social market economy, an economy free to respond to demand and supply; an economy in which no one segment receives any special treatment but in which each competes freely on equal terms, one with another. He says, and I'm quoting: "The yardstick and criterion of what is good or bad economic policy are not dogmas or the point of view of pressure groups, but exclusively the human being, the consumer and the people." Dr. Erhard believes the first essential of government economic policy must be a sound and stable currency. He states: "The social market economy is unthinkable without a parallel stability of the currency. Only a policy of this kind guarantees that individual sections of the population do not prosper at the cost of others." And again: "A stable currency must be one of those basic human rights which every citizen can demand of his government." He also maintains that inflation and the fear of inflation must be banished. He proves with statistics that the slightest rise in prices causes people to reduce their savings and to spend unwisely in search of protection from the effects of inflation. But even more important, Sir, inflation bears hardest on those least able to protect themselves, pensioners, the retired, others on fixed incomes and, as the Honourable Member from Roblin has pointed out, also on the farmers. Going further -- quoting further rather: "I have again and again pointed out that in the long run no amount of economic progress can be big enough to offset even the most apparently harmless softening of the currency. The second essential must be the complete absence of cartels and monopolies of any kind. For manufacturing, for retail trade, for special skills and for professions, there must be no protection from the normal economic forces of the market place. "The business man," says Dr. Erhard, "can justify his existence only so long as he is prepared to fulfill the functions of a free business man with all its opportunities, but also with all its risks." Dr. Erhard however, says that one of the biggest dangers to a social market economy are the pressure groups, who demand for themselves increasingly larger slices of the economic pie while giving little in return; industries that demand tariff protections from foreign competition; trade unions that annually demand wage increases in excess of labour productivity, increases which must lead to higher prices which, in turn, have the effect of cutting consumption and which, in turn, leads to unemployment. On this point Dr. Erhard writes: "One does not need to be a pessimist to reach the

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd.)....conclusion that many democracies are facing a serious crisis on this score. The problem of organized pressure groups, as a part of society and the political structure, has yet to be solved."

Well, Mr. Speaker, how does our situation here in Canada look in view of Dr. Erhard's views? We have mentioned the decline in the percentage of the labour force employed in manufacturing. This is a symptom, but what is the cause? Well, in 1950, the average weekly wage in industry was \$45.08; in 1959 this had climbed to \$73.49 an increase of 63 percent. Wholesale prices in the same period increased by only 14 percent and the consumer price index by 26.5 percent. How very clearly wages were advancing faster than other costs and faster than productivity. The Honourable Leader of the CCF suggests we should raise wages still more in order to increase purchasing power and so end the business slump. Now I suggest, Sir, that if his theories were of any substance whatever that disproportionately large increase in wages in the last ten years would have guaranteed a booming prosperity. We don't have it; we can only conclude that his theories are not very substantial in this regard.

Now his group is prone to say that increased wages can come out of profits without raising prices. Well let's have a look at that. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that on the basis of 1956 equals 100, the wage index in the third quarter of 1960 was 124, up 24 percent. Corporate profit index on the same base was 89, a drop of 11 percent in the same period. Clearly then, some of the increase in wages has been coming out of profits. I suggest, Sir, the result has been not only a decline in profits, but a consequent decline in the rate of business investment in industry. A decline in the type of investment that most needs to be increased to increase employment. I think, Mr. Speaker, the brutal truth is that we in Canada and the United States have been on a colossal economic binge and we are now suffering the inevitable hangover. During days of high demand when Europe was rebuilding its productive plants, we were raising wages faster than productivity and raising prices to compensate, without regard for the effect of a subsequent inflation on our consumers either here in Canada or abroad; and because we have raised wages faster than productivity, we have reduced proportionately the purchasing power of large segments of our economy. We are unable to face the competition from foreign industry and, as a result, our secondary industries are not able to grow to provide jobs for our growing work force. How much better it would be, I wonder, if gains in productivity were passed on in the form of lower prices. This would have the effect of increasing real wages in all segments of the economy with a corresponding increase in consumption. This in turn, I think, would result in increased employment. I'm sure this is the end we all desire. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that as the Honourable Member from Roblin said, if labour and management do not cease their struggles; if they do not start behaving like partners instead of continually warring, each seeking to gain at the other's expense; the situation can only get worse. I do not ask that they stop working for their own interests, but only that that interest should be enlightened. No one sector of our economy can prosper at the expense of another. Such gains are short-lived and illusory at best. The only solution, surely, is to increase the total value of the economy and for all to share in that increase.

Now there's another economic prophet going around the country these days preaching deliverance of a sort. His name is James Coyne, head of the Bank of Canada. He does not apparently believe that the answers to Canada's economic ills can be resolved by fiscal policy. He also expresses great concern over Canada's foreign indebtedness. We would all agree, I think, that more of our risk capital should be raised at home; that more of Canada's protective plant should be owned by Canadians. Mr. Coyne, apparently, thinks that by keeping interest rates in Canada substantially above those in the United States, he is in fact discouraging U.S. investment in Canada. He believes that lower interest rates in Canada would stimulate what he calls "unwise and unproductive investment." Apparently he's referring to municipal and Provincial Government investments. He believes that there's room for only selective investments today. This, Mr. Speaker, seems to suggest to me that government control, not fiscal policy, is his answer to our present problem. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would remind Mr. Coyne that, as Erhard remarked, "state control is like pregnancy; it's impossible to have a little of it". I disagree emphatically with his implication that our free economic system has broken down; that it suffers from chronic structural defects that he maintains. In 1960 more Canadians were working, earning more money than ever before in history. Despite the large numbers of

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd.)....unemployed today, the numbers of people with jobs is at, or near a peak. Our economy is, in fact, operating at a pretty high level, and while it has not expanded in the past few months, it nevertheless has afforded to a great many of our citizens the relatively high level of prosperity. I agree, Sir, that this is not good enough. The economy must expand at least fast enough to absorb our growing labour force, but I do not subscribe to the belief that this cannot best be accomplished by a free market economy.

I think, also, it should be obvious that the large foreign order shift in Canadian resources and industry is due primarily to the ultra conservative policies of our lending institutions. We take great pride in the fact that our banking and insurance institutions are among the safest in the world, but, Mr. Speaker, I think the price we are paying for this security is to see foreign investors, who are willing to take some risk, helping themselves to our most profitable resources and industry. Surely if Canada is to grow and prosper, we must somehow awaken in the Canadians of today the spirit of enterprise that our forefathers showed in opening up this land. Our lending institutions, particularly our banks, must be put in a position where they can participate in those more profitable, albeit more risky fields of endeavour. Surely, Sir, the maintenance of the interest rates in Canada, above those in the United States, can only stimulate U.S. investment in Canada. It is quite true the lowering of interest rates in Canada may slow down the rate of saving and it may stimulate some spending on the industrial and local government level, but to hold, as Coyne apparently does, that this is bad, seems to be errant nonsense to me. Surely now is the time for more spending, for less saving and more investment. To say that more investment now would be wasteful, because we already have a little over-investment in some industries and some idle plant capacity, is to show a complete lack of confidence in the abilities of our managerial and local government people. This is an attitude, Sir, that ill behoves the manager of our central bank.

Well, what conclusions can we draw from all this, Mr. Speaker? Well, in my opinion, Sir, the first duty of the Federal Government is to guard the soundness and stability of our currency. The suggestions made to reduce taxes, I think, would only aggravate the situation in days to come. Their second duty in the economic sphere is to be that of a referee, as it were, guaranteeing fair treatment to all sectors of the economy but never interfering to support one group against another. Further, in our present situation, I believe that the government should do all in its power to lower interest rates and to stimulate investment and ease the load on municipal and provincial governments. I would go one step further, Sir, and suggest that any future attempts to contain what might be considered too rapid an expansion of the economy should be through tax adjustments and not through arbitrary alteration of the interest rates.

In the field of labour relations, Sir, I would strongly urge companies to appoint members of the unions to their Boards of Directors. Mutual trust and understanding, in my opinion, Sir, can be the only basis for the ending of the senseless economic struggle that dogs our economy. I suggest, too, that many companies have found, through profit-sharing agreements, they are able to increase both wages and profits without affecting their competitive situation; and I think this should be proceeded with much faster. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in our concern for the problems of today, we should be very careful not to embark on programs that, while they may offer some short-term benefits, will in the long run further aggravate the basic problem. There is no easy way out of our dilemma. The sooner we face up to the basic issues of today and make the sacrifices which are necessary, the sooner we will have the general prosperity we all seek.

Now, Sir, I have one last quotation from Mr. Erhard that I would like to leave with you, and I commend it particularly to those of our group and also to those of the Official Opposition who seek some magic formula. Why I left out the CCF will become apparent immediately. I'm quoting from Dr. Erhard. "Freedom is indivisible; economic, political and human freedoms are a complex unit. Detach one and the whole unit collapses."

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Logan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. R. SEABORN (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the consideration that the members gave to me on this question of my bill, but I'm positive that neither the Honourable Member from Arthur or myself could make a sensible speech within twenty minutes, so I'll leave it until Friday if you don't mind, please.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it he has the unanimous consent of the House.

MR. SEABORN: Yes, though I prefer to leave the matter until Friday if I may, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: The Honourable Member is withdrawing the request that he made a few minutes ago because the time has run out on him, and it is pointless at the moment.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, we'll just proceed on the Order Paper as it is.

MR. ROBLIN: I thank the members for their consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for St. Mathews .

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand.

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

MR. SEABORN: Mr. Speaker, if we strip this resolution of all its frills, we will find the argument that is essentially public ownership versus free enterprise. Actually, the subject matter is of relatively small importance for the last speaker on this resolution ranged over the American continent, trying to prove that free enterprise is an evil, insidious thing that has no place in our economy. Public ownership, on the other hand, is the ultimate goal which brings with it perfect harmony.....

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I feel I simply must challenge the truth of that statement. I did not try to prove that private enterprise is an insidious thing. Nowhere near that.

MR. SEABORN: All right, Mr. Speaker, I'll accept it. However, the Member for Brokenhead endeavoured to prove that public ownership is the ultimate goal which brings with it perfect harmony, peace and justice to all men. Actually this is the issue, this is the core of the whole resolution before us. The Honourable Member from Brokenhead referred to the Tennessee Valley Authority and discussed it for some considerable length of time. He extolled it as quote: "One of the greatest acts of any American government in the history of that nation." Now this sounds rather strange after he and other members of his party were so anxious in regard to the manner in which this government was obtaining land for the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. He probably doesn't know the facts so I'll endeavour to enlighten him a little bit. To build a project like the TVA, they naturally had to have land. Actually, they had to have more than a million acres of it for dams, for reservoirs, for transmission lines and towns, so if it couldn't negotiate deals with owners that exercised his powers of eminent domain, it sued. It even involved an ingenious technique for blanket take-overs for they found individual suits were too time-consuming. TVA, therefore, worked out its non-training scheme ostensibly to protect the government against land speculators. The scheme was simple and effective. The appraisers set the price; TVA made the offer; and the owner had to take it or leave it. Most of them took it, but many went to court to defend themselves against this condemnation. At the time, the war hadn't come with its insatiable demands for light metal and chemical industries and for explosives, and TVA had to have customers -- preferred customers. The TVA Act passed by Congress had directed that preference be given municipalities, rural electric co-operatives and other public agencies, and there simply wasn't any worth mentioning in the Tennessee Valley area, so TVA had to promote them and it did so. It used as weapons its broad bond-issuing powers; the relative high rates of the private companies of the region; the wholesale and the retail rate structures of TVA, the yardstick rates they were called, and they were so low by the current standards that they made the people's eyes stick out.

How did they arrive at these rates? I would like to refer you to the factual analysis of the Tennessee Valley Authority by Mr. Hewitt Batou and he proves that the reported investment is far below the reality. Secondly, that the allocation of the investments in navigation, flood control and power was a means to deceive the public about the true cost of the production of power; and thirdly, that the reported cost of operation is altogether fictitious as no interest charges are considered on the \$700,000,000 appropriation of the government, and that the loss of taxes resulting from the elimination of the tax-paying utilities of the regions is just forgotten. It was by these evasions that the TVA was able to establish its fantastic yardstick of costs of

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.)....electricity, applying to the production of power only 40 percent of its investment and only 33 percent of the cost of operation. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the yardstick used by the TVA is just about as comparable as, or makes about as much sense as a 5 inch foot or a 6 ounce pound. Such a policy could not help but bring ruination to all the privately-owned institutions, even though they fought the case to the Supreme Court. Finally Congress, after a bitter fight, amended the TVA Act to permit the authority not only to acquire the transmission lines from the water power properties of The Wendall Wilkie Commonwealth and Southern Group, but also acquire its steam plants and TVA could do anything from then on. Mr. Roosevelt obligingly called Mr. Wilkie to the White House and laughingly told him that he better sell the Tennessee Electric Power Company while he had something left to sell -- and that did it. Wilkie sold for about 80 percent of the real value of the properties and the other power companies also gave up, either selling or making deals to cede part of their territories to the TVA distributors. They were paid \$116,000,000 and lost 288,000 customers in the deal.

The Honourable Member for Brokenhead. I believe, stated that the private companies could not meet the competition of a public utility; and it's easy to see why. TVA is answerable to no one, except nominally to the President, for its costs, its rates or its method of operation. TVA controls the rates and operations of its 140 public power outlets -- controls them absolutely -- and states and municipalities have nothing to say about it. Neither has the Federal Power Commissioner or any other governmental body. TVA can do anything and everything within its power. Anything but eat it. I have not made any charts but the true capital costs of the TVA development was well over \$1,000,000,000, and in the allocation of costs to the various purposes for which the TVA is said to have been developed, only about 40 percent is charged to power.

Now one cannot spend a billion dollars anywhere or any manner, or for any purpose, without touching a lot of lives, without pushing a lot of people around. A little investigation will soon reveal that at least 75,000 persons were actually forced to leave their homes, their farms and businesses, to make way for this gigantic project; and this does not include the thousands of persons who lived on higher ground and worked on lowland farms or in lowland canneries, flour mills and other small establishments. Folks have found out from sad experience that you simply do not oppose the Tennessee Valley Authority, not in the Tennessee Valley at any rate and not if you want to stay in business in one piece, for the TVA is in everything. First the TVA has undisputed control of the water resources of the Tennessee watersheds, in a large measure its land resources. TVA is in absolute control of the manufacture and distribution of power for 5 million people. TVA has the bordering power companies completely buffaloeed, companies like the Georgia Power, Mississippi Power, Gulf Power, Alabama Power and the Birmingham Electric. They have never once challenged the TVA. They know it is futile and disastrous after what happened to Mr. Wilkie's power empire.

TVA is also in the fertilizer business. Some \$20 million a year. It is one of the biggest manufacturers and distributors of phosphate fertilizers in the world. It isn't worried about costs either. It controls its distribution to test demonstration farms which it supplies with free fertilizer, and selects the co-operatives which get it at cost and pass it under TVA rules. TVA is in all the land grant colleges. Their extension services in the offices of the country agents sets up attractive research projects in the universities and pays all the bills. It allows the extension service and the country agents to handle the free fertilizer test demonstration deal, and pays the salary of all the assistant county agents to carry on the TVA land-use programs. TVA is also in the planning commissions of the various states it affects. It sets up most of them, mans them and pays all expenses. TVA provides free seeding trees for state forestry departments as well as thousands of privately-owned farms. It helps set up fire districts; makes good deals with the Federal State and local agencies on fish and wildlife projects, parks and recreation sites along its chain of man-made lakes -- all under contract; all according to the TVA plans.

TVA is also in the banking business. It may issue bonds up to \$100 million for its own use or to finance its public power distributors. It competes with the private contractor by doing all its own construction work. It quarries limestone and marble; does engineering work, both inside and outside the Valley. It is in the recreation business, either its own or through

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.)....contracts with private operators. It builds and operates river terminals, docks and piers. It promotes food processing and marketing associations; co-operatives to handle TVA fertilizers. TVA has contracts with other Federal Agencies, with states, cities, counties, co-operatives, utility boards, industries, schools, libraries and universities -- hundreds of them. They go everywhere. TVA does not engage in personal politics. TVA does not interfere with state and local governments of the Tennessee Valley. The TVA doesn't have to, for TVA is the government in the Tennessee Valley. There is nothing, no one above it. It is absolute dictatorship -- (Interjection) -- Nominally, yes. The cost of developing power in the Tennessee Valley is very high. I thought I should mention this fact before I leave the subject of TVA. The reported cost of development for the various projects is equivalent to \$448 per kilowatt installed; and to \$718 per kilowatt year produced. The cost of power developments runs as high in one TVA plant as \$4,000 per kilowatt year produced. In Quebec it's \$330; and in Manitoba, \$250.

But, Mr. Speaker, we do not have to go to Tennessee to compare the relative merits of public ownership or free enterprise. All we have to do is go into Saskatchewan. It is pretty obvious it has been the policy of the Saskatchewan Government to throttle private enterprise in favour of Crown Corporations in that province. Perhaps we should see how some of these government projects fared over the years. Altogether, the Saskatchewan government set up a total of 19 Crown Corporations, ranging from a leather tannery to insurance. The Provincial Government has invested about \$200 billion of the taxpayers' money in these enterprises and it would certainly be of interest to see how efficient public ownership is compared to the evil profit seekers of free enterprise.

The first business that I find any record of is the leather tannery established by the Government in 1944. It went into one economic crisis after another until its employees were thrown out of work just before Christmas in 1946, and the company closed with a deficit of \$200,000. Before the leather tannery closed, the Saskatchewan Government had established another business, this time a shoe factory. The year was 1945 and Premier Douglas proudly announced the shoe factory, utilizing the products of the leather tannery, would produce shoes at \$2.75 a pair. This shoe company finally closed down in 1948 after a loss of \$85,000. The next thing I found was the establishment of a woollen mill in Moose Jaw, but it seems as if this business was in difficulty from the very day it opened. It finally was forced to close its doors in 1951 with a staggering debt of \$830,000. The Saskatchewan Government finally sold this mill to a private company, which we must agree was rather a naughty thing to do. After the war the Saskatchewan Government decided it would go into the housing business, and set up a corporation to convert military huts into housing accommodations that could be rented. I have not been able to ascertain exactly how much it lost but, in any event, it became involved in financial difficulties and had to close down in 1947. I've actually missed one because early in their first term the CCF Government of Saskatchewan set up a fish board and built a number of fish filleting plants in northern Saskatchewan. Every commercial fisherman was compelled to sell his fish to this board but, despite this, the board lost money from its inception. What makes it even worse, the fishermen were receiving less money than they would have received from private buyers. After a loss of \$400,000 the government closed it down in 1949. There are others I could mention. The lumber mill which was set up in 1951 at Big Beaver, which lost \$97,000 in a year and a half, and cost the Provincial Treasury another \$45,000. The box factory which was actually expropriated from a private corporation through very drastic legislature. The Government of Saskatchewan confiscated this plant when the manager refused to follow a certain course of action that would have resulted in certain bankruptcy for this business. Ever since they took it over it has been in financial difficulty and, in 1957, it showed a debt of \$352,000. This whole operation, so-called public ownership, was a complete fiasco.

But before leaving experiences of the Saskatchewan Government in business, there is one more that must be considered and that is the clay plant in Estevan, known as the Saskatchewan Clay Products Limited and, as I intimated, a Crown Company. Now this company had a competitor in the same province, a privately-owned company in Bruno. It is very interesting to note that the Crown Company could not compete against the Bruno Plant. In 1952 the Estevan plant had lost \$21,000 and after awhile the Saskatchewan Government took action. On

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.)....February 16th of this year in Regina, Mr. J. A. Langforth stated that he fully expected that an Order-in-Council will be passed requiring that all clay products on government projects must be supplied from the Estevan plant, but this policy of issuing closed specifications had already been in effect for some time, certainly as long ago as 1958. Here's a typical example taken from the specifications for the Saskatchewan Government Telephone Building in Regina, and the clause reads thus: "Common brick and terra cotta tile, where shown and required, shall be hard-burned and free from checks and cracks as made by the Saskatchewan Clay Products, Estevan. No substitutes for Estevan products will be approved." This clause appeared in all government specifications covering hospitals, schools, telephone exchanges -- in fact, any government project. The people at Bruno were desperate. The clay plant was an important part of their economy. They appealed to the Premier to purchase the plant for it had been forced to close last September, but they were told by the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Brockelbank, that they were not interested in purchasing the plant; they did not think any good purpose could be served by engaging in further discussions on the subject. Incidentally, Mr. Brockelbank is the Chairman of the Board of Directors in Estevan. Bruno is a village of 600 souls. The plant provided a payroll of \$80,000 for 23 men who had 51 dependents. The closure of this plant has had a severe impact on the economy of this community in Saskatchewan, but I suppose the main thing is that under the new closed specification policy of the CCF government, the Estevan plant has enjoyed its first profits, some \$75,000 in 1959. So in spite of what they say, the Socialists seem to be very interested in making a profit too.

But we can see, Mr. Speaker, that public ownership can only exist if it wipes out all competition, for it just can't compete against free enterprise. In the case of power utilities it is argued, as the Member from Brokenhead attempted to do, that private enterprise cannot or will not do the job. Now this is just not true. For example, the Southern California Edison Company Big Creek Development shows what private power companies have done -- (Interjection)- We'll get there in a minute -- on many rivers in various parts of the United States. In the high sierras of Southern California, Edison Company has constructed a \$100 million project. Beginning 46 years ago this company built access railways and highways, a 13 mile tunnel, hydro-electric power houses and dams. In addition to furnishing a steadier water flow for power production, these dams also provided valuable flood control for the entire valley. They flood no good or tillable land. They store water to be released for power products during the dry season. The water is then automatically available for irrigation of the valley below. Not only do the taxpayers make no contribution to this project, but they also receive contributions from all these improvements through taxes paid on them by the Southern California Edison Company. In contrast of the tax supported TVA project which the Honourable Member admires so much, this job is taxed while the people get the resulting flood control and irrigation benefits without charge.

MR. SPEAKER: Might I enquire if this would be a convenient time to call it 5:30?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker if the honourable gentleman hasn't got too much more perhaps we might hear him out, because he told me that it would be difficult for him to come here tonight to finish his speech. If it doesn't take too long, we could hear him out.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, because we have been accommodating, I think, the honourable gentleman and some other in connection with margarine, and I certainly don't feel like staying here for an extra 15 minutes to listen to this particular speech.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I say that it was my intention to adjourn the debate of my honourable friend because there is a reply and a very good one, I think, and that was my intention. Now I'd be agreeable if the House were agreeable to allow you, Mr. Speaker, to call it 5:30 to allow my honourable friend to continue in his remarks the next time the resolution is up for discussion on the Order Paper.

MR. SEABORN: That would be satisfactory to me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: I certainly don't want, Mr. Speaker, anyone to think we are trying to interfere or curtail the honourable member's speech, and I'd be agreeable to that if the House is agreeable.

MR. H. P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask one question of the Honourable Member for Wellington. Is it a fact that this shoe factory in Saskatchewan went broke for making 59,000 shoes for the one foot?



5  
MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I take it that it's agreed that we will allow this particular debate to stand now. The honourable member who is speaking can resume his debate the next time private members come around and I presume that this will meet with the approval of all members in the House. It's a little irregular and I'd like to be sure that it has general consent. If it does, perhaps we could call it 5:30 on that basis.

MR. SPEAKER: I might make the observation that the Honourable Member from Wellington has now spoken 30 minutes, and if it's agreeable to the House I would call it 5:30, with the understanding that the Honourable Member for Wellington, at a future date, would have the opportunity to continue his speech.

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