



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. G. W. JOHNSON (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Trafalgar Savings and Loan Association praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Trafalgar Savings and Loan Association.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The petition of Allan Henry Fitch and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Secured Investors Association.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.  
Notice of Motion.

Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. D. WATT (Arthur) introduced Bill No. 68, An Act to incorporate Virden and District Elderly Persons Housing Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. G. JOHNSON (Minister of Health)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the resolution standing in my name.

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

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): . . . . . administrator of the Province of Manitoba having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to revise and re-enact The Hospital Services Insurance Act and to provide for a plan of hospital services insurance for residents of Manitoba and, in connection therewith, to provide (a) for the making of certain grants from the Consolidated Fund towards the costs of providing the insured services; (b) for the making of advances from the Consolidated Fund of amounts required for working capital; (c) for the payment by the government of certain premiums in respect of certain persons resident in unorganized territory and the collection from those persons of amounts so paid; (d) for the acquirement of real and personal property by the Minister of Public Works for the purposes of the plan.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, by way of explanation, in view of the fact that the Hospital Services and Insurance Act is being amended so extensively by inserting "the Commission" in certain places in place of "the Minister," and due to the extensive alterations to the bill, the Legislative Council advised us to re-draft the whole bill, which would mean that the present Act would go out of force when the new bill as re-written is introduced, and I believe in accordance with this it was necessary to introduce this resolution. This resolution calls for the subsidy by the Province of the plan, payment of working capital and the other measures which are in no way a change in policy at this time. It just means -- when the bill is before the House there were certain few principles introduced, one of them the extension of the term "dependent" which will mean further monies from the Consolidated Fund, but other than this, this is just a rehash of the original resolution which accompanied the original bill.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his explanations on this. Could we take it, then, that each one of the four items listed here under (a), (b), (c) and (d) are now presently part of the Act as it exists? There is no change here?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): No there are no changes in that. (a) and (b) I think are self-explanatory, Mr. Chairman, in that the Consolidated Fund contributes to the present plan and the payment of premiums in respect of persons resident in unorganized territory -- this is the policy that came in with respect to the guaranteeing of municipalities where 178 municipalities

(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd.) . . . now guarantee their premiums. In unorganized territory the Province is the guarantor. In this bill it is true we are spelling out that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is authorized to pay on behalf of these people as the guarantor. This has been carried out in practice since the guarantee system was originated and before, and this might be a slight change which is in effect as administratively the same as before.

MR. MOLGAT: So, in fact then, Mr. Chairman, these items are not changes in the Act, but there will be further changes from what the Minister said, provided in the Act when it comes down. So we'll be faced, in other words, with a new Hospital Services Act, in effect.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): A complete rewrite of the present Act introducing two or three changes -- extensions such as the dependents clause which was announced in the Speech from the Throne, plus the -- this particular change -- spelling out that the Minister of Municipal Affairs shall be the one who acts as the guarantor or may on behalf of people in unorganized pay a premium, and other than that, financially there are no other changes.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister whether there has been any amendments proposed -- is he aware of any amendments proposed at Ottawa in respect of the Hospital Aids Act that might be included in this? Any new departures or just those items that are in there at the present time?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): No, I don't think anything, Mr. Chairman, affecting this resolution, other than we may by agreement with Ottawa from time to time extend our services, such as the inclusion of physio and occupational therapy which would involve federal sharing. The provinces -- it's left up to the provinces to extend and seek agreements with Ottawa, which we have done; which involves us in further expenditures. But these are done by agreement and they are already in the Federal Act and they are already -- the permissive legislation is in our Act.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . as far as cost sharing between Ottawa and ourselves in the rewrite of the bill.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, if this is only a matter of legislation then why was the matter brought in by way of resolution? It would appear to me, Mr. Chairman, that this must be some new legislation, or anticipating some new legislation, because of the manner in which it is brought into the House.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I don't know the legal reasons for this. I was surprised to see that the resolution had to come forward before the House again also, but the explanation the Commissioner gave me was in view of the fact that the present Act will -- the whole thing was being rewritten from beginning to end, fixing up little dots and commas and putting in the two new principles we had and substituting Commission for Minister, they thought it only proper not to anticipate the House and bring in the resolution holus-bolus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Measures to be adopted? Carried. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker the Committee of the Whole House has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 65, An Act respecting the insurance of residents of the Province against the cost of the provision of hospital services.

MR. SPEAKER: We have with us this afternoon 23 pupils from Lorette High School, Grade XI, under teachership of G. A. Guilbault. The school is situated in St. Boniface Constituency and is represented by the Honourable Mr. Desjardins. We hope that . . .

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, a correction there, it is situated in the constituency of Springfield.

MR. SPEAKER: I accept the correction. The note I have with me mentioned St. Boniface constituency. However we're happy to have the students from Springfield with us this afternoon and we hope that their stay with us will be educational and pleasant and they will take away from this Chamber favourable impressions of the lawmakers of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, in a House which is bilingual I should think it would be proper that a French-speaking member of this House, due to the fact that you yourself do not speak French, I understand, fluently, should be allowed to say a few

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . words in French to our visitors.

Monsieur l'orateur, membres de l'assemblee je suis tres heureux de me joindre a monsieur l'orateur pour souhaiter la bienvenue en ce moment a nos distingues visiteurs et visiteuses ainsi que les Reverendes Soeurs qui nous honorent de leur presence et je souhaite que leur visite ici soit profitable tout en etant interessante.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF ABOVE:

Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislative Assembly, I am very happy to join Mr. Speaker in welcoming our distinguished visitors as well as the Reverend Sisters who honour us with their presence today. I hope that their visit here will be profitable as well as being interesting.

MR. SPEAKER: We also have with us this afternoon students, 66 in number, Grade VIII, David Thompson School. They are under the guidance of their teachers, Mr. Ostrowski and Miss Epp. This school is situated in Elmwood constituency and is ably represented in the House by Mr. Peters. We also hope that they will have a pleasant afternoon with us and their stay most pleasant and profitable to them.

Orders of the Day.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, as is our custom on these occasions, I would like to advise the House of the death of a former member of this Legislature within recent days. I speak of Mr. William James Westwood, who was a member of this House on two separate occasions, first from 1917 to 1919 and then again from 1932 to 1936. I suppose that the Honourable Member for Lakeside must be one of the few members in the House now who will recall Mr. Westwood as a member of the Chamber. Mr. Westwood was born in Manitoba in the vicinity of Rapid City and lived all of his life in this province, most of it near and in the town of Roblin, and it was the constituency of Roblin that he represented on the two occasions I've referred to, in this Chamber. Mr. Westwood was very active indeed in the affairs of his community. He was interested not only in provincial affairs but also in local government where he took a prominent part, and in a number of fraternal organizations within his area as well. Shortly after the Second World War, Mr. Westwood moved to Russell and he was living there at the time of his death. He leaves behind him his wife and three sons, some of whom are well-known to us in this House.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin that this House convey to the family of the late William James Westwood, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement, and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bill Westwood was a long-time resident of the Roblin district, having come there in 1912 and stayed there until he moved to Russell approximately 12 years ago. He was for many years the Secretary-Treasurer of the Shell River Municipality and was also Mayor of Roblin for four years. Members might be interested in knowing that he was the first secretary of the Roblin Pool Elevator Association, which is the first association of the pool elevators in Manitoba. He was a very active worker in his church and all other community affairs. The last year or two of his life he was quite often incapacitated from the shoulders down, but that never affected or never dimmed his zest for life. I know of many people this past year who went to visit Bill Westwood with the thought and idea of cheering him up, and found when they got there that it really wasn't necessary and that after they left they found that their own spirits had received a considerable uplift from their association and their visit with him. Bill Westwood had a great philosophy of life. He believed sincerely in the responsibilities of the individual, to his community and to his brother man. Mr. Westwood will be sorely missed, not only by his family, but his community which he served so well.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, as the First Minister indicated, there are not too many in this House now who had the pleasure and the privilege of sitting with Mr. Westwood. My two colleagues on my immediate left and right are the only two left in the House who knew him personally at the time that he was here. I cannot speak on this occasion from personal knowledge of the man involved. I can, however, say that I know some members of his family and I know the high regard in which they are held in their own communities. There are members

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . of our group better qualified than I to speak about the qualifications of Mr. Westwood himself, and I merely wanted to make this personal tribute at this time on behalf of the man who served Manitoba to his best capacity and who left behind him sons who are carrying on that tradition.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, our group here joins in this tribute to the late member of this Legislature. There are no members of my group at the present time who had the pleasure and honour of knowing Mr. Westwood, but we join in a tribute to his service and to the service of those who have served Manitoba well before we had the privilege of joining the House. I think all of the members of this House are well aware of the sacrifices that it is sometimes necessary to make in order to fulfill our public duties to the people of Manitoba. I am sure Mr. Westwood, from the remarks of the Honourable Member for Roblin, fulfilled his duties well. I was particularly interested to know that not only he served in this Legislature, but he was so active in his community as well. We of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, join in this tribute to him and extend our sympathies to his family.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, Bill Westwood was one of my very close personal friends when we were together in the House, as some others have mentioned. He was here on two different occasions, and I didn't sit with him when he first arrived here -- as the First Minister has mentioned that was in 1917, and he stayed that time only until the election of 1920, then he did something that very few politicians do, he retired voluntarily. Probably the one great mistake he made was when he decided to go back into politics later on, but he retired voluntarily, because in 1920 the young men were returning from World War I, or had recently returned, and there was in that community a young man who had made a distinct contribution to the war effort in those years, and I think it is characteristic of Bill Westwood that he decided that it was better, it was proper during the readjustment period that was bound to come that that fair constituency should be represented by one of these young men who had recently come back from overseas service, and so he willingly handed over the nomination to Major Bob Richardson, a name well-known here because later on Bob Richardson served in the provincial department of Agriculture with great distinction.

Now I should say, as our First Minister has already mentioned, that Bill Westwood was in every sense a Manitoban. He was born in the little district of Pendennis near Rapid City; he grew up there, like a couple of other distinguished members of this House whom modesty prevents me from naming; he attended Brandon College -- that's a great start for anybody -- the ones who did that really stand out in any community or any legislature -- and then he became a banker and he was a bank manager at the old Union Bank. Not many of the folks in this Chamber are old enough, I think, to remember the Union Bank even. It was in that capacity that he went to Roblin and he stayed with the bank for some time. I think again it was characteristic of the type of man that Bill Westwood was that he left the bank in order to go into public service, then he left the public service to hand over without any contest to a man that he thought could better represent the constituency under the circumstances then prevailing. Then it was characteristic of him, as the seconder has mentioned, that he threw himself completely and fully into community activities, became the Secretary-Treasurer of Shell River Municipality up in that area, became at another time the Mayor of the town or village of Roblin, and was a community citizen in every sense of the word. Then all who sit in this Chamber will understand when one relates that he went back into public life and from '32 to '36 he was here again, and the great experience that he had and the good judgement were shown in very many ways. I'm sure that it is a proper tradition of the House that we should pause in our busy work here looking after the affairs of today, to pay tribute to those who have served in this House on similar occasions. I am sure that we do not very often make those expressions of appreciation to the individual and condolences to the family for one who deserves it any more than Bill Westwood. He was a good citizen in every way, a very fine man, and in his later years he decided to move from Roblin to Russell. One of my honourable friends over on the other side of the House would say that was an improvement, the other would not be so sure. So that he joined down there one of those distinguished members that I spoke of a little while ago and I think he could tell the House that in that capacity he proved to have great ability too, that he invested in a very thriving business in that thriving town. So I join most sincerely with the expressions of appreciation for Mr. Westwood's service in this House and in his community,

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . to the province, and also with the sincere expressions of sympathy to the family.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): I feel I would be remiss in not expressing my condolences in this matter. I first met Bill Westwood in 1916 when he was at the bank in Roblin and afterwards in my capacity as district engineer I had very close contacts with Bill up until, in fact up until the time of his death. I met him and his very good wife here quite recently. The last time was about a year ago. I just wish to join with the other members in the House in expressing my thoughts of what a good citizen he was for the district he was in and for the Province of Manitoba, and I think I would just sum it up with these words, that he was a white man.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, while I do not know the deceased I know one of his sons quite well, intimately, and I feel that any father who raises sons of his calibre, that he has been doing a marvelous job, and I would at this time like to extend my sympathies to the bereaved.

MR. ROBERT G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a word to add to the tributes that have already been made to my friend Mr. Bill Westwood. When I came home from overseas and returned to my home town the Westwoods had taken over a hardware and furniture business in that town formerly operated by the W. J. Doig Estate. I had known one of Mr. Westwood's sons through activities in church organizations, but I did not know Mr. Westwood until I went home in 1950. At that time he led a rather quiet life for him. He was getting along in years and his boys were associated with him in the business, and as much as possible he let the boys run the business although father Westwood still kept a close eye on what was going on and careful control. Mr. Westwood was a very influential man. His wife tells me that for many, many years the only times she ever saw her husband were when he was on his way to a meeting or on his way home from a meeting. He was very active in most of the activities in the community, in particular the Red Cross, the United Church, the Masons, and the Chamber of Commerce, and it was my good fortune to serve with Mr. Westwood on the Resolutions Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Russell on two occasions. When I began to consider accepting a nomination for this office as Member of the Legislature, one of the people from whom I sought advice was Mr. Westwood, and he strongly recommended that I should run for public office but he did express certain regrets that I couldn't have chosen a different leader to follow.

He was a man who was known in the community differently to different people. To his contemporaries he was known as Bill; to people of my age he was almost universally called Mr. Westwood. He was a man who had a very strongly developed sense of humor -- he dearly loved a good story -- and on many occasions in the midst of a busy day my telephone would ring and it was Mr. Westwood just wanting to tell me the latest joke that he had heard from some traveller or someone who had dropped into the store. And I used to reciprocate on occasion. If I heard one that I thought Mr. Westwood would enjoy I would call him, and he enjoyed a laugh in the middle of a busy day.

During the last few years of his life he became quite ill and it became necessary for them to sell the family business, and Mr. Westwood spent nearly the last two years of his life in bed. He suffered extreme pain during all that time. I visited him on many occasions and in spite of the pain which he suffered I never ever found him anything but one of the most cheerful men I have ever met anywhere. He dearly loved to talk about the time he spent in this House and he nearly always reminded me that while he was here, on at least one occasion, he occupied desk No. 5, and he thought it rather interesting that I should have taken over that desk when my turn came.

He will be long remembered as an esteemed gentleman in our community, a man of whom we were all proud. He was my friend.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable members please rise for a moment's silence.

Orders of the Day.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to make an announcement of interest to the House and to the general public about the new issue of Manitoba Savings Bonds. An issue of Manitoba Savings Bonds series No. 2 will be made in the near future, to be dated April 1, 1962, and to mature April 1, 1972. An interest rate of 4 3/4% per annum on the nominal principal amount will be payable in each year commencing with the

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . year 1963. This represents a reduction of 1/4 of 1% from the interest rate payable on bonds of the 1961 series. The effective rate to maturity is now 4.99% as against 5.23% last year. This is a reflection of the changing bond market at the present time. Canada Savings Bonds in 1960 yielded 4.71% to maturity and in 1961 the yield was 4.60%. In view of this and the extremely good reception accorded to the 1961 series by the general public, we believe that the issue can be successfully marketed at this new rate. These bonds will be payable on demand at any date on or after October 1, 1962, at the office of the Deputy Provincial Treasurer or any chartered banks in the province, in accordance with the following schedule, and now I read the details of the ballooning effect that is a feature of our bond issues with respect to those who hold them for full maturity:

If presented for redemption on or before April 1, 1967, the price of 100.00; after that date but before April 1, 1968, the price of 100.50; April 1, 1969, a price of 101.00; April 1, 1970, a price of 101.50; April 1, 1971, a price of 102.00; April 1, 1972, a price of 102.50; and on or after maturity April 1, 1972, at a price of 103.00. The bonds will be issued in denominations of 100, 500, 1,000 and 5,000 dollars in fully registered form. Exchange for registered bonds of different denominations will be made on demand up to 15 days prior to an interest date without charge. There is a limitation of not more than \$25,000 that may be sold or registered in the name of an eligible purchaser who may be: (a) an individual in his own right, whether adult or minor, who is in the time of purchase a resident of the Province of Manitoba, or who has a permanent mailing address in the province, (b) an incorporated company having a registered office in the Province of Manitoba, and (c) an incorporated society, trust or association, having a registered office in the Province of Manitoba. This is the same provision made last year to restrict this bond to citizens of the province.

Applications will be received for this issue after the opening of business on Monday, March 19th. The province reserves the right to cease to receive applications at any time thereafter upon having given notice of not less than two full business days of our intention to do so. The issue is open-ended -- no total amount has been set. Provision for the sale to be concluded is on two full days business notice. The commission that will be paid to agents is 7/8 of 1%. This represents a reduction of 1/8th of 1% from the full 1% paid in the 1961 series. That is in keeping with our efforts to achieve the lowest cost to the people in respect to this issue, and is in line with agents' commissions earned on the issue of Canada Savings Bonds. The purpose of the issue will be to finance capital expenditures, such as roads, water control and conservation, and similar activities of that sort which the House passes on from time to time. There is a 3% sinking fund set up with respect to the redemption of these bonds as was the case in the previous issue. I think, Mr. Speaker, that those are the salient facts that the public would like to know with respect to this second issue of Manitoba Savings Bonds.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to thank the Minister for the statement he made. I think it very fitting that he should make it to the House before the bonds go on sale, of course. I think the House would be interested in knowing the total amount which the government anticipates to raise by this method. I notice that there is a change from last year whereby they can cease the sale on two days' notice. I think this is a very desirable item and glad to see that my honourable friends have profited from last year's sale when this actually should have been included or a specific amount set. Not having done so I think it resulted in some difficulties for them. With this present method this should be corrected. I note too that they have continued the practice of last year of limitations to individuals. I presume that again these will not be transferrable and that the only means of redemption would be through the government itself and that they could not become held in large amounts by any corporations or any banks whereby the government would be faced with a sudden redemption of a large amount on any occasion. I think those are the only comments I want to make at this time, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to know the total amount the government anticipates raising at this time.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that for once I cannot agree with the Leader of the Liberal Party. No. 1, why a limit? I know it's the orthodox way of selling bonds but we are not professional brokers and we need the money, the people want to buy, and as I stated once before a lot of them go out begging on the market. We have people that are anxious to buy provincial bonds knowing that security is better than any other bond in the world -- all the credit the government wants. You have the province behind it; you have the



(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . people behind it; you have the millions of acres of land behind it and so on. That's question number one. Question number two, why give away almost 1% to the brokers? A clerk in your office, the Provincial Treasurer's office can do the very same thing as the brokers, and if you happen to sell \$50,000 or \$50 million or \$100 million, you're giving away 1% almost, \$1 million for exchange which is absolutely not necessary based on the experience. I knew it before that; I advocated for years, but based on the experience of last year, I don't think you need to give anybody any commission for helping to sell bonds which the people are begging to buy -- are begging to buy. Your limitation of \$25,000 may be all right, because you don't want one or two people or half a dozen people grab all the bonds. They have the money, the interest is good, the security is good, so the \$25,000 limit is perhaps a very fine thing, but not to limit the amount. Limit the amount to sell, but not to limit the number of \$25,000 or \$5,000 bonds to sell. And finally I would suggest if it's not too late, make the denominations small; let everybody in the province have an interest; let everybody in the province have a share in the province. Let them buy. Some people may have \$500.00, \$1,000.00 and so on. I think that this should be made not under the strict code of the so-called brokers and bankers. We are representatives of the people; we sell the bonds to our own people; they're willing to buy. No limit. Sell it to them. You need the money -- here's a good chance for you to have it and give the interest back to your own taxpayers.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is a 10-year term bond, to mature in '72, yet the First Minister told us that they're setting up a three percent sinking fund. How do you reconcile the two?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if I may have the indulgence of the House I'll try and answer some of the questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other member wish to speak? The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: I'll deal with the points in order of presentation. I would like to say that the Leader of the Opposition and I will probably continue to disagree about whether or not we got too much money last time. We don't think we did and we're quite prepared when we get back on this subject to demonstrate to my honourable friend in dollars and cents that we didn't and therefore we are not at all embarrassed by the thought that this particular bond issue may be popular. However, my honourable friend is quite right when he says that we have changed the provisions for the cut-off date. Last year the cut-off date was two full days' notice but not effective for a five-day period after the opening of the issue. This year we have eliminated that 5-day waiting period and will be able to cut it off sooner than we did last time.

I do not know how much money we will get. We are coming in with a different term, a different proposition than we had last time, and I for one would not care to prophesy how much money we will get. If you ask me how much can we use, I would say that we can use anyway 20 to 25 million and we'll see what happens. With respect of the question of transferability, my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition is correct, that this is non-transferable and the limit in the hands of any one person or corporation is to be \$25,000.00

Referring to my honourable friend the Member for Inkster, let me say that I appreciate the support that he has always given to us in connection with these savings bonds. He's always been an advocate of them and I think that his wisdom in that course has been demonstrated by the facts. I would say to him that the limit of \$100,000 -- that's the smallest amount you can purchase -- I think makes this reasonably available to citizens generally throughout the province. You can buy them in denominations of \$100, \$500, or \$1,000 or \$5,000 so that pretty well covers the requirements, I think, of any class of borrower. My honourable friend says we shouldn't pay commission to the agents who sell them. Well, we have to pay that because we do need their assistance, their valuable assistance in distributing these bonds. Our rate is 7/8 of 1%, and incidentally I would tell him that the rate in Saskatchewan is a full one percent. In the Province of Saskatchewan, where they have a similar bond to ours, they have found it necessary to pay their agents and we find it necessary too, but our rate is somewhat lower than theirs.

With respect to the Honourable Member for Rhineland, I would point out to him that the rate of -- the rate of -- what word am I thinking of -- the rate of sinking fund about which he speaks is 3% and it is of course quite obvious that 3% will not retire a 10-year bond. That,

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . of course, is a customary situation which I think he will find with all classes of bonds, that there's no necessary relationship between the sinking fund percentage and the time which the bond matures. For example, in our Hydro Bonds they are perhaps a 20-year bonds, but they have, I think, a 1% or a 1 1/2 or 2% sinking fund position, because the life of the asset is considerably more than 20 years and there's that relationship between sinking funds and life of the asset. I should think that we will be using this form of financing for some time, and if we do we get roll-overs of amounts that have to be refunded at the time or the period that the bond is expired. So it seems to me that this is quite a usual provision in respect of these bonds. I think those answer the questions, Mr. Speaker, that were asked.

HON. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Minister of Welfare)(Portage la Prairie): Before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House a return to an order, dated Friday, March 2nd on a motion from the Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . question the Minister of Welfare. Yesterday in answer to a question from myself, he indicated that the revisions to the Social Allowances Act were now under study and that the committee would meet this week. Can he tell the House when he anticipates the study will be completed?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: The committee, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, met yesterday and they considered the subject of the regulations to the Social Allowances Act. The report of that committee approved the suggested amendments by the Director of Welfare and they also studied the advisability of further amendments, but they reached no conclusion on that subject.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to address some questions to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the government received request for a grant from the City of Winnipeg for urban renewal at the Jarvis-Main Street area? Question number two, has the government received request for a grant from the City of Winnipeg on some rebuilding at the Jarvis-Main Street area? Number three, has it received a request for grant from the City of Winnipeg on the Burrows-Keewatin Housing Development?

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend suggests that I should answer this question. The answer to all three questions, to the best of my knowledge, is no.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. It is my understanding that the Director of Housing and Urban Renewal for the City of Winnipeg made a report to the finance committee of the City of Winnipeg, I think some time in December, on the matter of housing and urban renewal. Has the government seen a copy of this report?

MR. ROBLIN: I can't answer that question, Mr. Speaker. It is possible they may have, because sometimes at the technical level there are exchanges of which we are not aware. All I can say is that no official representations have been made to us in respect of this matter that I am aware of.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's edition of the Free Press there was a heading on a story, "Free legal aid gateway to prison, says ex-convict." The story deals with a convict who spent eight years in the penitentiary who is claiming that the Legal Aid Society is a gateway to prison and issues some maliciously unfair and untrue statements about the lawyers who are assisting people who haven't got the money to seek legal aid. I think the statement is grossly unfair to these people and I think it will intend to discourage lawyers who are assisting people who get into difficulty with legal assistance, and I would like to suggest to the Attorney-General that he issue a statement refuting these comments by this convict so that the people of this province are not misguided by these statements. The liberty of the House -- I'd just like to cite one instance just to show you how unfair some of these people are. A short time ago a man sought legal aid and he was granted one of the better lawyers in the province to help him. This lawyer was fired by him and then he came back to the Legal Aid Society to ask them to appoint another lawyer and the lawyer that he had fired was one of the more prominent lawyers in this city.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General & Minister of Public Utilities) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, this is one of those happy occasions when I can agree with the Honourable Member from St. George, and I think he will agree with me though when I say that not too many

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . people will place too much stock in the statement that was contained in yesterday's paper.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Monsieur l'orateur depuis plusieurs années le député de St-Boniface se fait le porte-parole de la Société Saint Jean-Baptiste pour inviter tous les membres de la législature à une soirée annuelle.

Mr. Speaker, this year again, in the name of the Society Saint Jean Baptiste, I would like to invite all the members of this House as well as the members of the press gallery to the Annual Pea Soup Night to be held this year in St. Boniface at the Circle Ouvrier at 8:00 P.M. on Wednesday March 28th, and I am sure that those who have visited at these evenings in the past will want to be there. Thank you.

MR. ROBLIN: Je sais que je parle pour toute la Chambre en acceptant la gentille invitation de notre collègue le membre pour Saint Boniface.

I know that I speak for the whole House in accepting the very kind invitation of our colleague, the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. PAULLEY: As one of the representatives from that great city of St. Boniface I join with the Honourable Member from St. Boniface in extending this invitation. Over the past years we have always enjoyed ourselves in the Circle Ouvrier and I am sure that there is in store for the members of the Assembly, the members of the press and others who come to this affair the usual warm, congenial, amicable reception that only the likes of the City of St. Boniface can extend to its guests.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to bring to the attention of the House a matter which I think we all take pride in, that is the success of our local troop here, the Cercle Moliere in the semi-finals at the Drama Festival held in Fort William. Once again they obtained the highest recognition there, first prizes.

J'aimerais en cette occasion aussi, monsieur l'orateur, souligner que le groupe du Cercle Moliere fait honneur non seulement à tous les gens de la province du Manitoba mais en plus je crois à tous les groupes de caractère français de l'ouest canadien. Il me fait plaisir de souligner qu'ils se sont encore couverts de gloire en cette occasion suivant leur tradition du passe dois je ajouter. La directrice Madame Pauline Boutal, l'acteur Robert Trudel et l'actrice Monique Guyot ont tous mérites le plus haut prix chacun dans leur catégorie respective. J'aimerais souligner en cette occasion en plus que Mademoiselle Guyot est originaire de mon propre village de Sainte Rose du Lac. Nous félicitons tous ces artistes et la troupe en cette occasion.

I would like to take this opportunity also, Mr. Speaker, to underline that the Cercle Moliere honours not only the people of Manitoba but as well I believe all the groups of French character in Western Canada. It pleases me to emphasize that they were again this time covered with glory following their tradition I might add. The director Mrs. Pauline Boutal, the actor Robert Trudel and the actress Monique Guyot each won the highest award in their respective categories. I would also like to point out that Miss Guyot hails from my own village of Ste. Rose du Lac. We congratulate all these artists and the group as a whole on the occasion of their triumph.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think it's entirely fitting that my honourable friend should direct our attention to this notable dramatic triumph. I had the good fortune to be able to wish Madame Boutal Godspeed and good luck before she set out from Winnipeg for the Head of the Lakes, and I felt pretty confident that when the results were known they would be highly satisfactory to the people of Manitoba in general and the citizens of St. Boniface in particular. And it is indeed a pleasure to be able to join with the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in extending our congratulations and good wishes to a troop which has persevered through many difficulties to achieve that level of dramatic excellence which is represented by that accomplishment.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Address for papers. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that an Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for (1) the names and addresses of all members of the different Government appointed Boards and Commissions. (2) the names and addresses of all members now serving on Committees established by an order-in-council. (3) the individual annual salaries, allowances and expenses of all these members. (4) the total annual cost of all salaries, allowances and expenses paid

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . to members of all other Government appointed committees.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think we can accept Orders 1, 2 and 3 but Item No. 4 presents a great many difficulties, because there are a great many committees of a multitude of varieties, inter-departmental and all other different sorts, that I think it would be not practical for us to undertake to obtain that information, but we certainly would be glad to get the first three questions for the honourable member.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, before placing this order, this address for papers, as you will recall we asked this brought in to the House earlier and the then Leader of the House told us that this would be acceptable and this is why this was worded as such.

MR. ROBLIN: I appreciate my honourable friend's attitude in that respect.

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

MR. SPEAKER: This brings us to the point on the Order Paper where we have an amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye to a motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Inkster.

I might bring to the attention of the House, first of all, that the amendment is not as yet formally before the House. It has not been as yet proposed to the Chair. I might say that I am sure that the members of the House are anxious to know what disposition will be made of this motion. I might say that I have given it considerable thought and I have consulted some people who were learned in the law, and I have changed somewhat my original opinions in regard to this motion. I might say that the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, while it deals with the same subject matter in essence it only asks this government to approach the Federal Government to enact and administer a contributory old-age pension plan. The motion permits the Federal Government, that is the constitutional motion permits the Federal Government to enact a contributory old age pension plan, while the other motion requests them to do so. I might say that the constitutional motion if it's passed by all of the parliaments in Canada will enable the Government of Canada to approach Westminster for a change in the British North America Act. If all of the provinces pass the constitutional resolution that is now before this Chamber it will give unanimous consent, all of the provinces, to this motion which will enable the Federal Government by unanimous consent of the provinces to permit the Federal Government to enact a contributory old-age pension plan.

Now this amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye is not as yet formally before the House because it has not been proposed to the House and in order to avoid two questions on the same subject matter to be debated at the one time with all the confusion and misunderstanding that would result, I propose to hold the amendment in my name until the House has disposed of the constitutional amendment. I would at the next sitting of the House, after the constitutional amendment has been disposed of, put the motion and formally bring it before the House for debate.

The amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye to the motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster, first appeared to me to be out of order. The constitutional amendment to the British North America Act proposed by the Minister of Welfare on the same subject matter is almost identical in language. The constitutional amendment however is necessary before any action can be taken on the subject matter by the Federal Government. Clause (a) uses the same language as the other amendment. However, if the Government of Canada succeeds in getting amendment to the British North America Act from Westminster as stated in the resolution, they will then have the power to enact legislation with respect to the further benefits. However, if all legislatures pass the constitutional amendment, they will have unanimous consent to proceed with one clause of the paragraph, one of the resolution, and would not have to go to Westminster for this amendment to the British North America Act.

This resolution in simple form gives the Government of Canada the power or right to deal with the matter of a graduated old-age pension on a contributory basis. The amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye asks this Chamber to request the Federal Government to do just that, so I believe that if I hold the resolution until the constitutional resolution is disposed of, that that should be the proper course that I should take.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may just ask a question on the subject. I presume then that the present resolution which is before the House will also be held. There will be no debate

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . . on it any more than on the proposed amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: No, my thinking on the matter is that we should proceed and dispose of the constitutional amendment before the House, and the Session after that has taken place that the amendment should be placed before the House for consideration.

MR. MOLGAT: When you say Session, Mr. Speaker, I take it you mean . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Sitting of the House.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, do I understand as the result of, not exactly your ruling, but your suggestion to the House that any further debate be not proceeded with in respect of the main motion standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that that would follow, that the main motion would not be debatable when the other is attached to it. So if we have the agreement of the House, we'll proceed to the Adjourned Debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. E. I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, rising to speak on this resolution in regard to uniform time in the Province of Manitoba, I've had the privilege on many occasions of attending municipal conventions. Both the Union of Manitoba municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association have on several occasions had resolutions similar to this presented to them by various municipalities, asking that some type of uniform time be established within the province. Unanimously last year, both these conventions passed a similar resolution. At no time, Sir, have I heard the relative good of standard time as against daylight saving time debated. It's more the confusion and concern of people living distances from the City of Winnipeg on the difference in times, that they can't complete their business, they are an hour short as far as they're concerned in arriving in Winnipeg, and the other case is the difficulties that have arisen with the long daylight time being invoked for the last few years in Winnipeg with regard to the school children, in going to school and the overlapping districts.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, I realize that it is difficult for the Province of Manitoba to legislate for a time zone inasmuch as this is a federal matter and my understanding is that the Central Daylight Time now is established by the fact that the City of Winnipeg passed a recommendation that the civic clocks go on one hour at certain periods of the year and then everybody within the area follows suit. I believe, Sir, that the lack of leadership, should I put it that way, that the inconvenience and hardships that have been created has another factor that I don't believe is understood too well in Winnipeg. There's an economic value to the City of Winnipeg that are driving potential customers to other sources for supplies that is being caused by this change and difference in time. And I honestly believe, Sir, that regardless of whether this province wishes to take leadership in daylight time or whether they wish to take a combination of times, I'm not too sure that that has any great argument of value. I think the whole value is that we should have a uniform time within the Province of Manitoba so that all people can work and act under it. Personally I feel that representations have been made from these two well-known municipal organizations; they have been unanimous; they have not discussed the merits of one time as against the other, but they're asking this province to set up -- a uniform time be established in the Province of Manitoba. Now this resolution does call for a compromising feature in joining the two, that central time be from 1st of September to May 31st and that daylight time be from 1st of June to 31st of August. Now, Sir, I believe that in most cases, particularly in the rural area, that the people would be very agreeable and would accept this type of a compromise. But surely, Sir, they will not accept a longer term where it's going to start in April and go to October, and I think, too, you can take that the City of Brandon have now -- they did try central daylight time for a period -- have now gone back and abandoned the fact that they're going to use it. I think that they have felt that it has cost the City of Brandon a considerable amount of money and business within the community as well as the inconvenience to the surrounding people. And, Sir, I would like the House to give full support to the fact that this province and this Legislature should give some leadership in the fact of establishing uniform time throughout the Province of Manitoba.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded -- (Interjection) -- who's that? Well go ahead. Well, I want to adjourn the debate. If you wish to speak, go ahead.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): If it's permissible I'd like to speak before the adjournment of the debate -- (Interjection) -- I'm just waiting to see next year, possibly a resolution is going to pop up that the sun shouldn't rise at 5 o'clock in the morning, it should rise at

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) . . . 3 o'clock and set at 11 o'clock at night. That's my personal view. Naturally we are fooling ourselves with this daylight time, standard time -- I just can't understand this. Absolutely not, because in the early days we carried on on the same clock, of the same time, and the sun was rising at the same time, and setting as it is now, and yet we want to fool ourselves with one hour, or two hours, three months, four months of the year. To me it sounds ridiculous. As far as I'm concerned in the early days I remember when our clock at home used to stop, how did we find out to know when it's noon hour? We'd make a clock on a piece of paper and put the needle and then let mother nature state when it was 12 o'clock. And I'm very much surprised those people who want to get up earlier, who stops them? Let their employer call them 7 o'clock to the employment office; let them leave 4 o'clock and that's well done. Now we dicker here in this Legislature over the timetable which we haven't got no control. Next thing we know we will want the moon up to September; we won't want the seasonal weather to come along -- boy, I wish we could have that power. Well what we do, we fool ourselves with the hands of the clock. That's ridiculous in my opinion. And as far as the farmers are concerned, for example the school students--some people living closer to the city they have to take their high school students one hour earlier, the elementary school out in the country, one hour later. You handicap these parents. They've got to get up earlier, then they go home, pick up the smaller children, drive them back to school. The railway people operate on standard time. Now you have two timetables here in the city, for the city people, and I'm as sure as I'm standing here in this Legislature that if you would have a referendum here in the City alone today you would lose out. We would come back to the standard time as we should have it. And as far as the farmer is concerned he doesn't need to have daylight time, saving time, standard time -- he works around the clock from sun to sun and then he lights his tractor and he goes out in the field. Now, if we want to be so democratic, legislators here in the Province of Manitoba, we're going to do justice for the Province of Manitoba, let's do it on a province-wide referendum and see what happens. And I'm surprised, and I must reiterate, that to me it sounds ridiculous that we here are contemplating speeding the daylight. How can you speed the daylight? To mother nature the sun is always at the same time -- it's ridiculous.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GRAY: Anyone else wish to speak? I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, 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 Elmwood. The Honourable the Minister of Health.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I must get uniform standard out of my veins before I get going. In speaking to this resolution I wish to, in proposing the amendment, which I will, after speaking on this matter, I wish to assure the Member for Elmwood that I think his resolution is a very worthwhile one at this time in the development of meat processing in Canada and I take it in that spirit.

However, on the one hand while, as we know -- I wanted the House to know and share with the House, the fact that the entire matter of meat inspection which is traditionally a responsibility of the Department of Agriculture, the federal department, is at present the subject of very extensive discussion between the federal government and the government of Manitoba, and while we have reached no conclusions yet in our discussions, they are proceeding vigorously and I'd like to comment on these, and every effort is being made to establish a workable plan by which the public will be assured that the meat they buy is entirely safe.

I would like to bring it to the House's attention that the department have been concerned in this area now since 1958, in fact the Department of Health has been interested in and concerned with the operation of small meat and poultry establishments since that time. Actually it goes back to the time of the development of the local health units during the forties when it became possible for health officers and sanitary inspectors to work directly with the operators concerned. To start with there were within the province 200 slaughtering establishments in the early forties, and many of them were so small that they didn't even warrant the most modest investment necessary to reach the simple minimum standards of that day. And following the second World War a certain amount of consolidation resulted with the rural electrification and the development of frozen food locker plants and all-season transportation, and at this time the

(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd.) . . . . Department of Health was consequently able to focus its attention to dwindling numbers of these rural slaughterhouses, and by 1960 these had been reduced to 55 in number. Now some of the plants located in larger communities, and they processed a sufficient volume of animals to allow the unit, working with the local authorities, to arrange meat inspection with the local veterinarian. This happens in some of your larger rural communities. The same inspection has not been possible in the smaller establishments, making it necessary to confine health safety activities to sanitation inspection.

I would point out to the Members of the House that in '52 I believe the legislation was changed at that time to put the onus of inspection at the municipal level. The municipalities actually licensed the slaughterhouses and the feeling seems to be going back again now that the local health unit authorities of the municipalities are contributing to the establishment of the health units -- which they are, as you know, approximately a third -- that this should probably go back to the provincial level and take them off this responsibility. And this is a matter which again has been active in the last two years and the reason for what I'm -- as it will come out here.

Now whereas the technology of handling the meat has changed very little there has been what amounts to a revolution in the poultry industry. The rapid consumer acceptance of fresh and frozen eviscerated poultry has demanded development of new poultry evisceration plants. The fact that a large part of the market is located outside Manitoba has forced most of these plants to reach Canada approved for any interprovincial trade. It can therefore be stated -- in 1961 our study showed that over 90% of poultry was federally inspected and Canada-approved. The Health Department and the health units have played an important key role in promoting and guiding this transition.

Now it has been recognized for a few years, as I said earlier, since 1958 when we began to do a lot of thinking in this area, that a long-range program was absolutely necessary to support the local health units authorities. Now because the recommendations of the Health Department are dependent on the extension of Canada-approved veterinarian inspection service, the department's first activity has been to consider carefully all the implications throughout the province of the Canada-approved program, the mandatory program. In addition to the Health Department, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Industry and Commerce in the government are vitally concerned, the Department of Agriculture and Conservation in their concern for the primary producer, and Industry and Commerce with the industrial development program. Now the Ministers of these departments after instituting their own studies following the Health Department studies, have now agreed that fundamental recommendations can be made. The Department of Health's recommendations to me were shared with the other two departments at the Deputy-Minister level, and they were asked to come forward with some recommendations which we could follow, and we have asked the federal government to arrange a meeting for complete discussion of the recommendations. We have had correspondence now over the past few months. To date Canada-approved inspection services has been restricted as you mentioned -- the Honourable Member from Elmwood mentioned -- to large-volume operations. Our own program in Manitoba depends on how much the Canada-approved program can be made applicable to the smaller volume establishments. Most certainly the present minimum volume requirement of 1,000 animals, of so many employees, will have to be reduced in order to give a comprehensive program throughout Manitoba. I think the minimum of 1,000 head per month or 12 employees is quite impractical in these areas where we're consolidated. Alternatively it is equally evident that the operations of a series of small operators may have to be co-ordinated to allow one inspector to supervise several establishments on a schedule basis. We hope to convince the federal government that their employees now completing their brucellosis program, which we think will be to the end of March this year, would be retained and utilized for meat inspection. This is one of the things we are hoping for.

It must be understood that a change of this magnitude can't be done overnight. For this reason we have set our sights on a three-year program. An adjustment period of this duration will in particular be necessary for certain of this secondary meat processors, some of whom will have problems in meeting federal standards. During this time the Department of Health will be heavily involved, providing guidance to the small establishments aspiring to the Canada Approved standard. This will entail important co-operation and co-ordination with the Federal

(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd.) . . . . Health of Animals Branch since some small operators, with experience in this area, will inevitably look to the department for assistance. So the three departments, having reviewed all the recommendations from the Division of Food Control and then their own departments from the producer level and from industry's concept, made recommendations to the Department of Health, and it was determined that our Director of Health--Food Health--the Bureau of Food Control should carry forward this to the federal government, that a further request be made to the Honourable Mr. Monteith, Minister of National Health and Welfare asking for an early meeting to discuss meat inspection again. He has written to us some time ago, asking if we thought a meeting--the clandestine affair in Ontario occurred just about when our committee was working on the recommendations and we had a letter from Ottawa at that time saying in view of the clandestine affair in Ontario would we consider this important? Well, we have on six or seven occasions in the past year had unofficial talks, our deputies, with federal officials, with respect to meat inspection and with respect to the program we thought should be instituted in our province, and we are continuing this and have made very firm recommendations along these lines I have indicated. Specifically we want to continue our negotiations.

Number two, that request be made at the meeting when we do meet with the federal authorities, we want the existing volume requirement to obtain Canada Approved standards to be eliminated to allow certain smaller plants to qualify. Secondly, that the Canada Department of Agriculture provide assistance in assessing what improvements are necessary in small existing plants to qualify for Canada Approved and detailed requirements for new small establishments. I would point out here that we see a lot of consolidation going on. We would have to bring the municipalities into the advanced stage. They are now the licensing agent. There's going to have to be a re-assessment there once we get federal approval. We don't want to duplicate Canada Approved by a provincial meat inspection service because this will eliminate inter-provincial trade. I mean, meat moving out.

Thirdly, we can't get the specifications to date from the federal authorities as to what constitutes the minimum specifications for a processing plant for instance, to achieve Canada Approved. These are the things we're asking for. Give us the specifications so that we can work over a three-year period with the small operator at the municipal level if necessary, to create a Canada Approved plan. At the provincial level we can go out and help these people. We can go out with technical knowledge which we will receive both from Ottawa and ourselves. We can go out with possibly the Development Fund or other resources to assist in some areas, and we certainly feel that this can't be done overnight but we set a target of three years working with these people to bring them up to Canada Approved. Now two years ago, as the committee may know, the House may know, we started a similar program with fish, in bringing our fish-handling establishments up to Canada Approved standard, and we did this by approaching industry, getting the specifications and our local health unit people working with the industry at the local level to bring the standards of fish handling, refrigeration, plant sanitation up to this proper level, and it's working very well. There's just been some magnificent things happening in the fish industry which I had the pleasure of seeing last year. Therefore the committee have recommended that we pursue these matters with Ottawa, that we can provide this extension service locally, that we contact these small operators, and that we do it on a three-year basis, and that in meeting with the municipal officials we might entertain further legislation.

However, I want the House to realize that since the Health Department has been concerned with this area since 1958 and in the studies to date, we have been on top of this to a degree that we have never been on top of it before, and we are beginning to see our way to what we think is a reasonable and satisfactory solution for all concerned, that we can take a lot of satisfaction from the fact that 80% of meat consumed in this province is Canada Approved, that over 90% of poultry is Canada Approved. We must temper this with the knowledge that as recently as 20 years ago we had 200 slaughterhouses, that we had the beef rings until 1957; we had 16 beef rings in 1955; we had two in 1958; so modernization has come in at a very great rate and it was because we saw this problem in '58 that we started showing our concern. In short, the problem is recognized. We must involve the Federal Department of Agriculture in Canada Approved; we don't want duplication of inspection. It's going to mean--we have solid recommendations to make when we meet with the federal authorities and we have communicated our volume requirements



(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd.) . . . . . to them. We feel that certain areas in this province, it just isn't practical to follow present regulations. We do want to know what Canada specifications are and we do want some assurance that some of these smaller plants can be serviced. As a matter of fact the department feel that if they could raise some of these plants up to--have them licensed--bring them to Canada Approved--possibly a Veterinary Meat Inspection Service could be developed where a man would spend one day in each plant on a circuit. After clearance with Ottawa and with the Federal Department of Agriculture, Health of Animals Division, if we can get our way, then I think we must then come back and plan--bring the municipalities into the picture and proceed with our program.

So while I certainly feel the member from Elmwood has made a very positive contribution in bringing this matter before the Legislature, I would like to at this time, in view of what I have said, propose an amendment to the resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The first two sections, the first "whereas" of his resolution, if I may, I would like to break up into two "whereases" and delete the--a change in the third section and deleting the fourth paragraph, so the resolution would then read: Whereas the health and well-being of the people of the Province of Manitoba are a major concern and whereas one way of insuring this is by insisting that all meat and meat products be inspected by Federal Government inspectors, and whereas this service is provided by the Federal Government on a voluntary basis, therefore be it resolved that the Province of Manitoba continue its negotiations with the Federal Government towards increasing the scope of its inspection service and relaxing the existing volume requirement in order to obtain Canada Approved inspection of smaller slaughtering and processing plants. I move this resolution as stated, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the intention of the Minister to add this on to the motion?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): No, it's--this resolution is an amendment to the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member from Elmwood. You could actually leave the same "whereas" as it is. I just broke it up into two because health and well-being seemed to me to be plural, "are of major concern"; it doesn't matter. The first one could stay, the other is changed somewhat.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . you take the amendment in your hands. I can appreciate the fact that my honourable friend hasn't suggested in this amendment certain deletions and additions. I am sure that it would meet with our satisfaction that if you kept it in your hand and then it can be presented to the House in its proper form.

MR. SPEAKER: It would appear that the motion is in its final form as amended, and with the permission of the House, I would undertake to sort it out in its proper form and put it on the Order Paper.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, and I think it is a point of order, I would suggest that that was a good idea because evidently the intention of the Honourable the Minister is quite clear but I would think that the amendment is not proposed in the ordinary form so I'd suggest that would be a good disposition of the matter. Mr. Speaker I was going to ask if I could ask the Honourable the Minister a question. Is it the intention of the Minister and his department in the negotiations that they are carrying on or are planning with the federal department to go as far as this present resolution suggests?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): . . . . . resolution or the one I am proposing?

MR. CAMPBELL: No, I am not dealing with the amendment at the moment. I am asking a question of the Honourable the Minister as to the negotiations that he and his department are carrying on with the Federal Department. Are they considering going the distance that this resolution suggests?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I am trying to amend the resolution to say that we continue our negotiations with Ottawa towards working towards a Canada Approved standard within this province, but making it possible for smaller slaughtering houses to comply with these Canada Approved regulations by bringing down volume requirements. We say in our submission to the federal authorities we can't do this overnight in Manitoba. Nobody can. We do feel that we have to work with the people at the local level in order to bring this about. We have to involve municipalities. We are trying to avoid duplicating any provincial service with what the federal may be able to provide. By no means do we go in to the extent that the resolution would indicate here but as the resolution says that the government ask the federal

(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd.) . . . . . government to consider the advisability of making all meat and meat products processed for human consumption liable for inspection on a compulsory basis. We think we have to bring out the points, the recommendations of our sub-committees, of our three deputies, and the report we have from the field, and temper this with the program as I have indicated we have initiated in fish. It is working. Industry becomes aware of it.

We think that many of these things are not too hard to achieve in the local level in the field if we can just get these specifications; what do these people have to do in the small plant to come up to a Canada Approved? What are these specifications? Once we have this information and can go to the local level and get the reaction, I think then we have to decide on our final report.

MR. CAMPBELL: I am not in any way trying to embarrass the Honourable the Minister. I am just trying to get the point clear. He has come very close to answering my question and I guess in order to get him closer, I'll have to phrase the question a little differently. May I ask the Honourable the Minister if his department is making representation to the federal department that deal with inspections at other than the slaughterhouses and packing plants. In other words, quite frankly at the level of those different livestock products that are prepared right on the farm.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): We are mainly concerned here with beef products--resale of meat. Certainly we don't want to interfere with the practise of butchering on the farm for local consumption, but we would like, through a process of education with--this is a role, I think, we as the provincial government should play with regional--I would like to see eventually regional slaughterhouses established where custom killing could be done, but certainly this is the long range view, and it seems to be coming to that anyway from our trends in rural Manitoba. But we want to--certainly this is all the meat that is for resale.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Could I ask the Minister a question? True, we understand this inspection process can't come overnight, but I was wondering what assurance the Minister's department is going to give us about looking after the health and welfare of the people of Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the problem is recognized by this department, and never before in the history of the province of Manitoba has the amount of Canada Approved Meat and Poultry been sold in this province as is being sold now. The health of the people has, I would venture--the guess coming from a member of a government accused of bias over public relations and so on. We think that our people in the department have been only too aware with this, as I've tried to indicate today, since 1958, when detailed studies began. We do recognize the problems in the industry; we recognize the problem of the local primary producers; we recognize the problem of small industry; and we recognize the value in achieving the very most excellent program we can; but we say we can't do this overnight and no government or agency can protect the public against unscrupulous individuals such as happened in Ontario. This is beyond the pale of anyone. It's just like putting poison in a baby's milk. Nobody can prevent this sort of thing, if people are going to do it. We are trying to indicate that, in the meantime and over the past years, the health units, inspectors and medical personnel have tried to work with the local communities in carrying out sanitary inspection services of these plants. In many of the larger centres the local municipalities license them, after they launch such a slaughter house and after the medical officer of health has inspected it. In these cases, local veterinary services have been laid on at the slaughtering time. However, we must work towards this. As I said earlier, I think the resolution is a very timely one and I am not critical of it. We all want to achieve excellence in this field and I think the main thing is that we are on top of it; we are negotiating; we have a clear-cut plan to offer the federal authorities; and we're going to try and do it.

MR. SPEAKER: I now have the motion in proper form. Moved by the Honourable Minister of Health, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the motion be amended by striking out all of the words after the word "Manitoba" in the second line thereof and substituting the following: "area major concern; and whereas one way of ensuring this is by instituting that all meats and meat products be inspected by the federal government inspectors; and whereas this service is provided by the federal government on a voluntary basis; therefore

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd.) . . . . . be it resolved that the Province of Manitoba continue its negotiations with the federal government towards increasing the scope of its inspection service and relaxing the existing volume requirement in order to obtain Canada Approved inspection of smaller slaughtering and processing plants".

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a few brief comments on this resolution. In the first place, to offer my compliments to the Honourable Member for Selkirk on such a concise and clear explanation of the basis upon which this matter rests. He has raised an important matter and one that is of continuing concern, I think, to all people in Manitoba. I want to thank him and accept the terms that he proposed and that is that this would be discussed on its merits. He himself refrained from bringing the matter of controversy into it and I am only too pleased to respond as well as I can in the same tone of voice.

Certainly Manitoba is dependent for its present trade and for any extensions of trade very largely on achieving reductions in costs of transportation. This resolution calls for increased competition in the field of providing transportation, at least with respect to the coasting rates on the Great Lakes, and in doing so would tend to lower prices. As such, we must all accept that principle and agree with the purpose of this motion, and that is to lessen this competition and call for resistance to this arrangement which is being proposed.

The general position of the province of Manitoba was established very firmly before the Spence Commission that was initiated by the former administration. On assuming office, we reviewed the presentations that had been made at that time and I found that I agreed with them and with the position that had been taken. So I wish now to compliment the honourable member for bringing forward this resolution; to say that we agree with it in our group on this side of the House; and that I propose to vote for it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): 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 Fisher. The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. KLYM: Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that probably we should not be discussing federal issues in this House. However, as brought about by the resolution of the Honourable Member for Fisher the other day, I was somewhat tempted to analyze the said resolution. To my immediate observation it appeared to me that the honourable member had confused the whole issue both right and left. He seemed to have been in reverse gear trying to go ahead. He stated in his resolution that the three main farm grains are far too low in price and so forth, but to my observation and I think to everybody in this House, the Federalization Act and the machinery of it does not control prices or anything of that type as far as the grains are concerned. The grain is controlled by the machinery of the Canadian Wheat Board. Therefore, I think there's a great big misconception of the whole thing on the part of the member who spoke on that the other day.

Now while speaking about grains, I might as well bring to the attention of this House that not too long ago the Canadian Wheat Board had raised the price of wheat by a dime, and just during the week-end, the wheat was again raised to the extent of about 12-1/2¢ per bushel. So it appeared to me right there that the wheat price is going up, and especially so is the oats and the barley. The oats especially today are at a fairly high price. We find that the people who are raising cattle, hogs, etcetera, find themselves in a rather peculiar situation because they find that the prices are quite high as compared with previous prices of the grain, and they find it hard to get these at a fair price to feed their stock. Today our wheat is priced, I think, in exactly today's paper, at \$1.90; compared with 1957, \$1.68. That is the initial price of the

(Mr. Klym, cont'd.) . . . . . Wheat Board. Oats are 93-1/2¢ and barley is \$1.46. Now we must also understand the fact that the Canadian Wheat Board always gives us dividends or, as they say, participation payments throughout the year. Now on the oats, I think not too long ago, we happened to receive one lump sum of 16-1/2% per bushel, as compared with about 3 and 4 cents of previous years. So you can pretty well say that the price of that commodity is pretty well in line with other agricultural prices. Farm income, Mr. Speaker, is not down because of prices but because of reduced yield of the last few years, especially 1961.

Now again, when we talk about other commodities besides grain, we find that pork is up in price. Just lately it's been up I think by about a cent. Now we are all told go back to that old commodity which is rather fragile, sometimes probably it is hard to find a place to write out a cheque on it as was done by somebody in the east the other day, and that's the eggs. Egg producers seem to be in difficulties all the time, especially here in the west, and the west is really the place where we can over-produce many of those commodities because of the scarcity of people living in very large centres that would be able to use these. Now eggs are very perishable too. Anybody wanting to rush them very fast to large markets in eastern Canada would have to do that somehow, I say probably have to use a jet to do so, because all those buyers in the east require these not more than a day old. Now in sparsely settled areas as in the west, and being far from those large centres, no doubt they'll find themselves in trouble. But yet in the west the production is heavy at all times. Sometimes as you travel along the road at night you find practically everybody's hen house lit up. What do you think the hens are doing there? They must be busy laying eggs.

Now let us not state at any time or try to forget that The Stabilization Act, since it came into being in 1958, has helped to keep small volume producers in business, that is in farming business, because of the millions of dollars, to be exact about \$141.3 million, that were pumped into the farm economy, especially of those small producers. We of the government always endeavoured to endorse a farm policy that will stabilize prices of farm products at the highest level possible, consistent with the demand outlook for specific products. We have to search constantly for markets, and when we do search for markets, we must also be able to supply those people with credit. Many of the countries who require our products are not able to pay our price off the bit. We have to search constantly for markets to enable farmers to utilize volume production to spread rising costs. Acreage payments, many people sometimes consider as not very much, but I think, in my own estimation, that many of those farmers who get the \$200 or somewhere around that point seem to be quite happy. I have not met very many that were not any too happy with it. If we do happen to go--suppose you went on a dollar acreage all the way to 10,000 acres, what would happen then? It would be the big man who would get it, not the little fellow. So at the \$200 level I think we have most of the smaller farmers pretty well getting that amount, and that alleviates a lot of the pressure on them. We admit that that is probably the best under the circumstances until a definite solution could be worked out and developed.

The next thing of course that's coming into being, and has been pretty well a good example of, is crop insurance. That alone will play a great part. It will cover all crop hazards. Those people who were insured under that plan in 1961 are a happy people. Now that is only the beginning. When that crop insurance is pretty well universal in Manitoba we will have, I think, a very happy society.

MR. ORLIKOW: When will that be?

MR. KLYM: I beg your pardon?

MR. ORLIKOW: When it comes into being, Sir.

MR. KLYM: Many farmers are in trouble today because they were placed on lands which were probably submarginal. During the hungry thirties, as people often call those years, many people were sent back to the land without any consideration by the then administration as to the type of land they were being sent to. Probably it was seen at that time there was some use for brush land and so forth, to cut pulpwood, and logs and lumber and what not. That was all right. But those particular lands on which forest grew are just lands that are left, but the forests are gone. The forests do not grow any too fast in this part of the country because of the short growing season. Now those people are faced practically with starvation because the land is not suitable for agriculture. What are we to do about that? Today we have such things probably as

(Mr. Klym, cont'd.) . . . . land studies and so forth, and before any place is being opened up to settlement, it is well planned ahead to see whether that land will support those people or not. As a result of former years, they probably have several communities in not too distant parts of this area who will have to move to some better land, otherwise they would be practically on a starvation basis.

Today, I must also mention the open quotas in the grain elevators. I believe it was in 1952 last when that happened. I met quite a few farmers who were quite happy with the thing because they're able to sell their grain. They no doubt will not be complaining.

Look at the beef prices. Beef prices have been pretty strong lately, haven't they? I think anybody going into beef production would be doing very well because we are practically running short of beef right along. Of course, as I mentioned a few moments ago, hog prices were strong and getting stronger slowly. But if we were to produce, as we had started under the Act, you know what had happened. We had a surplus of pork. Look today what a fine example our butter is with the support prices. We have a surplus of it. And what are we to do with it? It's a beautiful example. It is supported at about 106% of the floor price; eggs are supported, 83%; and hogs at 83.5.

Now we should also compare the million of dollars pumped into the economy since the Act came into force as compared with about a hundred million dollars that the former administration spent in about 14 years. In raising prices to a very high degree, we must ask farmers to be able to accept production controls, and I do not think any farmer in Manitoba or in the west is prepared to accept production controls at this time or at any time. On the other hand, it is far better to expand markets. We must also be able to supply our customers with credit, as I mentioned a few moments ago. We must also have a diversification of crops. We must be able to supply irrigation for diversified products because they must have constant water supply. In that case, we must develop water resources in the province of Manitoba and also be prepared to protect farms from flooding during wet seasons. We must also be able to provide for adequate research in order to keep our farmers informed, in order to keep abreast of the farmers in the world under very stiff competition.

Therefore, with all these points brought out, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin, that the resolution be amended by striking out everything after the word "income" in the third line and substituting therefore: "in spite of expenditures under this Act of \$141.3 millions, and whereas total payments to agriculture have been \$706.8 millions in the 1957-61 period as compared to \$363 millions from 1953-57; and whereas so-called parity prices are more than parity for some producers and less than parity for other producers; and whereas it is not practicable to use price supports by themselves to achieve parity without introducing production and marketing controls to prevent the production of unmanageable surpluses; and whereas the use of production and marketing controls would tend to stunt and limit the further development of agricultural productivity in western Canada; and whereas western farmers are not at this time prepared to accept such controls; and whereas 1961 experience has emphasized the fact that prices are only one factor in the formula which determines farm income; and whereas although the price of cereal grains today is substantially higher than in recent years, farmers are still in financial difficulty because of drastically reduced yields; and whereas the current economic difficulties press hardest upon the small volume producers; and whereas temporary measures are justified to alleviate the widespread financial difficulties of small family farms; and whereas it is desirable to implement permanent and long term programs which will correct chronic problems in the agricultural industry; therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of this House the governments of Canada and the provinces should give consideration to the advisability of a farm policy that will: (1) Stabilize prices of farm products at the highest levels possible consistent with the demand outlook for specific products but at all times providing reasonable protection for the producer by means of a floor price. (2) Expand markets to enable farmers to utilize volume production to spread rising costs. (3) Provide credit which will enable the farmer to develop and maintain an economic unit of production. (4) Utilize temporary measures such as acreage payments and other emergency programs such as freight assistance, etcetera to alleviate pressures on the small farmer. (5) Assist in stabilizing agricultural income by providing for the early expansion of crop insurance. (6) Encourage rural industrialization. (7) Encourage increased diversification

(Mr. Klym, cont'd.) . . . . of agricultural productions. (8) Facilitate proper land use. (9) Provide for an orderly development of our water resources. (10) Provide for training and re-establishment of persons who are unable to compete in the modern agricultural industry. (11) Provide for adequate research into economic and social problems of rural communities with emphasis on marketing problems. (12) Recognize the need for continued research of all kinds to keep our farmers abreast of competition they face from other producers in other countries of the world. And further be it resolved that this House endorses the government's request that the federal government through reinsurance, should share Manitoba's liability under the crop insurance program; and further be it resolved that this House endorses the government's action to promote the early establishment of an Agriculture Economic Research Council for Canada.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the House should require you to read that long amendment at this stage, but I wonder whether it wouldn't be advisable for Your Honour to take the matter under consideration to see whether or not the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Springfield is in order as an amendment to the resolution that we have before us. I would also respectfully ask the proposer of this amendment if he would supply us with copies. If you agree with me, Sir, we could take the matter under advisement, and when you are prepared to bring the matter back to the House, if we have any point of order to offer as to whether or not it is in order, we'll be in a position then to know. Certainly, Sir, I think it's only reasonable that with just reading such a lengthy amendment that we would not be in a position to take the matter under our consideration ourselves.

MR. SPEAKER: Does anyone else wish to speak on a point of order?

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . . simply combine it with the estimates of my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: I would be glad to take the motion under advisement. I followed it and, in my opinion, very likely there's one or two paragraphs that I have not got the implication of, but I will take it under advisement and advise the House.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable member who proposed this if he would get his staff to make available copies?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend will be able to peruse it in Votes and Proceedings, or in the Hansard.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if you're going to bring it--it won't be up until Friday it's true. I guess possibly it will be printed by that time, providing the printer doesn't run out of ink.

MR. ROBLIN: I can assure my honourable friend that we always take care of his legitimate requests.

.....Continued on next page.

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

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to commend the Honourable Member for Fisher for presenting this resolution to the House. I am sure that we must all agree that he's a diligent and energetic worker for the people of his constituency and I think it is fitting and proper that this particular matter should receive the attention of the House at this time. I must say that after having listened to his remarks and later having discussed the matter with him, that I am in substantial agreement with him in his reasons for presenting this resolution, although I cannot say that I agree with the remedy which he suggests.

I think perhaps, Sir, it might serve some useful purpose if we pause to look for a moment at the situation with regard to government assistance for building of roads in local government districts and also in organized municipalities. At the present time in an organized rural municipality for main market roads, the municipality is expected to provide 40% of the cost and the remainder of that cost, the 60% is paid for by the Province of Manitoba. For the same type of road in local government districts, the Province of Manitoba pays the complete cost of building and maintaining the roads. In rural municipalities for roads other than main market roads, the municipality is expected to pay 100% of the cost of building and maintaining the roads. In local government districts the cost of roads other than main market roads are shared equally between the local government district and the Province of Manitoba. This situation is not new, this is something that has gone on for a number of years past and I think the arrangement which has been made was dictated by the circumstance that in most local government districts the assessment was not sufficient to provide those funds to the local government districts to provide roads in the same manner in which a rural municipality can do so. In local government districts the roads other than main market roads were the responsibilities of school districts, and they still are. In some school districts in local government districts there is a tax levy for the purpose of providing the funds for the 50% of the cost of building those roads, the responsibility of the local government district; and in such school districts the school board of the district has the responsibility for the administration of these funds, they determine which roads shall be built and which roads will be deferred. In other school districts, Mr. Speaker, there is no levy for the purpose of building roads, and I would suggest, Sir, that where there is no levy in a local school district, it matters very little whether the government's share is 50% or 75%, because the school district as such has no funds of its own with which to pay the other proportion of the cost.

Now this is a generality and I should go on to say that in this situation, the individual farmer who wishes to have a road built may put up the money himself for the school district's share of building that road, and this is the matter in which the Honourable Member for Fisher is primarily concerned. Because, what happens in such a school district? The question of whether or not there will be a levy for road building purposes is decided at the annual school meeting and if in this particular school district there happens to be a fair proportion of main market road system and a large proportion of the farmers in that school district live adjacent to or close to a main market road, they are not concerned with the raising of moneys by taxation for the building of roads other than the main market road, and they will vote against any provision for a road levy in their school district in that year. The Honourable Member for Fisher, Sir, is concerned with "John Farmer" who lives back in the corner of the school district who is not close to a main market road and who has no access to public funds to pay the school district's share of building a road to service his property; and I agree, Sir, that the honourable member should be concerned for those of his constituents who are in this position, because I share the same concern for those of my constituents who find themselves in this same position.

The proposal that the honourable member has made would help that individual, but to my mind, Sir, the proposal is patently unfair. In 1960, Sir, the rural municipalities in Manitoba raised a total of \$6,368,701 for public works in their rural municipalities and this amount was raised on a total assessment in rural municipalities of \$310,353,122.00. This represents an approximate mill rate of 20 mills. In the 1961 season the local government districts in Manitoba raised a total of \$129,554 for public works, both by road levy and by private contribution. I lump these two sums together because this is the only way in which we can make a comparison, and the total taxable assessment in local government districts in that year was \$16,615,800.00.

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd.) . . . . This would make a levy of approximately eight mills. Now, Sir, I think that it would be unfair if we expected, or if the people in the local government districts expected the province to increase the share that they are giving for roads in those local government districts when they are not at the present time raising a share at least comparable in comparison to their assessment to that being raised in the rural municipalities. For example if the amount being raised in the local government districts today by local contribution represented an amount approximately equal to 20 mills on their taxable assessment, then I would think they would be in approximately the same position as the taxpayer in a rural municipality, and if they still could not provide the funds for the building of these roads, they might have more cause to complain.

And Sir, at the present time there is an organization within this province which is giving considerable study to this problem. They are at the same time studying the whole problem of municipal organization. I think that most of us will agree that it is desirable that local government districts should be organized into municipalities wherever possible. I recognize, too, that in many of the local government districts that we have within this province today this is not possible; but there are local government districts in the province today where I believe there is some possibility they could be formed into municipal organizations in some manner. As I mentioned previously, there is at the present time a commission, the Manitoba Municipal Enquiry Commission, studying the whole of this problem and related problems in the pattern of municipal government. It seems to me reasonable, Sir, that this is one of the problems that that committee is already studying. If they are not making a particular study of this particular problem I think that it would be quite within the range or the scope of activity of this committee that they should do so. And for that reason, Sir, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne that the resolution be amended by striking out all of the words after the word "increased" in the first line thereof and substituting the following: And Whereas the traffic of today demands a better standard of road than in past years; And Whereas in certain areas of this province outside of the limits or organized municipalities, no satisfactory provision is made for the raising of money for this purpose; And Whereas certain citizens of these areas are deprived of roads to provide access to their homes and farms; And Whereas at the present time the Manitoba Municipal Enquiry Commission is studying the whole question of municipal and/or hospital district and other inter-municipal responsibility in the total pattern of government; Therefore be it resolved that this House request the Manitoba Municipal Enquiry Commission to include in its study and to report upon methods of providing roads for those residents of areas of Manitoba outside of organized municipalities.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, will the honourable member permit a question? The member knows, of course, that committee was appointed by the Urban and Municipal Association. Is the member suggesting that the government or this House will have any responsibility to follow recommendations which that committee may make on this or any other matter?

MR. SMELLIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the honourable member, the government of this House is not bound to follow the recommendations of any commission. The recommendations of the commission are for the help and guidance of this House in their deliberations, and this is one area in which I think the House could be materially helped, and the government, by the recommendations of such a commission. I know too, Sir, that this commission is considering problems of this very nature at this time, and therefore, I think it's only reasonable that we could request them to include a specific reference to this particular problem when they make their report. I am not suggesting that the House or the government should be bound by the recommendations of the committee.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask you to consider whether this motion is in order? The original motion recommended that the government should do certain things. Now this amendment suggests that this matter should be referred to committee, that this House is not financing, that it cannot make any recommendations along those lines. It is too busy already doing its own work. I don't think it is proper that we should further load this committee that's been set three years ago with this work -- this special work. It's the work of this House, I don't think it should be passed on to another body with which we have nothing to do. I don't think it's in order.



MR. SMELLIE: On the point of order. The honourable member is speaking to the subject matter of the amended resolution, he's not speaking on a point of order at all.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't see too much wrong with the amendment; however I'll take a look at it later, but in my opinion at the present time, there is not too much wrong with it. Adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to speak to this matter at this time because I have not yet received certain information that I consider essential. If there's any other member of the House who would care to speak on the matter at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other member who would care to speak?

MR. SMELLIE: If there's not, Sir, I would request that the matter stand.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that "Whereas the youth of our province is our greatest asset, And Whereas more leadership and co-ordination is required in the field of recreation, physical fitness and in the organization of the leisure time of our youth, our adults, as well as our older citizens, And Whereas in addition to education there are many other important factors required to further develop our youth, Therefore be it resolved that this government give consideration to the advisability of establishing a Department of Youth and Recreation.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the establishment of a Department of Youth and Recreation is not a new subject in this House. I have spoken on this subject at every regular session since I have been sitting in this House. I do not want to seem repetitious and therefore I would suggest to those that are interested in this matter that they might read the following answers. In 1959, the June 22nd issue, page 153; 1960, the March 1st issue, page 1088; 1961, April 4th issue, page 1590. Each time that this subject has been brought into this House many members, including such notables as the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Minister of Education, have agreed with me that some of my ideas anyway on this subject had some merit; but for some reason or other, it was always turned down. Twice at least the government felt that I should be declared out of order -- although you ruled differently on this -- and therefore they didn't do anything. And other times they thought it would cost money. Well, Sir, those reasons hardly seem good enough to refuse to at least consider the merit of some resolutions. We of the opposition are often invited and asked to forward some constructive criticism, some ideas, and we are assured that these ideas will be studied on their own merits regardless of which side of the House it comes from, but it seems that this is not the case. I would like, Mr. Speaker, I would like the government -- for the government to tell me if those ideas have any merit -- it's the fourth year now that we've asked for this -- or if my reasoning is not sound on this matter. I might say that the principles that I'm advancing today are unanimously approved by the Liberal caucus and have also been approved by the Liberal Association.

Yes, we feel that we have different departments dealing with the health, welfare, the labour, public works, industry and commerce, education, the Attorney-General, agriculture and so on. We have all those departments existing now. It is important to keep a healthy body, to see that everyone has enough to eat, has proper shelter and clothing. We are interested in proper working conditions for the people of Manitoba. We are busy building bridges and roads. We must safeguard our population from the floods. We must attract industry, lend money to try to help industry get started. We want to sell our natural resources. We want to give our children an education that will permit them to go into the world and make a decent living, to earn a good living. We study delinquents. We prosecute and punish the guilty. We want to grow food, we want to get as much as possible from the earth. And we believe in need tests for material things. Sir, our concern, our interest in these matters is well placed. We should be congratulated. But does our responsibility as legislators stop there? Isn't there a void, isn't there something missing? We are in a rush -- it's always go, go, go. Progress -- this is our motto -- the show must go on, forward. Well what about man? What about his soul, his freedom, his self-respect? It seems that everything should be sacrificed in the name of progress. Progress should crush everything in its way. The show must go on, Sir, but what

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . . kind of a show? What about total fitness? Emotion stability. Mental security. Social adequacy and physical fitness? This is health, this is welfare. Doesn't the need test apply here?

It's all right to think about the working conditions of the people of Manitoba, but what about the leisure conditions? Isn't that important? Isn't it the time that they have free? It's all right to build bridges, roads and so on, but what about building the character of the youth of our province? Isn't that important? It's all right to develop industries and our resources, but what about developing the mind and leadership of our young people. It's fine to give an education that will permit you to go into the world to make a living; but what about a thorough education that will help you to live as a good Canadian and to help your fellow man? Try to cultivate the earth, yes. But what about cultivating the individual talents — the minds of our youth. It's fine to help the delinquents, but shouldn't we study once in a while the non-delinquent. It's fine also, it's right and it's just, to punish the guilty; but what about encouraging the good.

No, Sir, I don't feel that I live in a world of make-believe. I have no secret formula. I haven't the complete answer. And the simple bringing in of a new department will not answer all this. You might ask me then, well why all this -- what is my point? I do think, however, Sir, that amongst all these departments there should be one a little more sane than the other. One that will stop, or at least slow down, and look at all these problems in a sane way -- look at all these things under their proper perspective. One that realizes that man does not only exist; but live, and give him a chance to live and enjoy freedom. We have been conformist too long it seems, Sir, and it is high time that we started thinking for ourselves. A government has to show concern, leadership, and it has to co-ordinate. Isn't it a fact, Sir, that we are not progressing too well in the fields such as crime prevention, moral and physical education fitness, recreation direction, rehabilitation, leadership training? Couldn't we improve the planning, censoring, what have you, of our TV, our radio, our movies and our reading material? What about a program on sex and alcohol education?

We have an electric bulb in every house we say, and we're proud of this. Well, wouldn't it be something to be proud of to replace that house by a home, a real home? Now it seems to be that it's the survival of the fittest. Our greatest asset, our youth, is neglected. And our senior citizens, well, they are simply forgotten, they do not exist.

From the beginning of man the elders were respected and we could judge a person by the way he took care of his father and mother. But now, we have the old age assistance, something that was supposed to help these people. Now it's the old age pension and it's the greatest political thing in the world. Well, why not? Why should we think of our people when these socialistic ideas are creeping in more and more and the state is going to assume the responsibility of these people.

The CCF Party, the NDP are repeatedly accusing the two old parties of borrowing their ideas. Well, Sir, there is some truth in that. We do not believe all of them but we must stay in power at all costs, so we go with some of their ideas. And you know what's happening, we're getting more of a socialistic state all of the time. Can't we be fair to all? Must it always be a choice between private enterprise or public enterprise? Free enterprise against socialism. Big corporation or big labour bosses, is that the answer? Can't we do what is right by everybody? The CCF and the NDP tell us that eventually the Conservative and the Liberal Party will unite to form but one party. Well probably I'll be shot for saying that, but if we are all liberal-minded people and if we have the interests of the people at heart it might not be such a bad idea, because there is a problem now of trying to keep this freedom of man. Oh, I can read in tomorrow's paper, Sir -- "backbencher dreaming"; "Desjardins not realistic; the Member for St. Boniface let his emotion run away with him again." But, Sir, most everything that was worth doing started with a dream and often times our dreams give us the strength to keep on growing. Scientists are dreaming of a cure for cancer. Five or six years ago who would dream that some day we would send a man around the earth in a question of hours. Most of us here have read the work of Jules Verne and what did we say? We give him credit for one thing, a very strong imagination.

You might tell me, Sir -- some of the members of the House might tell me -- well, this is being done now; all this is being done by the minister we have now. Well, Sir, I say that when these things are divided they do not seem as important. And, as I said before, the

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . . ministers now have too much work and these vital things form just a little part of their work, and therefore they -- not that they're not interested but they have so many other things to do -- that they forget about them.

Let me ask some of them, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Education if he has enough time to think about physical fitness, to think about not only building these great gyms that they have in all these schools, but seeing that they're used to their full capacity. I could go on, especially in this department for a long time. Now we could ask the Attorney-General if he has had the time to do anything about youth committee, to really sit down and study what makes a man a non-delinquent or makes a man a delinquent. The Advisory Committee on Youth -- what about proper censorship? Every year he tells me that he can't do anything about it. But we're so busy trying to keep Time magazine and Readers Digest out of here to protect the newspaper. Maybe this is well but what about protecting the minds of our people. There's more filthy magazines that come out from other countries but nobody's stopping them. It might be a good sign, at least nobody's competing with them in this country -- that might be one sign. Now, Sir, I think that it is difficult for these different ministers to look into this, and I could take one department one by one, but I think this would take too long and I think that I've made my point.

What I am suggesting, Sir, might be a small step forward. It might lack clarity in the minds of a lot of people, but nevertheless it is a step forward, and even if this department can only provide leadership; could only co-ordinate our efforts, our thinking, it would be well worth it; it would be a step in the right direction. And I might say that it would not be costly at all; in fact, it might save many thousands of dollars for the people of Manitoba, besides the other value that it would have.

Times have greatly changed, Sir. The average high school student who is not working after school has away more than 100 hours of leisure, that is, counting vacations, weekends and other leisure time. The working man now is working less and less hours, and therefore has more time on his hands. The housewife with all these new commodities, those new inventions such as electric dryer and washer, these TV dinners, canned food, frozen food, and so on, has an awful lot more time on her hands. Now shouldn't we try to help them organize this free time and do something worthwhile with it? Couldn't we help them in this? Help them find a way to do something constructive with their leisure time? A hundred years ago and perhaps only fifty years ago, the frontier family lived a rugged life. The families were closer together, yes; but their only spare time was centred around the church, and frontier religion cast a questioning eye upon play for adults and even for growing boys and girls. Well this has all changed, Sir, and it is clear that now, especially in this century, we are not doing enough for the individual -- for his material needs, maybe yes, but what about the rest, his leisure time. What are we doing in the field of recreation, in art and something to further his, to make him enjoy life? Not only the idea that he has to sleep, he has to eat, he has to work. Now I think that this department, setting up this department, as I say, this might not be clear to too many of you, but this is the fourth time I have spoken on that and if you read everything I think that it would give you a good idea of what I have in mind and I certainly think that this is a step in the right direction. Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON (Assinibola): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Osborne, the debate be adjourned. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, Wellington.

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 Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to allow this motion to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate on the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable Member for Cypress.

MRS. THELMA FORBES (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks, in presenting this motion, said it was his hope that some consideration be given to a group of our citizens who, in his opinion, are a forgotten section of our community. I'm sure that he's not really serious about that statement for I feel that the honourable member knows that our Social Allowance Act, knows what that Social Allowance Act is doing for all Manitobans,

(Mrs. Forbes, cont'd.) . . . . and that our senior citizens are not a forgotten section of our community but at long last they are a recognized group in our midst. These citizens whose sole income is old age security pensions or old age assistance pensions, blind persons allowance or disabled persons allowances are covered by our Social Allowance Act which first of all meets their needs with cash allowances, secondly meets their medical expenses with our Medicare Card, both which are over and above the flat rate of \$65.00. I sometimes wonder where the reasoning of our friends opposite are when they say the senior citizen is subjected to embarrassment and indignity when he applies for allowances or Medicare.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks states old age security is given as a matter of right without a means test, but I point out to the honourable member that the applicant must apply for it. He must apply for it. This is all that's required of the individual when he needs additional cash allowances or Medicare, he must apply for it. But as long as our friends over there try to sell the public on the idea of embarrassment then they are doing a great deal of harm and a great disservice to the senior citizen of whom they pretend to be the champion. Now the honourable member states, and I quote from Hansard of March 6th, on page 447: "but before you can get on social allowance, you usually apply through your municipality, and I understand that in most cases it's the municipality who applies to the province to have these people placed on social allowances and thereby giving them this Medicare card." Now, Mr. Speaker, the municipalities do not determine who is eligible for social allowances and Medicare cards. This is a basic misunderstanding on the part of the honourable member. We never expect or require applications to be cleared through the municipality. As a convenience we do supply the municipalities with application forms. The form itself directs the applicant to the Director of Welfare, not the municipality, so the applicant need only apply to the Director of Welfare. Sure he can pick up his form on which he may apply from his municipal office, or else he can drop a line direct to the Director of Welfare. Now anyone can do this for the applicant if he is unable to do it for himself. There's nothing embarrassing about it; nothing embarrassing at all about his dropping a line to the Director of Welfare. When the application is received a social worker in charge of the area wherein the applicant resides will call on the individual and right in his own home sit down with him and in a friendly business-like manner, assess the needs of that individual. Now if the pension is the sole source of income and his financial needs are greater than that \$65.00, then the social worker will see that the cash allowances are paid to meet this need. If it is medical attention that is required then a Medicare card will be issued. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, this is not embarrassing, far from it, and I would like to tell the members that it is appreciated. It's a personal touch and often more beneficial to the applicant as the social worker actually gets to know the applicant and to know his wants and his needs. And I'd like to point out here too, that it proves to the taxpayer of Manitoba that the need was investigated; that the need was there, that the need was met, which justifies the spending of his welfare money.

Now I think that if the members over there were really serious they would suggest more than \$75.00 because even the Honourable Member from St. John's stated on March 6th -- and I quote from page 429 of Hansard: "I don't think there is a member in this House, if he gives it any thought, will not realize that even \$75.00 a month will give the old age pensioner a very, very slim kind of life. There certainly won't be any luxuries; they certainly won't even be able to meet the necessities as most of us are accustomed to it. We think, Mr. Speaker, that this is the rock-bottom minimum which the old people of this country are entitled to." Well, Mr. Speaker, we don't think it's all they're entitled to as evidenced when we introduced our Social Allowance Act and our Medicare plan, which as you know, is in addition to the flat rate provided by a pension. So there's no truth in the statement that these people are a forgotten section of our community, and we didn't wait until an election year to do this, we did it when this government took office and I state with no fear of contradiction, Sir, that if all the provinces of Canada had such a Social Allowance Act and such a Medicare plan as Manitoba has, then we would not be faced with this question of should the pension be \$65.00 or \$75.00 or any other figure. We are limited by the federal government to the extent to which we can go on the three-shared program. But, Sir, under our Social Allowances Act, we go beyond that on a basis of need. The federal government had to set programs that could apply to all the provinces. Provinces with NDP governments, Liberal governments or Social Credit governments; provinces

(Mrs. Forbes, cont'd.) . . . . that have not even yet, a program as comprehensive as ours; a program that meets need; a program that meets the medical needs of the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks in effect asks that those whose sole income is \$65.00 should automatically get a Medicare card. He says, and I quote: "I suggest that there is no better way to give them security from fear of medical bills than to issue them Medicare cards." But the whole problem is how to determine this? The Social Allowance Act says the government shall determine the need of the person. Now the honourable member says: "determine whether the sole income is \$65.00 a month." Well, Sir, in either case determination means an application from the person and a decision or a judgment by the government on the individual case -- which is exactly what we are doing.

Sir, I think every individual should provide for his or her old age. This spirit of independence should be encouraged and maintained. This attitude is being borne out by the people of Manitoba themselves. The very fact that the percentage of persons in the old age assistance group has remained relatively stable since the plan was introduced in 1952, because in 1952 out of some 27,000 eligible people in the 65 to 69 group the number receiving old age assistance was 4,816; and in 1961 out of some 28,000 eligible people in this group, the number receiving old age assistance was 5,124. Now this fact that the percentage of persons receiving assistance has remained relatively stable in spite of all the attractions of exemption from hospital premiums, of higher ceilings on income; of a considerable easing of the means test based on personal property, it would seem to me to indicate a marked spirit of independence among our people. This same spirit of independence is demonstrated by the over 70 age group. Out of 56,300 persons over 70 as of December 31st, 1961, there were only 23,240 who were currently exempt from paying hospital premiums. For those unfortunate citizens, through no fault of their own, who require help and assistance, we should be willing to support, but for all Manitobans and all Canadians we should aim to develop a comprehensive medical care plan, one that can be extended universally; one available on a voluntary basis as set out in this government's brief to the Royal Commission, and I favour that prior emphasis be given to this particular age group, our senior citizens, because I believe that it is the area of greatest need. And so I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre, that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word "pension" in the third line thereof and substituting the following: "blind persons allowance and disabled persons allowance, And Whereas the provincial government through the Social Allowance Act makes provision for comprehensive health services to those in need, And Whereas those services are available to those in need on application to the Director of Welfare, And Whereas there are some 9,256 persons in all the pension categories receiving these health services free under The Social Allowances Act; Therefore be it resolved that this House reaffirm its belief in the principle of The Social Allowances Act, including meeting the health requirements of the elderly and the infirm, on the basis of need.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that the debate be adjourned. I would think that this would be a good time to call it 5:30.

MR. ROBLIN: That's a very sound decision, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I now call it 5:30. I will resume the Chair at 8:00 o'clock this evening.