

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



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 21st, 1961.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

Notice of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

MR. JOHN A. CHRISTIANSON (Portage la Prairie) introduced Bill No. 63, An Act respecting the City of Portage la Prairie.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Treasury Act by providing, among other things, for the removal of certain limitations on expenditures from the reserve or reserves established and maintained for depreciation and replacement of assets .....

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 from St. Matthews in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has been informed of the subject matter in the proposed resolution recommended to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Treasury Act by providing among other matters, for the removal of certain limitations on expenditures from the reserve or reserves established and maintained for depreciation and replacement of assets.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, this Bill is intended to do what we thought we did last year in connection with the depreciation reserves that are maintained for heavy capital equipment that the province operates, such as road graders and heavy matters of that sort. As the legislation now stands a depreciation reserve is set up, but we are only allowed to use 75 per cent of it, the result being that the other 25 percent is frozen, and there seems to be no particular good reason that we could discover as to why that limitation was in there, and the purpose of this amendment is to remove the limitation freezing that 25 percent. We had thought that this was done last year when we had a similar piece of legislation before us but when the Comptroller General had a look at it he decided it wasn't so, so this correcting legislation is brought in.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, this deals only with that one particular fund, does it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: ... Committee rise and report, call in the Speaker.

MR. W.G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted certain resolutions and ask me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 68, An Act to Amend the Treasury Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. On the news film on Channel 7 on Sunday they showed some film of men drilling around St. Norbert in connection with the floodway and the news report said that the drillers had found a lake 32 feet under the surface -- but they said they thought it had been there a thousand years. Could the Minister elaborate on this, on these findings?

HONOURABLE GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): No, I can't do that very .....

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well could the Minister table the findings for the Members of the House then?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the same matter, if I might direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation. I would like to ask if it is a fact that the authority connected with the floodway is having some drilling done in that area, and is the Minister in possession of what might be called the cores or samples that are taken from there? Has he a report on the findings?

MR. HUTTON: Personally I have no report, but I would expect that the floodway division will be keeping in close contact with the work that is going on. It's being carried out under the supervision of the department.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to clarify an order for return in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, order No. 7, in which he requested certain information about contracts between the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company and certain contractors from August 15th. We neglected to say that the term that was covered by this order for return was from August 15th, 1958 to December 31st, 1960. There was no termination date on the original order, so the members could take note of that. I believe the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose was particularly interested in this information.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. Order stand?

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I have the adjournment on this resolution and I wish to say very briefly that insofar as our group is concerned that we could not support the original motion in its entirety; consequently we brought in an amendment which was later defeated. But now that we have before us the amendment of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, and after looking at it with due consideration, we feel that this is a good amendment; an amendment which could very well solve the problem of imbalance of school construction costs in this province. Now one reason why we opposed the resolution, at least partly, the original resolution, is because we felt that by making the increase and making it retroactive, we might not have been fair to those school districts and divisions which practise or try to practise as much economy as possible in the construction of their schools. But now looking at the amendment, it seems to me that if the Building Board of the Department of Education should see fit to approve a cost higher than the maximum for which they allow grants at the present time -- if they're willing to approve and see fit to approve, then it seems to me legislation should follow which would provide grants in accordance with that. This is what the Member for Selkirk I'm quite sure, had in mind. The retroactive clause here is not offensive either in this case because if the Building Board saw fit to approve a cost higher than \$15,000 per classroom, then I'm sure the Department should compensate or make provision by way of grants for this higher cost.

I notice that the Minister of Education when he spoke to the amendment on March 14th said that although he didn't have a copy of the amendment before him, he felt that it would not be workable and might not be regarded as fair by the citizens of the province, and that it might not take long before there would be a chaotic condition existing with which it would be impossible to cope. Now I'm not sure if the Minister still thinks that way now that he has had an opportunity to read the amendment in print, but certainly I cannot see that there should be such an unworkable situation arise. After all the Building Board is supposed to pass as to the approval or rejection of the costs of construction, and if they see fit because of the varying factors to approve a school construction cost of greater than \$15,000, it shouldn't be so unworkable to follow that action with a comparable increase in grants. With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that we shall support the amendment in its entirety.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question. Question before the House is the amendment to the main motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain I wonder if I could adjourn this debate in his name.

MR. SPEAKER: Have you a seconder?

MR. HILLHOUSE: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Elmwood would be closing the debate.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Minister of Labour

(Mr. Peters, cont'd.)...decided to take part in this debate. To me it seemed rather strange after introducing this bill that the Minister finally decided to take part. In his remarks he had said that we didn't have a case and he was going to vote against it. To me, Mr. Speaker, getting the Minister of Labour up on his feet and trying to defend the minimum wage, proved to me that we have a case and a very strong case; and he helped it a lot when he introduced his budget, for when he introduced his budget, Mr. Speaker, the total income of the budget was \$1,510.08, expenses were \$1,509.78 leaving a net of 30 cents a year. The basis of his budget was that the person had to work every available day that they were available for work; if they got sick for one day, bang went the budget, the budget was finished. If they were sick for a week, where would they be? The budget just doesn't hold water. Mr. Speaker he went to great length to point out to us that this minimum wage was supposed to take care of people of the barest minimum, and he used the example of a single girl, and said that it would work out for a male. But he didn't take the trouble to tell us that this Minimum wage Act also covers married people and a family, and he didn't make it known to the board -- all they did was take the lowest possible that they possibly could and say, "Well we've got a pretty good argument, we'll pull the wool over their eyes and nobody will be any the wiser." Mr. Speaker I wonder when the Minister of Labour got up to speak, he always listens when the Manitoba Federation of Labour presents their brief -- why didn't he tell them how he felt about this minimum wage? He's never ever mentioned it to them, he's let them come every year, tell their story, he listens to them and then walks away and doesn't say anything. Why doesn't he tell them this story when they present -- why doesn't he tell them, "It's no use you presenting your brief to us because we're not going to do anything about it anyway"?

Mr. Speaker, there's been a lot said about -- that the province, the Dominion of Canada, they weren't ready for \$1.25 minimum wage; costs would be too high. Mr. Speaker I maintain and I've always maintained it isn't wages that puts up costs; it's profits and one other item that nobody has brought in on this debate. I haven't and I'm bringing it in now. What about the costs of public relations? Your T.V. programs, your radio programs, plugging a certain product -- how much money do they spend? That all goes on to the cost of that product. Who pays for it? We, the people that are buying that product and it doesn't matter if you're working at the minimum wage or if you're making \$10,000 a year you still have to pay the same price for that product when you go into the store. They don't ask you, "Are you working for a minimum wage and we'll sell this product to you at a smaller amount". You pay the same as anybody else. We've heard about Socialism and creeping Socialism and that we're giving everything away free. Who is responsible for all this give-away and stuff? Not the CCF -- big business. Hardly an article that you go to buy in the store today isn't 89 cents off, this off, this free if you buy this. That is the kind of economy that we've got used to; that's the kind of economy that we are living in today -- getting something for nothing. We have never said, "You are going to get anything for nothing". You are going to pay for everything you get, because Santa Claus is dead. A good example Mr. Speaker is -- we talk about Brandon Packers. What did they do, they're in a supposedly low wage area. Did they pass off a saving to the people in the Brandon area? Not on your life -- as I stated when I spoke on the Fair Wage Act -- they were charging the people in the Brandon area five cents a pound more for their product than they were selling it for in Winnipeg and Emerson and Dauphin. So saying that they can't afford it because the people couldn't afford it in that area is all wrong, because private enterprise will not pass off any saving that they make to the people in the area, and that's a fact.

Mr. Speaker, from that side of the House we've had some arguments, some agreeing -- and I've talked to many of them from that side of the House in private and they agree that 66 cents isn't enough. But what about my friends on the right here? Not one word; not one word. They're going to woo labour in the next election -- with what? 66 cents an hour -- irresponsible government. Mr. Speaker I would like to say this too, that in many cases the minimum wage becomes the maximum wage. The Minister pointed out that under the Minimum Wage Act they have their industrial standards and all the rest of it. But the Minister knows, he has cases every day in his office or in his Deputy's office where people are taking advantage of the ordinary working people. He has all kinds of these cases and he knows of them. I had a list of them -- I've misplaced it -- of all the firms that are in his office where somebody is coming to get something rectified quite often, pretty regularly.

I mentioned Mr. Speaker, that wages weren't responsible for the high cost of products.

(Mr. Peters, cont'd.) . . . . I'd like to read an item here taken out of The Packing House Worker of 1960, November; "A survey made by the United Steel Workers of America show that 1959 average remuneration of the highest paid executive of 24 major steel producers was \$170,631 as against \$159,593 a year earlier. Incomes of the three highest paid accounted for 25 percent of the total of 4.1 million paid to the 24 company officials, while the income of the top seven amounted to 2.1 million or slightly more than half. The lowest paid of the officials surveyed by A.R. Maxwell, Jr. was paid \$80,000 by Pittsburgh Steel. Highest paid was Arthur Homer of Bethlehem who received a total of \$407,785.00". I don't think I need to read on any further, Mr. Speaker, but in connection with that item the production, to produce a ton of steel in 1950, it took 19 man hours to produce a ton of steel; today it takes 12 man hours to produce a ton of steel. In 1950 the steel mills had to run at 60 percent of production to break even; today they can operate at 45 percent of production and make a profit -- (Interjection) -- production capacity, that's correct. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give to benefit of the members of this Legislature a budget that some people have to live on that are on welfare in the City of Winnipeg. This is a family of four that have an income of \$104.00. They have an income of \$104.00 and because they have that income of \$104.00 the Welfare Department of the City of Winnipeg for a two-week period has to still give them \$16.87 in the summer \$21.55 in the spring and fall and \$23.89 in the winter -- and the reason for the spring and fall and winter, the increase is to take care of fuel bills. Here is another family -- a family of seven have an income of \$121.33; the City Welfare Department still has to subsidize them in the summer for a two-week period, 14 day period, \$40.70; spring and fall \$47.09, in the winter \$50.29. Mr. Speaker -- and we can sit here and say that a minimum wage is good enough when we have people that have incomes and still have to go on welfare. The Minister can't tell me that we're in a pretty sound position with a minimum wage of 66 cents an hour.

Now the Honourable Member from Brandon, I think it was, mentioned if we introduced this \$1.25 minimum wage it was going to do these poor old age pensioners -- if they had a chance to go out and make a few cents, to subsidize their income, that they wouldn't be able to do it. Let me say this Mr. Speaker, there are now old age pensioners that are going out and doing odds and ends and they're not subject to the minimum wage. They're working for a neighbour, they go and ask and the neighbour out of the goodness of his heart -- not because he needs that fellow to do it -- but out of the goodness of his heart, let's him go and do some little job for him so he can give him an extra couple of dollars so he has a few extra dollars.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I want to say any more; I think I have made my point clear. One thing I would like to ask. I think we should get rid of the Minimum Wage Board because they are not doing the job that they were set up to do. The last time the Minimum Wage Board sat they couldn't meet for awhile. Why? Because one of the members of that board was on vacation in Israel. Is that the kind of members we want on this Board? Let's get rid of it. Let the government take care of the Minimum Wage Board. Let's not shirk our responsibilities. That's all I have to say Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. PETERS: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the motion moved by the Honourable Member for Elmwood. "Whereas the cost of living . . . . .".

A standing vote was taken the results being as follows:

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas: 9. Nays: 41.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I ask that this be allowed to stand.

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

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd.) . . . . .for St. John's. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I ask that this be allowed to stand.

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

MR. A.J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be brief on this resolution. I think we should look at this resolution from a different angle. Possibly at one time there was a large difference in living expenses in the country and in the city, but now Sir, that is not so. Rural areas have been electrified and many have other convenience, which have increased their cost of living. Many people in rural areas now have daily bread and milk deliveries, and we must remember that with all the school building going on school taxation in the rural areas is practically equivalent to city taxation. Then we must remember that any saving that is acquired would be taken up in transportation costs, because every time you go anywhere in the country in pursuit of your daily livelihood and the necessities of life, you must travel a greater distance than people do in the city.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Brandon mentioned that winter work could be done at a lower cost to the public, but unfortunately that is not so. I've had experience with contractors, and true, Sir, they want to hire men at lower rates and they tell us that the cost of construction is greater due to wintertime, so that doesn't achieve a purpose because men get less money, the public pay more and the only one that ends up to the best are the contractors who make more profits. Also he spoke about overtime which was a hardship on the general public in having to pay bills. He cited one case such as a window being blown in by a windstorm. Well Sir, such cases as these are covered by insurance and would obviously not concern the party involved. You know the trouble Sir, we're always concerned about the small businessmen -- whether he'll make a go of it. Well Sir, I look at it this way, when he started out he had to work hard, all by himself to get established, and naturally in a competitive market. He has proven as he goes along in his quality of work and his products. Now he has more work than he can handle himself. So Mr. Speaker, the public must have faith in his products to warranty such conditions, and to pay a fair wage to an employee or his employees would definitely not jeopardize his business. You know Sir, and it's absolutely true, that employers take advantage of the difference in wage scales. Many articles are constructed and prefabricated outside the Greater Winnipeg area. I have seen precision houses built outside of Winnipeg moved in by trailer. These products you would think would sell for less in Winnipeg than comparable articles or units made in Winnipeg; but Sir, it's not true. They sell for the same. There's no saving for the public. This I investigated in the case of precision houses built outside the Winnipeg area to specifications from the owner. After all expenses were totalled -- labour costs in this case were definitely lower to the contractor -- but the initial price to the purchaser for a similar house in Winnipeg made no difference. So I think Sir, businessmen are quite capable in looking after their own affairs. We should concern ourselves here in looking after the welfare of the majority of people in Manitoba, and by and large they are the working people. They need our help; not contractors and businessmen and the likes, so I'm supporting the resolution to help my fellow man.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, 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 Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask that this be allowed to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand? Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased indeed to have the opportunity of discussing the important subject matter that has been raised in this resolution presented to the House by the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party. I would like to start out by saying that in my opinion he endeavoured to approach this problem of unemployment, the whole question of our economic climate and the economic problems that we face, in a constructive manner. It does not follow

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . of course that I agree with each specific that he proposed as to how this situation should be dealt with, but I would like to offer my compliments to him for what I think is a very good effort indeed to discuss this important problem from the most helpful point of view. While I may have occasion to disagree with some of the observations he made, I hope that I will be able to take the same attitude in what I have to say; because I think Sir, that it is obvious to all of us that the great economic problem of the twentieth century in this continent, and in the free world as a matter of fact, is not the problem of production. Indeed, if we believe Professor Galbraith who writes very persuasively indeed, that difficulty or that challenge has been overcome at least in United States, though I admit I don't subscribe fully to what he has to say. Our problem rather is this whole matter of "Full Employment in a Free Society, to quote the title of the important book written by Lord Beveridge just at the conclusion of the second great war -- how we are to obtain full employment; how best we can cope with the cyclical nature of our economy. Now I'm conscious Sir, that the very best minds of our century have grappled and struggled with this question and I'm not so bold as to suggest that I'm going to make any original contributions to this debate here this afternoon, nor even to say that I think there is an obvious or a full solution available to us, given the circumstances that we face here in our country. But I do think it is a matter that does challenge the best contribution we can make in this Legislature, because the problem is of great importance. It's important in abstract terms; it's important in terms of the productivity that is lost when we face a period of unemployment; it is important in terms of the problem of maximizing the output from our society and from our economic machine. Though I think that we are all here aware that it is also very important in personal terms; in terms of the individual men and women who may be without occupation during a time such as this. No one who is old enough to be a member of this House -- perhaps that might be a slight exaggeration -- but very few of us are not without some experience as to the stress that unemployment places upon the personality of men and women and the problems that it introduces into family life, and those matters of a psychological and personal nature which I think are the great hazards that people face when confronted with unemployment. I think it is true to say that one of the great developments of our time at any rate has been that we are better equipped to relieve distress and destitution that we ever were before, but we still have to face up to this social and personal problem which to my mind is the great problem that confronts us in this matter. Our task is how to secure the full employment within a mixed, but nevertheless, essentially a free economy, and that is no easy job indeed.

I think I would agree by and large with the analysis that the Leader of the CCF Party made of our situation here in Manitoba. It can be said and it is of some comfort I know that we have higher rate of employment here than we have ever had -- more people are working in Manitoba than at any previous time; but we also have to face the fact that our unemployment problem is certainly a serious one indeed. We can take some comfort in the knowledge that it is not as bad as the national average. There's been a little argument about that, but I think I can say that again, that it is not as bad as the national average. That it is good or better than most provinces in Canada, and that the rise in unemployment this year, thank goodness, was less than some of us feared; but nevertheless it is a serious problem. In looking at this problem, it is of some importance to note that two-thirds or three-quarters of those who are unemployed belong to the unskilled or the semi-skilled groups in our society. In fact one measure indicates that about three-quarters of those who are unemployed have less than a public school education, and this gives us a clue I think as to some of the difficulties we face when in trying to reduce this hard core of unemployment. Now we have had a winter work program, and I am not going to bother about arguing how many people are employed by it, needless to say it's substantial and it's worth doing; but I quite subscribe to the opinion of those who maintain that it is no answer, because it certainly is no answer. All it does is redistribute our employment slightly, perhaps with the incentive given to municipalities to do things that they might not do for some period of time, it has an extra plug in it, but I would never maintain, Sir, that the winter employment program is any solution to our problem. It helps but I think that's as far as I'd care to go. And in looking at this problem we have to try and make up our minds something about its nature and its dimensions -- how much unemployment can we tolerate? Do we insist on working toward a complete employment picture? Well



(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . that would be nice, but I think the general conclusion is that there is an acceptable level of unemployment which we must expect in a society like ours, and Lord Beveridge's famous report established that as three percent of our working population, and I believe that's generally accepted by people like the Canadian Labour Congress and others. President Kennedy, I see, would set his threshold for unemployment at four percent, but in any case there has to be a certain number of people who are out of jobs from time to time, because they are moving from one job to another, because they're not well, because there are technological changes in industry which demand shifting from one form of activity to another. I suggest that all economies, regardless, do have this slack in their employment with them most of the time -- that there are idle workers at the best of times. But I would like to point out, Sir, that in an economy changing as drastically and as quickly as ours is, with a technology that is moving so swiftly, with the problems of re-organization of industry, the problem of -- a word I'm thinking for is one that means the machine is doing all the work, it's escaped my memory for the moment -- automation, thank you very much, you really helped me over a tough one there -- the problems of automation; the problems of the new and relatively unskilled workers coming into the market; the problems of skilled trades that are becoming obsolete -- face us, I think, with more than the conventional target of a three percent unemployment, it faces us with a more difficult question that that. One of the matters we have to look into, and which I think are not being adequately looked into today, and which we are going to try and do something about and other levels of government must do the same, is we must find out more about the nature of our unemployment. Who is unemployed? Why? When are they unemployed? What are the factors connected with the individual people who are seeking work? And special emphasis, I am sure, must be placed on the question of fitting our young people who are coming into society for the society into which they are going to join. We have to become more skilful in forecasting those types of employment for which there will be a demand and fitting the available young men and women to meet that demand, and we're also going to have to place greater emphasis on what to do with the men over 40 -- over 45 who are out of jobs for technological reasons. That is a human tragedy which is not, I think, receiving sufficient attention. Then we have to have some measure -- some forecast -- some idea of what we're getting into, if we are to tackle this problem with any degree of effectiveness.

Now I think I can say this, that the present administration at least recognizes this problem. I would be the first to admit, Sir, that we have not produced a completely satisfactory solution to it. Maybe there are things we should do that we are not doing now, but I do think that we have not tried to avoid recognizing the nature of the difficulty, and in the Speech from the Throne members will recall that some reference was made to measures that we had adopted and to measures that we proposed to adopt, and in the speech that was made the other night by my honourable friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, further elaboration of our views on that were given. We have already taken the trouble to try and estimate how many people we will have here ten years from now in 1970. It will be over a million if we retain our natural increase alone, regardless of immigration. That in that population of around a million there will be 375,000 workers, but as far as we can tell, sitting here and now and trying to project ourselves into the future, there will probably only be about 336,000 industrial and agricultural jobs, so there will be a short fall at the present rate of going, both in job formation and in the increase in our population of some 39 or 40,000 jobs -- and I would say, as an interjection here, that that figure is probably on the low side, rather than on the high side -- but it does give us some measure of the problem that we are likely to face. In looking at the problem one naturally asks oneself, where are jobs coming from; and I suppose the answer to that is, to look at the record of recent times and see what's been happening. We hear a great deal about the emphasis on our primary exporting industries; we hear a great deal of the advisability of developing our natural resources so that we may export our raw materials to other countries and the primary industries, whether in agriculture or mining or forests, should be encouraged, and I am sure that that's all to the good. But the rather discouraging fact is that the primary industries of the country: agriculture, mining and forestry, have not succeeded in producing increasing numbers of jobs, even though there has been increasing quantities of goods exported, both in absolute terms and in terms of dollars. That's a rather discouraging fact which I think we should do well to keep note of. I think that if we were to look at the great

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . area of new jobs in this country in the last ten years we would find it in terms of the tertiary industries, the service industry, the dry-cleaning industry, the amusement industry, banking, finance and all matters of that sort, and no one objects to that. But I think we have to recognize that it is likely that those service industries do not produce in the same degree, any new wealth, new productivity for our country as some other industries do. It would be an exaggeration to say that the service industry can be likened to taking in our own washing -- it's a dramatic way of saying it; although I am frank to admit that it does not by any means tell the whole story. Looking at the other sector of our economy, the industrialization of our country, it has certainly been rather disappointing, I think, to see that secondary industry has not provided that quantity of new opportunities for jobs that one might have hoped; and in looking at our own problem in Manitoba, we have concluded that we have to increase the rate of our advance in the secondary section from 1.1 percent per annum to 1.7 percent per annum if we are to come within measurable distance of filling that job gap that I spoke about and that really represents a 50 percent increase in the development and growth of secondary industries in this province. That is an enormous target. I think we must frankly face the fact that the very best we can do is going to be none too good and none too much in this contest.

Well Sir, that brings me to a point of looking at what we have been doing and trying to form some conclusions as to the extent of our powers and naturally, their limitations. I think that is important because in the resolution before us, the honourable member who moved it not only suggests that we move in co-operation with the Federal Government but he adds these words, "all by itself," in producing that program that would put the unemployed of our province back to work. Now that is a nice idea, that if we can't secure satisfactory, or what we believe to be suitable measures, at other levels of government that we should do it by ourselves, and as far as we can, I think we have some obligation there, though I think it would be unrealistic to think that we have an extent of power and capacity that would enable us to solve this problem if we deal with it by ourselves. I want to look for a moment at the extent and limitations of the powers of a Provincial Government in dealing with these vast economic problems. I would suggest to the House, Sir, that in the main we are limited in two ways: first by our constitutional jurisdiction; and secondly, by the interrelation and the interdependence of the provincial economy with the external economy, both of our own country and of the world at large. As regards our constitutional jurisdiction, we are confined to the field of direct action, either through the municipalities or through instrumentalities of the provincial government. That means that we can provide services and facilities and incentives and direct aid where these are not being or cannot be satisfactorily provided by others. In fact our role is confined largely to the practical development of the resources and the maintenance of practical conditions within the existing circumstances that we find ourselves faced with and insofar as the municipalities of the province is concerned as well. We provide the regional force of economic stimulation of the public sector of our economy. This leads me directly to a consideration of the second set of limitations, namely our place in the whole economic picture, because the province cannot and does not control all the circumstances that effect the economy under the provincial jurisdiction. We cannot initiate nor can we participate practically in the creation of fiscal policy or monetary policy or trade policy, or indeed all those policies of a national scope which have a very great influence, indeed, on the provincial circumstances. We're therefore restricted to doing what we can within our own jurisdiction, and in these endeavours we are further restricted by the externally created circumstances and events which we don't control. If that is accepted as a reasonable statement of the provincial situation, what about the Federal Government? Because many of the powers that are not available to the provinces in the economic field do reside within the authority of the Dominion. These include the ability to establish particular fiscal policies and to create anew such instruments as the Bank of Canada in the establishment and control of a monetary policy component of the fiscal policy. The Central Government may regulate trade and commerce interprovincially and to the extent that the practical possibilities are open to them internationally. The Federal Government may direct the interregional activity or resources may be shifted between provinces through taxation and through related policy. The Dominion may directly effect the credit and interest and money supply as well as the conditions and rates under which it is

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . .supplied and used. The chartered banks and the banking institutions must for all practical purposes be operated in conformity with the federal policies and that of their instrumentality. In other words, the overriding authority for the regulation of the economy lies with the Federal Government. The responsibility for the physical development of the economy, insofar as resources and enterprises are within provincial boundaries, lies with the province, or jointly with the province and the Dominion.

Now another factor, Sir, which has a very direct and important bearing on what we can do can be described in the phrase, "powers of taxation". In citing the several powers of the province in the economic field, taxation has to be considered as a special example of both capacity to act and limitation on the power to act in respect of the economy. We are restricted by constitutional provision to direct taxation, including the levying of fees and the imposition of licenses and permit requirements. Even within this direct field we have by agreement suspended the provincial authority to determine tax policy to a substantial degree insofar as we have rented portions of our major tax fields, the corporation profits and personal incomes and succession duties as we have, at least until 1962. The economic restrictions on provincial tax policy even without giving consideration to the constitutional requirements are considerable. We cannot readily shift resources by virtue of taxation without seriously affecting those sectors of the provincial economy concerned in their competitive position with related enterprises in other provinces. And that, of course, is the theme of many a debate here when we talk about economic activity that the province should take within its own sphere. We cannot provide incentives to one sector without, in our narrow sphere of operation, affecting enterprises in other sectors of the provincial economy. We're furthermore restricted on our use of tax policy for economic purposes by the fact that many of our essential service responsibilities, like social welfare and education, which take up by far the greater part of our budget, are not directly revenue producing, although I think all of us would claim a certain degree of investment in respect to them. The federal authorities have a less restricted capacity to use the powers attached, but even so they come within some of the restrictions that govern us. I think though the point that has to be recognized in any discussion of this sort, is that the tax dollar whether federally or provincially is not made by the government. The tax dollar is created by those upon whom the tax falls. If the taxing power is used badly, that dollar is not created; the taxation policy defeats itself. I think there's another consideration which applies particularly to us and that is our economy, the Canadian economy is not a closed economy. No restrictions on the powers of the Federal or Provincial Governments to act, are more significant in some respects than those stemming directly from our position in the global economic community. Provincial powers to induce economic development regardless of the degree of public versus private employment are ultimately limited by the ability to sell our goods elsewhere -- either in Canada or abroad; and I suggest that the government in any jurisdiction cannot live outside these facts for very long. Therefore policies which apply either regionally or nationally must accept limitations on their effectiveness that may be opposed by the like-making policy powers in other jurisdictions. All economic policy in our society depends ultimately and is limited by the people and their desires and their capacities and their actions.

Well, Sir, if you've borne with me so far in this rather academic discussion of the powers of the province and the limitations that affect us and some of the main economic considerations which none of us can escape from, I think we should try to answer the question of what the province is doing within the framework of powers that I have just set out. In defining the powers of government we have given an outline in broad terms of the responsibilities of government; but there is more to be said to it than that. While it is true -- and we stress this -- that government in our federal democratic system cannot create prosperity; it is equally true that the government can and must do much to encourage prosperity. And it must be our ultimate objective to create that climate of incentives and conditions which call forth the talents and abilities of enterprise in our community, whether on an individual or a corporate basis. I suggest that one of the most significant factors in this approach to the creation of unemployment is investment, because investment creates the facilities and the opportunities, and eventually the productive economy of fully employed resources and fully employed workers. Government can do much to stimulate investment within the limits of its financial resources. I would like now, Sir, to make the statement that this government has provided a major level

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . of public investment in the last three years in the Province of Manitoba. Through the municipalities we have added millions of dollars. I think the figure for school construction, for example, is \$50 million worth of capital construction in schools, either underway or authorized, has been done by this province in co-operation with the municipal taxpayers. When you add to that the investment in waterworks, sewage and drainage facilities, the hospitals and roads and bridges and public buildings, local utilities and service established of all kinds, you can appreciate that we have made what I believe to be a major effort, to make the right kind of investment that will lead to further employment and production in the Province of Manitoba. If you were to compile a list, Sir, of what has been done in the last two or three years, I think the total would indeed be startling. I've said there's been a capital investment in new schools of some \$50 million. At the University of Manitoba and its affiliates, there has been an investment of \$15 million. The Agricultural Credit Act and the Industrial Development Credit Act have accounted for an investment of some \$15 million. Roads and capital aids to municipalities and other public works \$142 million; expenditures on utilities \$172 million; water control and drainage, etc., \$15 million. In the course of the last three years and continuing into the present, there is a capital investment in what we believe to be sensible productive resources in the ultimate sense for our province, of over a quarter of a billion dollars; and I think this represents a mammoth effort indeed.

The point that I'm trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that this province in the last few years has done just about all, I think, that it could possibly be expected to do in the way of public investment in those basic and essential requirements, such as, education, sewer and water, hospitals, roads, the generation of electricity, the telephone system and all those things, that our capacity will allow us to absorb. Certainly I do not think that I would care to recommend any substantial raising of the level or increasing of that effort of public investment within the Province of Manitoba. I do believe that the provision of those public services which in my opinion are essential, have done about as much as one can expect government to do to lay a foundation upon which the rest of our economy and the rest of our society can profitably employ themselves, and employ the rest of the people within our community. If you add this investment with the private capital investment in the province, which has never been higher than it has in the last three years, I think you'll find that there has been a very considerable effort indeed made to provide that basic capital investment upon which, in the last analysis, jobs depend, and our economic progress depends. You can add to that, of course, the things that we're doing on current account which are useful in improving our services.

I won't repeat what the Minister of Industry and Commerce has been saying about the Industrial Development Fund or the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation about the Agricultural Credit Corporation, both of which are designed to make it possible for people who don't have access to capital requirements to get the money they need to make their facilities economic in every sense. I won't mention much about the service side of our activities except to say that they have been increased out of all recognition; but I think I can say that it has been done by and large at a reasonable cost to the taxpayers. The taxation has in fact been held low, which I think represents a contribution which the government makes to the attraction of enterprise and to expansion, and I think that is an important factor to recall when dealing with this matter. So it seems to me that while I'm quite sure that members can stand up and point to individual projects of merit, suggestions can be received which I think will be well worth listening to about matters which perhaps could receive more attention and better attention than we have been able to give at the present time. I would suggest to the House that looking at the picture as a whole and taking the overall view, that the policy of this administration has been, and continues to be, to create the most desirable circumstances for the expansion of industry and of activity here in this province insofar as governments can do by providing those services which come within its sphere. I don't think that it would be practical -- and it really hasn't been suggested sincerely -- I don't think it would be practical to visualize any great expansion of that degree of effort or activity as being sound and within the capacity of this province by itself to undertake.

Another point that I think was well made by the Leader of the CCF Party when he spoke on this matter has to do with the training and the retraining of our people; training and retraining of those who are unemployed; and the training of those who are coming onto the labour

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . market. There was a most telling report that appeared the other day about the unemployment situation in the Maritimes, which indicated that 75 percent of the people down there who were unemployed had progressed no farther than grade eight, and that one of the things that became more and more apparent was the cardinal importance of keeping people in school as long as they could receive some advantage from it. Well, we've recognized that, Sir. Our efforts to improve the secondary level of education in this province had that clearly in mind when we began; not merely to secure a university entrance standard, but also to make it possible and practical for the larger secondary divisions to undertake some kind of technical training; some kind of occupational training within the new system. I think it is going to take time for the full results of that to become apparent or for the full opportunities to be grasped by those concerned. But I think that is a basic step which we have taken and which bears directly on this particular province. There was an interesting editorial in one of the papers the other day about what a year in school will do and they attempted to put a dollar and cents value on staying in high school another year. The figure came out at \$16,000 to lifetime earnings for every year in high school, and \$25,000 for every year in college. Well it's a matter of debate as to whether those figures are realistic or not but they illustrate the point that I think was being made, and that is, in our modern society we simply must provide these educational facilities and we must persuade people to use them, and we must try to do the best job we can on it. Our reforms in education bear directly and immediately on this important point, but I'll be the first to admit that there's much that remains to be done. I think there are more possibilities in technical education. I would like to see the Federal Government give us more assistance in this important field, and I'm glad to acknowledge that in connection with the Manitoba Institute of Technology they did give us a very substantial leg up by offering to pay 75 percent of the cost of that institution which we will ask you to approve in due course. But I think the thing we have to remember is that people are not commodities to be processed; it requires of each one of us and each one of the public an exercise of will to try and fit ourselves into the future. It's our job to do our best to provide the facilities but we have to challenge the individual to co-operate and to take advantage of that situation. I would say Sir, that there has been a massive effort in investment in the public services in endeavor to create the right atmosphere and climate and facilities for the job. I think the investment in education which is the biggest one we make, is entirely worthwhile in preparing our people for the future and I've some hopes that the committee on Manitoba's economic future, which we have proposed, will help us to bring together all those people who are interested in the problems of growth and unemployment, because it does involve the whole community, and we must secure the interests and the active support of the whole community if we're going to succeed in this. It isn't good enough for us to pass the resolution; it isn't good enough indeed for us to content ourselves with providing these facilities, because as citizens we have to go farther than that. We have, for example, to try and strike a spark if you like, from men in responsibility in the field of management and the field of labour. We have to try and persuade those who are in charge of our secondary industry in this country on the two great sides, management and labour, that perhaps some of the things Mr. Coyne has been saying are not too wide of the mark when he tells us that we should try and supply a greater portion of our home market ourselves. Not that tariff is an ultimate solution; and not necessarily that people must work harder, but certainly that they must work smarter -- that we must challenge labour and management to increase productivity. That when we do so we have to make sure that everyone understands that when productivity is increased there must be a willingness to go fair share on the fruits of that product and the fruits of that prosperity as between labour and management. One of the things we could do within this country is a new climate of feeling and a new climate of confidence between labour and management and a new co-operative effort, because when people are snarling at each other on different sides of the table regardless of how well motivated they may be in their individual section, there is such a distressing human tendency to put on the blinkers and see nothing but ones own point of view -- and I suppose that politicians could be accused of that failing as much as any other group in the community. I will accept any reproach that honourable members would like to level at me in that respect because with the best will in the world we find it hard to do, but I think we must make that effort. Now I think the thing that our country needs today is men who are willing to make that effort because with the best will in the world, without that approach

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . to our problem and without the conviction that we are in the same boat, and without the conviction that each one of us affects the other and we can't get along without one another, we're going to continue to have difficulties of an important and serious nature.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that that attitude of mind would become agreeable to the people who are concerned in our economic program because whatever the policy our solution today is that we need a greater total product. I'm not interested in redividing the same pie among different people; it's an interesting exercise but it doesn't get you very far. I want bigger slices; and bigger slices only come from a bigger pie. There's no increase for anyone that will not cost somebody else something unless we're able to produce more -- and that's a message that needs to be driven home as hard as we can drive it. That it's no good just sharing up the same old pie between different people or asking for a bigger share ourselves. We've got to have greater productivity. Unless everyone benefits, no one really benefits in the long run. Now I would not maintain that there's no room for improvement in the distribution of our prosperity and our wealth at the present time. That's a process that's continually going on, but I suggest that improvement will not come about by reducing our productive capacity in any one section to benefit another. Such benefits are illusory and short lived. Only the total expansion of our wealth can be of real benefit to any sector; and only increased productivity can produce that expansion; and only such expansion can produce new employment. Sometimes it strikes one as a little odd as it often seems to me, that so many of our problems stem from an attitude of mind. So many of our difficulties come from the way in which we ourselves look on the problems that we face, and sometimes if we could get a new look and a new stance, we would find new results and new ideas and new progress. It's a wonderful thing to be able to stand outside of your own shoes for a little while and look at yourself objectively, and it's a very difficult thing; but I think this is one of the times when it would pay us to try and do it. So we have our committee on Manitoba's economic future which will bring together labour and management and government and the farmer and the academics of the university, in the community, to try and develop not a labour policy or a management policy or a government policy, but a community policy as to how we are going to create these jobs in Manitoba that we need. I think that our efforts here in this province compare well with what any other province is doing; I wouldn't mind being compared with other jurisdictions. I won't make the claim that we're better; I don't think that's relevant. But I do say that I think we are doing things that compare well with what other jurisdictions are doing. We're doing many if not most of the things that are reasonable and practical under the circumstances, but we have to admit the limits of our provincial capacity to carry out the good works that are so easy to think of and so easy to suggest, because without co-operation at the national level, and with other provinces, we are limited indeed.

It is not my business to say what the Government at Ottawa is doing in one sense, and yet perhaps it is not out of place just to repeat some of the efforts they are making in this connection, although members may have different views as to their effectiveness: loans to small businesses certainly is helpful -- recently the figure was given of some 15,000 small businesses have applied for around \$75 million worth of assistance, capital nature. I'm sure that will increase. Movement of the Canadian dollar toward par has certainly been helpful in my estimation for our exporting industries and also has taken some of the pressure perhaps off imports. Easier terms for housing particularly in the low income group we hope will stimulate the important construction section of our industry; in Manitoba it appears it is having that effect to some extent. The increased federal contributions toward technical education -- they now pay 50 percent of the operational costs and 75 percent of capital construction, which is a good thing. Grants to construct university students' residences is helpful. The double depreciation idea is very interesting and perhaps -- we find that in municipal areas on whom the initiative rests in this province who can take advantage of that factor, we may have an inducement to promote the industrialization of the province. I'm sure the National Productivity Council if approached in the right way, as I hope it will be, should be of assistance in what we're trying to do here in the Province of Manitoba. But there are other things that I would like to see the Federal Government embark upon -- and there's no secret about any of these things because I've talked about most of them at length in various places. One is, we have been

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . looking for a cheaper and easier supply of credit for investment in what I call social capital. We have long maintained that municipalities and provinces are not in a preferred position, perhaps not in as desirable a position, in obtaining capital as they should be. The Federal Government of course has first claim on the markets. And then private industry has advantages to offer that we cannot, such as convertible privileges by which bonds may be converted into stock rights and other various attractions which are called sweeteners, I suppose, in the trade, that improve the marketability of financial interests. We're not so fortunately situated. I've maintained for some time that it would be advantageous to the community, particularly where we need social investment as we know we do, in the building of schools, in the provision of sewer and water, in our road system, and in many of those other activities which are not directly revenue-producing, that there should be some assistance provided for the supply of capital. We have suggested several alternatives. Perhaps the interest on bonds of this sort should be income tax free. That is a system that is used with considerable effect in the United States of America. Perhaps there would be a 20 percent tax credit such as there is for dividends on Canadian corporations to at least place us in the same tax position as they are. Perhaps there should be a federal fund to provide money for social capital purposes for the provinces and for others. These things have been suggested by us to the monetary authorities on many occasions; I still think they would be very helpful indeed and provide a stimulus toward the provision of those services which we believe we need.

I would also like to draw attention to a proposal that I made to the Federal Government at the time of one of the Federal Provincial Conferences recently -- I think this was in October -- in which I urged upon them the establishment of a national development policy and a national development council. That we would like to see established jointly with Canada and the provinces a national economic advisory board which would analyze and consider and advise the governments of this country on measures best suited to our development. This would not be a body commissioned to produce a master plan for economic management. No such thing is contemplated, and in my opinion the practical value of it might be small. But it is possible and I thought at that time and I do now, essential that we should meet the complex economic problems that we face by bringing to bear upon them a co-ordination of the best minds and skills available. We need a continuing effort because the problems that we solve today will arise in other forms in the future. That's been the history of mankind. We thought that a permanent advisory group of that sort would be successful. Not that it should subvert the constitutional responsibilities or trench upon the powers or duties of government, but it would give us an informed body of advisers who could present facts from a technical level upon which the policies of governments might be related and might be based. It seemed to me that the problems of dealing with a high level of technological unemployment should be a number one project for such a body to consider; and I also said that it should consider all aspects of tariffs and trade and taxation policies to see how these bear on the economic circumstances of the individual provinces, particularly a province like ours where so much of our enterprise is geared to an export market. This body could deal with the impact of tariffs on the centralization of industry and what could be done to counteract it -- secure decentralization -- and could deal with many other matters that will readily occur to members if they consider the scope and aspect of a body of that sort. It seemed to me that this would be worthwhile doing. I know there are members who become impatient when we talk about these studies and experts and all that kind of thing, and I share their impatience, because sometimes they do blind you with science more than do any particular good, but it seems to me we have to try and get to the basic facts of our situation if we're to know what measures we can devise to relieve them. It would still remain the function of elected representatives of the people to decide what can be done, but I do not object to having the best informed advice available at my elbow; and it seemed to me a body of this sort, to consider some of our problems from a national point of view rather than the sectional and provincial one that animates us so often, might conceivably be of some considerable assistance. I must say that I like the export drive policies of the Federal Government because they represent something that should be done, and I am happy to recommend the suggestions made by the Minister of Industry and Commerce here in his eleven-point program as to how that could be turned to advantage in the Province of Manitoba. He dealt with that very fully last night so I don't think that the House would want me to deal with

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . it again tonight.

Looking over the field of activities in which I feel the Federal Government could be of assistance in helping the provinces to help themselves, and I think we must always keep that concept in the forefront of our discussions -- to help the provinces to help themselves -- that they could expand their assistance to technical education throughout the whole of our educational system, although I do agree that special emphasis should be placed on what perhaps might be called the junior technical colleges and the training and the retraining of the unemployed. I would like to see something done in that respect to enable people who have exhausted their unemployment insurance to continue their training, if they could profitably take advantage of it in a way that is not possible at the present time. I would like to see a National Development Fund set up because I rather agree with the Leader of the CCF when he gave his view that the Industrial Development Bank at Ottawa has tended to become pretty much like a regular commercial bank -- if you get it from them, you can go down and get it from any commercial bank -- and that's been my experience too. I would like to see the concept of the National Development Fund given some thought; to provide financial support and technical advice; to accelerate the development and growth of employment opportunities, both primary and secondary; and also to support the development programs that the provinces have. I think that if we had greater financial resources we could do a lot more toward helping ourselves here in Manitoba. I am a great believer in that form of decentralization because we're on the spot. We have, perhaps, a greater appreciation of local possibilities than the Federal Government might do, and if we could safely be trusted with the administration of some of these funds and I think we could, that we would probably get a greater return from the nation than if it were done some other way.

I would like to see measures taken to provide additional incentives, to encourage the decentralization of new industry on a nation-wide basis. We face that problem right here. We face the problem of trying to decentralize from the Metro area and the rest of Manitoba. Without wishing to claim the world by a tail, I think that we have made good progress in encouraging the decentralization of industry and spreading it out through the province. I think we have made substantial progress in that way and I think that we are getting the most splendid co-operation from the people of Rural Manitoba in that effort, and I can't be grateful enough for it. The same thing needs to be done, I think, in respect of the centralization of our national economy in the two great provinces to the east of us here. I want to see some assistance to provinces and local governments to secure social capital of the type that I have described, at economical rates of interest, either through the provision of incentives or by the institution of a national fund for that purpose. We would like to see, and we have said it many times, that the Federal Government should join with us for the development of a national highway grid, indeed in the development of a national power grid, which is going to become increasingly important as we use up the local supplies of power and turn to the great reservoirs that we have in the north; and any other measures that could reasonably be proposed to lead to a resumption of that rate of growth and development that we need in Canada to sustain full employment.

Mr. Speaker, I am only too conscious of the limitations of the contribution which I am trying to make to this debate this afternoon. I am only too conscious that it's difficult in the press of a session of this sort to compile a coherent and logical statement that covers the whole of the economic problem that a resolution of this sort does. I am only too conscious of the difficulty, the temptation that one might fall into of asking somebody else to do it all, or to do the major part, when we ourselves are not doing what we ought to do ourselves. I am only too conscious of the limitations which we have here, due to the responsibilities that are ours as compared to the national picture and the national responsibilities and the national interests, that some of the things that might appear so logical and wise to us, in our sphere, might appear somewhat differently on the national scene. But one must do what one can; and so I offer these remarks to the House this afternoon as a modest contribution to this very great and important and pressing problem, in the knowledge that other members will be able to make important contributions which perhaps I have not been able to do, but in the hope that it will provide, in some measure, a foundation on which we can try various measures and various alternatives in dealing with our problems. I don't believe that there is any magic solution. I don't believe that there is any theory that saves our liberties and which enables us at the same time to meet this problem entirely. I think it is a question of trial and effort; I think it's a question of doing what



(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)...we can and seeing how that works; and if it doesn't work, then we try something else.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to, traditionally, offer an amendment to my honourable friend's resolution. I hope he won't consider it to be a weasel amendment because it's not intended in that way. What the amendment does is it takes out of the main motion that suggestion that the province should perform this economic miracle by itself, for reasons which I hope I stated and covered in some degree. It's an amendment which asks the House to approve of what we have done, although I don't think it asks the House to say that we're perfect, and it sets out certain particular items on which we feel that further co-operation with the Federal Government would be helpful, although I am conscious that in particularizing in this way one always opens the door of the mind to a hundred other good ideas which other members may have. However I do submit this to you as follows: By striking out all the words after "whereas" in the first line and substituting the following: "despite increasing increases in the level of employment, unemployment has reached an abnormal level in Canada and in Manitoba; and whereas this employment constitutes a serious economic problem for the people concerned and for the country as a whole; therefore be it resolved that this House endorse the Government's present effort to advance the economic development of this province through its own program and support its endeavours to have the Government of Canada provide other necessary incentives to growth by such means as follows: (a) the extension of Federal aid toward the development of technical education throughout the whole educational system, especially in the Junior Technical Colleges, including the training and retraining of the unemployed; (b) the formation on a joint Federal-Provincial basis of a National Economic Advisory Board to inform and advise the governments in Canada on matters of economic importance, including the question of tariffs; (c) the establishment of a national development fund to provide financial support and technical advice to accelerate the development and growth of employment opportunities, in both primary and secondary industry, and to support provincial development programs; (d) the provision of additional incentives to encourage the decentralization of new industry on a nationwide basis; (e) the assistance to provinces and local governments in securing necessary social capital at economic rates of interest, either through the provision of suitable incentives or by the institution of a national fund for such necessary proposals; (f) the participation of the Federal Government in the development of a national highway grid; and (g) the participation of the Federal Government in the development of a national power grid, particularly in the north; and (h) such other positive measures as will lead to the resumption of the rate of growth and development in Canada necessary to sustain full employment. I have the honour to move this, Sir, seconded by the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two. First of all I want to congratulate the First Minister for his very able constructive prepared address. I think it could be considered an imposition on my part to get up and discuss a matter so important, and after such a very able address, but you know today is the first day of spring and a young man sometimes visualize or start dreaming and I thought perhaps -- I dreamt that I, on the first day of spring, have the nerve to spark the discussion with one of the ablest debaters in this House. After his hour and a half talk he did not say anything about where will the unemployed get a loaf of bread tomorrow. He needs it tomorrow. He needs a pair of shoes tomorrow walking the streets looking for a job. He doesn't need it in the days to come. We need it in days to come, but we need it right now; and all the resolution said is that we are ready and willing to try and do something now. After that supplement the First Minister said, I'm reminded of a very good true story. I had a friend of mine who was selling his vegetables in the summer; in the winter there's no market for it. They couldn't get any vegetables, still he had to feed a horse and carry him through the winter. He tried very hard to give him less food every day, teach him to live without much food, but by the time the horse graduated he died. Let's be practical. The 30,000 unemployed are here today. This resolution would give them a little bit of comfort, a little bit of, at least if not material comfort, hoping that here's a government that is not planning for him for an extra year -- it's going to come -- but is planning for him worrying about him, never mind anything else. It's worrying, it concerned about him tomorrow. By bringing in a resolution outlining a program that's going to

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)...happen next year, or five years, or ten years from now, I don't think it's playing cricket with the unemployed.

You know the Parliament in Israel once were debating the economic situation and some one suggested at that time, it was nine or ten years ago, to declare war on America and we are going to lose the war and then American will have to feed us. So the Prime Minister then said, "What will happen, if God forbid, that we will defeat America. Then we will have to feed 150 million people". That's exactly the very same thing today. All the promises made, and they are good ones, practical ones, all the suggestions outlined, all the plans outlined, for today is wishful thinking; and let's hope it may materialize. But at the same time I think that the unemployed here require a little hope, require a certain amount of promise from the government that we are concerned about them. They need any help that we can give them today. If there are plans for a hundred or a quarter million dollars of the province for the next year, or two, or three, let's do it right away. Let's do it now. Don't wait until they lose all their courage; they lose their strength; they lose their optimism; and, in many cases, they break up their homes because they cannot provide. So let's be practical once and for all and not try to water down everything that's suggested with something else.

So I will respectfully suggest -- first of all I want to apologize to the Premier for having the nerve to disagree with him, but at the same time I feel that these promises we've heard so many, so many times, they're practical and everything else. It's true it's very important to plan years ahead. If we'd planned the unemployment situation years ahead we wouldn't have any of this trouble today. We are just facing the problems when they come to us. Just like many go to the doctor when they are sick. When they cannot walk they rush them to the hospital, but they'll never go and see a doctor during the year. So I feel, Mr. Speaker, that everything the First Minister said may be all right. The amendment, in my opinion, will not solve the problem and it will probably create a worse dissension of the unemployed when they find that a very innocent resolution suggested was turned down by an amendment of things that will come in a year or two, or five from now. It is just like adding insult to injury. I think it is a big mistake, in my humble opinion, on the part of the First Minister, as able as he is, to amend this resolution. If he wants to do other planning, it could have come as a new resolution entirely. I see that there are 30,000 unemployed here in the province that are very disappointed with the action of this government.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words to compliment the First Minister on his wonderful address. It certainly was a good address and I do not intend to pick too many holes in it at all. He had a good theme, put it across very well; but it seems to me that, in one instance especially, he stretched the truth a little bit too much, unless I am totally wrong in my argumentation as I will bring it forward at the present time. He painted us a rosy picture of what sums of money his government has been instrumental in having spent in this province in order to provide employment. One statement that he made was this, that his government and the municipalities together had spent some \$50 million dollars in school construction in this province. I have before me, Mr. Speaker, a statement provided to me by the Minister of Education with respect to school capital grants. In this proposed year, it is proposed to be spent by the government \$4.8 million. Last year the government spent around \$3 million. In 1959, I haven't got the figures but I would expect that it's possible the school program was just getting established, it had just been voted down and not approved by the municipalities -- maybe there was a government expenditure of \$2 million in 1959. The First Minister told us that in the three years they had spent within this province \$50 million. Now in those three years I can make it only about \$10 million from the government, and knowing very well that the municipalities had spent possibly about as much as this amount, maybe 50 percent -- say the municipalities have spent \$10 million, this would be \$20 million.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I can set my honourable friend's mind at rest here, I think, because the figures that I am using are the total amount of money that is going to be expended or has been expended in the building of these schools. The total amount authorized and borrowed. The figures that he is using is the provincial support which, of course, is the annual amortization charge on that amount. They're two quite different concepts and completely consistent one with another.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I think the point taken by the First Minister is a good one. Let's see, the annual charge compares into the total cost, but still I'm doubtful whether the program that is contemplated this year, and what has been spent already, will amount to \$50 million. I'm still very doubtful.

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. ORLIKOW: I would like the permission of the House to withdraw this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member from St. John's permission to withdraw the motion? — Agreed. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, with the kind permission of the House, I beg to leave this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

..... continued next page

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, at first I had no intention of participating in this resolution, but after hearing several comments made, for and against it, I thought I could contribute something towards this very interesting debate. I believe it's the first time since I've been a member of the House that a resolution of this kind has been introduced here. Whether it's the first time it's ever been introduced in this House I don't know. To speak on the surface -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, I'm sorry, I think it was voted down on second reading. I don't think ..... On the surface the resolution appears to be a very easy way to raise money and to assist a very worthy cause. A worthy endeavour in order to defray the expenses of the rising costs of our hospitals in this province. But on the matter of principle, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is wrong, because our hospitals and other institutions should not be maintained and sustained by legalizing lotteries in this province. The legalizing of lotteries in my personal opinion would be a retrogressive action, for any political party to sponsor and put into effect. I believe it is against the proper code of ethics as far as the opinions of many, many people are concerned. I was very much interested at the comments made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. It took a great deal of research to prepare and get that interesting information, and particularly the fact, that I wasn't aware, that in England lotteries have been an accepted fact for over 250 years. But from time to time it appears the governments in power have felt that it should be suspended because of the unscrupulous methods that were conducted in the way the project was put into effect. May I say this, Mr. Speaker, that on the surface, state lotteries, or even lotteries that are conducted due to the jurisdiction of the government by private people, appear to be a good business project. Yet it is a recognized fact that it is very burdensome, and it's expensive, and certainly, certainly does not produce the profits that it appears to have at the beginning of the venture. From time to time we have read about frequent cases of counterfeiting of sweepstake tickets that have taken place abroad and on the North American continent. As a matter of fact, two or three years ago, down in the eastern part of Canada several groups of people, individuals who were actually conducting their own private type of lottery, were arrested with many counterfeit sweepstake tickets that were very much like the ones that were being promoted by the Irish and Australian Sweepstakes. I was also most interested in the interesting report given by the Honourable Member for Wellington. After reading it I realized he did a great deal of research work, because it was information that for many of the members was entirely new, and particularly in the United States it appears even at the beginning of the formation of the country, as far back as 1776 lotteries were encouraged, possibly brought over at the time from England. But due to an investigation made by the Grandjury in the state of New York they came to a plausible and very correct decision, and this is what they said. In my own words I'll express it, because I can't recall what was said at the time by the Grand jury, but it said that the lottery, they thought, was a cold-blooded method of raising money. The fact that the people were gullible enough to buy them. From time to time we know that lotteries have been suspended because of the very dishonest and unscrupulous manner in which they have been conducted.

I do, however, feel that to some extent the latter statement made by the Honourable Member for Wellington in which he immediately brings in the hospital -- I disagree with him there because of his usual anti-socialistic viewpoint which is contrary to the government -- your government, who are actually introducing socialistic legislation, and has been done across Canada for many, many years, and as far as socialistic legislation it has become a reality and accepted by many countries of the world. We're also aware, Mr. Speaker, that gambling and betting and taking a chance has been going on for thousands of years. If one were to read the histories, the backgrounds of what was then said to be civilized nations, going back to the time of the Egyptians and to the Greek period, the Roman Empire, and even to our South American Indians and North American Indians, betting was done. It was done, and it continues to the present time. Today we know that we have legalized gambling in the casinos and gambling halls of Las Vegas, in Monte Carlo, in Havana and many other cities around the world, and it does bring a source of revenue to the state or the country involved. Just as in England people can bet on soccer games publicly through the bookie, and the source of revenue that comes to the Treasury of the English government is possibly beneficial in that state. We know that the Irish Sweepstakes have been in effect for 31 years and they do sell tickets two or three times a year in order to bring in a revenue amounting to millions of dollars. But there's one thing, Mr.

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd.) . . . . Speaker, that people who have money will always gamble, but it is a recognized fact, a recognized fact that the bulk of the people who gamble at any time come from what they call the low or middle class wage earners. The bulk. We're also aware, Mr. Speaker, that in order to have sweepstakes in this province it still has to be passed by the Federal Government at Ottawa, and just a week or so ago it was talked down to the bottom of the orders, and no doubt it might occur again during the course of the session this year. We know that bingo games are played continually in this province. They're played on a very small scale and a large scale, and as a matter of fact in the past few years, particularly since the new arena came up, we find that various organizations have moved in because of its capacity, and are conducting colossal bingo games. There's one thing that we should not forget, is that the bingo games conducted in any church organization, or under those considerations, are supported by the people who are putting in time; they're putting in effort to sell the tickets and to help and assist at these games. The most important thing, we should recognize and remember that the bulk of the net revenue after you have taken the overhead expenses for the hall and for the tickets, the bulk of it goes to worthwhile community endeavour, whether it's for the church, for the Old Folks' Home, and for various other types of organizations. Let's not forget that. It's a voluntary effort on the part of the citizens who belong to the Kiwanis Club, the Lions Club, and many other church organizations, as well as the men and ladies; they go out, they're willing to spend their time and effort because the bulk of the net revenue from bingo games will go for a worthy cause to pay the debt of a church or a school, as the case may be, or any other needed furnishings for such activities. We know the work of the Kiwanis Club, the Lions Club; look at the ventures they have -- selling apples, and tag days, but I don't think anyone is regretting pulling out a quarter to put into a tag box, or is willing to buy a ticket or two for a venture of that kind, knowing that it will all go to the worthy cause. The most important thing is that in most cases where you have bingo games or raffle games, you find that the bulk of the prizes donated could be free for advertising purposes. I know for a fact that in some cases where at the arena where they're giving cars away, boats and electrical appliances, I've been told that they do get it at a great discount and some times at wholesale price. There is a service of that kind that they would get, but there's one thing that we should recognize, that bingo or buying raffle tickets is an accepted fact by our society. Why do I say this? Because they know it is less costly, and they would prefer playing bingo in a friendly atmosphere in a smoke-filled hall rather than go out to the racetrack where there's a lot of fresh air and bet the kind of money that they do, knowing that they possibly will lose more money than they will lose at a bingo game. Now why do I say this? Because a person can buy a ticket for a dollar, or two dollars the maximum, and play anywhere from 16 to 20 games of bingo, and as I said, enjoy the atmosphere of companionship. Or else a person comes up to you and says, "Buy a ticket." Well, you invariably will do it for two reasons. You know that it is going to go to a worthy cause. You'll invest 10 cents or pay three for a quarter, or in some cases we have cases where you pay a dollar a ticket. You don't mind doing it because you look at the label, who is sponsoring it, and you know that the people who are endeavouring to sell these tickets have one reason. They're raising funds for a sports club, for a community club, or for other worthwhile endeavours, but when it comes to sweepstake tickets where you possibly will have to pay a minimum of \$3.50, possibly \$5.00 a ticket two or three times a year -- to me that is very, very expensive. I'll come to that later on.

Now, it was stated in the paper by one of the members here that the recognized fact -- as a matter of fact in yesterday's paper, the Free Press, it stated that the Irish Sweepstake has got the largest prize-winning lists in the history of the Irish Sweepstake. I think the largest, amounting to -- what is it? Six million pounds. The largest of its kind. That appears to be a terrific sum of money to raise, possibly as I've said again, for a good cause as the sponsor of the bill mentioned, to aid in hospital work and in scientific research work and so forth. But let us not forget one thing, that out of the six million pounds or thirty million dollars that was raised this year or -- no, it would be less than that. What's the pound worth? About -- it's a little less -- but only an eighth of that, points out the Press, will go to the worthy endeavour. One eighth, or 20 percent somebody mentioned. Now the honourable sponsor of the bill suggests that if we were to introduce legislation on sweepstakes here in this province that the tentative figure that he suggests is \$2 million a year. Now, on the basis of what the net returns should

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd.) . . . . be compared to what the Irish Sweepstake fund contributes to the hospital, we would have to sell in this province to return \$2 million, or on the basis of 20 percent, anywhere from 10 to 16 million dollars worth of tickets to be sold a year, which is utterly ridiculous, impossible, even if we had the full authority to sell it right across Canada. It's out of the question. We couldn't do it. We couldn't sell \$16 million worth of tickets if we were the only province having the authority to sell sweepstake tickets. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm talking about the fact that we are turning first to the Canadian market. You've got to do a lot of advertising and spend money to get the American public in on that. Just like the Irish Sweepstakes are doing. As a matter of fact, according to the figure that was given by one of the honourable members, I think six percent of the people in Ireland buy those tickets. Is that right? Six percent. And the bulk of it, 94 percent, comes from all parts of the world. Now I always feel that a person going to bingo games has as much chance as the next individual of winning a prize, or if you buy a ticket you contribute 10 cents; you wish that you might win a prize, but according to the figures given, the ratio of anyone getting a winning horse -- I believe the Honourable Member for Selkirk mentioned that -- the ratio getting a ticket on the winning horse is one in 400,000. Or getting a prize, the least prize on the list would be one in 4,000. I think your chances of winning on a raffle are far better than they are in buying a sweepstake ticket.

Now, I was somewhat taken aback, Mr. Speaker, and very much surprised reading last week that a gentleman by the name of Mr. Wocks, who is the manager of the Manitoba Retail Association, came out publicly that he was for the selling of sweepstake tickets. That's rather odd, because the very same gentleman two or three years ago presented a brief on the Manitoba Retail Association protesting most vehemently that the Law Amendments Committee -- about the fact that we were going to raise the number of days of racing in this province from 28 days to 42 days. Now I can't understand whether this man spoke for himself. I'm pretty sure he didn't speak for the Manitoba Retail Association. That's rather odd that on one hand he's against the sanction of the racing time and yet he is for the idea of adopting the resolution to sell sweepstake tickets. Now what was the big beef at the time? Well, he protested on behalf -- we had a brief -- was the fact, and this is true because I'm giving you the experiences of my parents who conducted a grocery store themselves for many years, a corner grocery store, and during the horse racing season which appeared twice a year at Whittier Park and Polo Park, they were dreadful times for the corner storekeeper, I can tell you that. It was bad enough that we gave them credit which we couldn't refuse, but they even had the audacity to ask to borrow \$5.00 to go to the races, horse races, which we couldn't refuse either. And there were times when we had to wait, my parents had to wait months before they could get their debts of the grocery bills back because of the horse races that appeared twice a year at that time.

I voiced my criticism when it was suggested in the House, that they should raise it from 28 days to 42 days, because I feel that it's the sport of kings. It always has been. It started as the sport of kings, horse racing, if you know the history of it. Then betting took place. We know this, that the amount of money that this government received in return amounted to approximately \$300,000 as their source of revenue for last year, 1960. But let us not lose sight of one thing, that in order for this government to get \$300,000 there was a sum of \$5 million spent last year on the pari-mutuels in this province. \$5 million. Now, I believe the horses had a good winter. They must have eaten lavishly. I know that the racetrack people who own the track cut up a nice dividend, and I also know that the owners of horses spent their time in Florida for the last six months or so. But the point is, where did that money come from? \$5 million. Again I reiterate that it came from the bulk of the low-wage earners. The bulk of it. Now, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell suggests that we should move as quickly as possible to get on this gravy train before the other provinces wake up to the fact. Well, I can assure you that they're not going to be asleep either once Ottawa decides to open the door to sweepstake tickets in this Canada of ours, and there will be many of them who will move in so fast that before you know it you will have a glut on the market of sweepstake tickets in this province and right across Canada. So I'm afraid that your appeal there would not be too effective, because you still have to have the sanction of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I'm fully aware that we cannot eradicate, do away with gambling or betting, but I do say, why should we as legislators in this province encourage more legalized gambling?

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd. )..... I don't think it's our responsibility. I don't think it will bring that much revenue to the coffers of the treasury of this government that will ease the anguish of the money that will be spent. Coming back to the horse racing of the \$5 million. I would venture to say that we lost a lot of that, even 25 percent of it -- I believe 25 percent left this province, it actually left this province of Manitoba. It went to other parts of Canada and parts of the United States. -- (Interjection) -- Quite a bit, buy my contention is that any time that money is spent on such a large scale the horse winners and other people gain the benefits. Mr. Speaker, there is just one thing that I feel that we should recognize at all times, is that it's a difficult enough problem to try to discriminate the type of books as is mentioned by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, to discriminate the type of literature and the type of magazines that should be sold across the counter. We have enough difficulty right now in trying to impress -- you know the kind of trash that we get on TV shows, which affect -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes! Which affect a lot of our young youth in regard to the scenes that you see from time to time of gambling, drinking, and gun fighting and everything else, without trying to -- (Interjection) -- Well, that is very revealing at times, without trying to impress, for example, on our youngsters at school, and the evils of gambling or drinking or otherwise. But if we are going to condone sweepstake tickets you can rest assured that every kid will have a book in his pocket and clamouring on the door because he will get his dollar cut out of that sweepstake ticket. He will do it. He will do it, and I think it's the wrong attitude that we as legislators should take. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the arguments presented by the few of the speakers that I've heard that -- "Oh well, we all gamble, we always buy raffle tickets", -- I don't think that is a convincing enough way of trying to impress on the members here that just because we casually buy raffle tickets and go out and play an odd game of bingo that we should go ahead and support this resolution. In the first place, I think it's dishonest for any government to sponsor projects of this kind, and I certainly think it's immoral because of the vast opinions of investigations that have taken place in many countries of the world. We've had Grand Juries set up who all have come to the conclusion most decisively that lotteries of any kind is a racket, and only the selected few reap the benefits. I think, Mr. Speaker, I think we should look this resolution over rationally and sensibly, and vote it down this session, and let us wait to see what our superior members at Ottawa will do with the bill that's in the session at the present time. There's no doubt about it that possibly the member has moved it with honest intention -- I certainly don't doubt that at any time -- but I still feel that this is not the business of we in the Legislative House to promote and further legalized gambling at any time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. R. G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is moving the closure of the debate.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I had not -- with these faithful words I begin -- I had not intended to participate in this debate until I was stimulated to do so by the remarks of the mover of this resolution. We have, as legal members of the House will know, we have a very useful Latin maxim which we apply in the law from time to time, it goes as follows -- "De minimis non curat lex" (Hear, Hear!) -- and that means that the law does not concern itself with trifles. And I think that this would be an exceptionally fine resolution upon which the House might well adopt a similar Latin maxim, and that is why I hesitated at all to speak on this matter. But I must say I was tremendously interested to see this newest manifestation of the Social Credit policy in Manitoba, and to con-  
jure as some of my honourable friends opposite have done, the wonderful effects that it would have upon municipal government throughout our fair province. We heard from the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain explaining what it would do in his area, and explaining of course why it wasn't necessary. We heard the Honourable Member from Morris give a few more jolts to this resolution when he spoke on it, and generally I think the feeling of the House is that the less discussion upon this minimus would be the better. But there was one statement made that I thought should be brought to the attention of the House, and that was the statement of the

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . Honourable Member from Rhineland that there is no protection today for the person who is in default of taxes on his homestead -- the farmer or the non-farmer -- and I merely arose on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, to call to his attention the fact, which was probably known by some other members in the House, that as regards tax sales of land, the tax sales may take place, but no application for title may be made against the land of a farmer or a retired farmer that is land used for farming, or against the actual home or the homestead under The Dower Act of a non-farmer unless the Debt Adjustment Commissioner issues a certificate to permit the matter to proceed. It is true that many, many sections of The Debt Adjustment Act which was found to be necessary during the 1930s have lapsed, but I suggest to the honourable member that if he will consult the act he will find that that provision is not only there but it's still used -- still used every day, practically, of the week by persons who are engaged in tax sales proceedings. So I would suggest to him that all is perhaps not as gloomy as he would make it out to be. I think when he listens to the estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs he will find out that tax collections have been coming in at a very, very good rate; that all is not doom and gloom down on the farm just because the Social Credit is not in power in Manitoba. I would suggest, therefore, Mr. Speaker, having said more on this subject than I originally intended to, that it has been demonstrated by other speakers, and I think that the resolution itself demonstrates the fact, that perhaps it was ill-conceived; that it was certainly unsupported in argument, and that it is deserving of a very swift and merciful execution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on this resolution, I would like to begin by saying that in the short time that I've been in the House, I've never seen the true intent, and meaning of any resolution so quickly and perhaps deliberately distorted. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain brought in Crown lands and their exemptions -- as you're all agreed before opposing the resolution -- and they are in no way relative to the intent or purpose of this resolution. The Honourable the Leader of the CCF criticized the resolution by calling it ridiculous. Yes, he used the word "ridiculous" and, Mr. Speaker, let us examine the intent of this resolution, the real meaning that has been overlooked by the critics. Let us examine the resolution section by section. First that whereas the income of the farmers has been declining in the last number of years -- with this part the Honourable the Leader of the CCF agreed. Then, whereas it is apparent that greater economic difficulties are facing the farmer and farm families today -- the Honourable Leader says this is not the ridiculous part -- and the third whereas: whereas the farmer has no protection from having his homestead sold for taxes when unable to pay the same. He agrees that this may be so. In other words, this is not the ridiculous part. Therefore, be it resolved that this House give consideration to the advisability of bringing in legislation whereby all resident quarter-sections of land occupied by legal owners are forever exempt from seizure for any tax or fee emanating from any government body within or under the jurisdiction of this Legislature for any cause whatsoever. This resolved part, in the Honourable the Leader of the CCF's opinion, is the ridiculous part. He is entitled to his opinion but let us examine the purpose of the resolution. Its purpose is simply to place a limit on the actions that governments may take with regard to dispossessing a farmer of his land. This is by no means an exemption from payment of taxes. Apparently the Honourable Leader of the CCF has never heard of exemption laws. Exemption laws are defined in Webster's legal definition -- says, "Laws for the purpose of protecting those who are unable to pay without cause and distress to themselves and their family." Does the Leader of the CCF think that these are ridiculous? Surely those who have projected themselves as defenders of the common man cannot think that any law which seeks to protect such people is ridiculous. Further criticism, again they sound blind dislike rather than study, quote me as referring to a quarter-section landholder. Simple examination will show that this resolution applies to all landholders without exception, but only exempts the resident quarter-section on which the owner lives from seizure procedures. Much criticism has been levelled here by statements which would indicate that people would simply stop paying their taxes if they were given such protection. I think that such estimations under-rate the honesty of the Canadian citizen and Manitoba ones in particular, and here I would refer to the experience that I have had in the Credit Union movement, that we have very few people who will deliberately try and avoid paying their debts and so on, and in some quarters, especially in banking quarters, people who



(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) . . . . subscribe to Credit Unions are very often referred to as those that are bigger risks and who are unable to get credit from banking concerns. I will agree that no citizen is ever fond of paying taxes, but I feel, and I am sure that most of the members here feel, that our citizens here are as conscientious of their responsibilities as they are anywhere, and I cannot accept this as a valid pretext for opposing the resolution. It has been said that the power to tax is the power to destroy, and I think that in these days of economic hardship and declining purchasing power that unless some protection is given many of our families -- family farmers are going to continue to leave the farms, and farming operations will grow into larger and larger units to the disadvantages of villages, towns and rural life itself.

With regard to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Morris, I think that by and large his remarks were based on a blind dislike for the principles that I uphold, and that he had not given the resolution logical consideration but spoke more against Social Credit than against the resolution itself. I have been informed by the Manitoba Social Credit Office that they have never received a request for information from this honourable member, and can only presume that his dislike is based on ignorance rather than knowledge. Surely as a member of a farming area he desires to obtain a minimum of protection for even the 26 or 27 percent of the farmers that he interpreted the resolution as covering. Governments have three basic methods by which they can acquire property. First, they can obtain it as a gift; secondly they can obtain it by purchase or expropriation; and thirdly, they can acquire it by taxation. By this third method any government so inclined could collect property by increasing taxes to the point where the majority of taxpayers could no longer pay the tax and the property becomes the state's by default of the taxpayer's part. When this third point is considered I can readily understand the true reason for opposition, of the protection such as offered in this resolution, by the Socialist group who seek to eradicate capitalism and individualism. Farming is capital at work and farmers are individuals who do not readily capitulate to centralizing and the power of the state. Now if I recall Karl Marx correctly, he is reported to have stated that the way to eliminate capitalism is to tax it out of existence. I think that the substance of the resolution is such that it protects the individual against destruction by any government, regardless of its label. Now I therefore ask the members of this House to consider it in the light of the reason because of individualism and spirit of true freedom.

MR. H. P. SHEWMAN (Morris): I just happen to have some more of these pamphlets that are handed out by the Social Credit Party so it wasn't just altogether inference.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 30. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose) presented Bill No. 30, An Act to incorporate Les Soeurs de la Charite de l'Hopital General Sainte Antoine de Le Pas for second reading and referral to Private Bills Committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 31.

MR. MOLGAT presented Bill No. 31, An Act to incorporate Les Soeurs de la Charite de l'Hopital General de Flin Flon for second reading and referral to Private Bills Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT speaks in French, and translation will appear in a later Hansard.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, will the Honourable Member permit a question? Would the honourable member mind telling the House what he said?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 41. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q. C. (River Heights) presented Bill No. 41, An Act to incorporate Breezy Bend Country Club, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GRAY: . . . . . I am sorry, go ahead.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Speaker, the bill itself is the ordinary bill prepared for a golf club. As a matter of fact, it is similar in every respect to that given to Southwood Country Club with the transposition of the names and so forth and the legal description of the property. There is one power which they seek, and that is that ordinarily where three years are required for a

(Mr. Scarth, cont'd.) . . . . private club to have a liquor license, in this case they ask that that section of the Government Liquor and Control Act be dispensed with. It has been put up to me, Sir, that what would a golf club be without the 19th hole. Well, I'm not here to argue that, but perhaps I should go to the expression of the Honourable the Attorney-General, non curat lex -- whatever that helps I do not know either. I'd like to rely upon that expression if it will do me any good, but the point is, Sir, in connection with the golf club in question, it was operated for some time in West Charleswood as a private golf club, and this year a group of businessmen of Winnipeg have taken it over and are going to operate it as a club as such. While the amount involved is not a matter of the House, I can only assure the House they are responsible persons. They have caused or seen to, that \$250,000 will be subscribed to the taking over of the club and if it is the wish, Sir, I submit that in any event the bill should go to Committee to be incorporated as a golf club and then if the Committee decide to restrict the parties in their application for a liquor permit, that is one more matter, but I submit that in any event the bill should go to the Committee. Thank you, Sir.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I have never as yet opposed any bill to that second reading, but I would like to ask the question now, whether there is any restriction against anyone that wishes to join this club?

MR. LYON: I do not intend to object to this bill of second reading but I give the House notice that when the bill is in committee, very probably objection will be taken to the specific clause mentioned by my honourable friend with respect to liquor privileges.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, unless the honourable members can prove to us that their thirst is so unquenchable they can't wait that length of time.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . . . ready for the question?

MR. SCARTH: The question, Sir. I know of no restriction of entry to the club.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 20. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I know that about everything has been said that could be said about margarine in this House, and it may seem a little redundant to get up here and make a speech, and especially since quite a number of the members already have spoken at this session and they have said a good many of the things that I would say. But I think that you will agree with me that the farmers of this province, and in particular those 28,000 who go out to the barn twice a day to extract milk from old bossy, would think something was radically wrong if the Minister of Agriculture didn't have a word to say on their behalf. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for the Member from Wellington, and especially do I respect his talents as a musician, but I do object to the theme song that he has introduced into the Legislature, "Margie". He fiddles away at it, and it may be a catchy tune to the ears of some of the members. It creates an altogether different emotional upheaval within my breast. I find myself unequivocally opposed to him on this issue. A number of questions are always discussed at some length with regard to margarine and the colouring of it, and one is the claim that butter has to a particular shade of yellow. Any number of members always take occasion to point out that colouring is used in butter, and that because of this the dairy industry has no more right to a claim of this colour as a trade mark than anyone else. But the hard fact of the case is that the good Lord endowed the cow with the ability to transform the colouring of the grass into yellow of the butter. And it may not be general knowledge amongst the members that at times bossy does such a good job of this that the dairy operator, the creamery man, has to churn that butter just a little bit longer to knock the colour down to a shade that is acceptable in the market and acceptable under the Agricultural Stabilization Purchasing Policy. On the other hand, the people who manufacture margarine have a pretty sickly looking product unless they add the colouring to it. But bossy can do this all by herself. She doesn't need the mechanicalions of human beings to perfect her product, and I think this is a very important point, a very important factor to be considered when we're arguing about the rights of individuals to do this and do that in this Legislature. Many of us here grew up on farms, and mother used to take the cream and she'd put it in the churn and she'd churn it and she didn't worry about colouring. She added a little salt and that was it. And it was always a tasty palatable product --

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . . and that's more than you can say for margarine, more than you can say for margarine. Margarine just can't stand on its two hind legs. That's where margarine differs from the cow. That's where margarine differs from the cow. It's got to be jacked up. It's got to be jacked up by the Legislature here. That's what they're trying to do. They're trying to jack up the product and get us to throw our support behind them so that they've got something they can sell on the market. This is -- as far as I can see, these are the true facts of the matter. And the fact is that I was interested in knowing just how some of these dairy people felt about this question of margarine, and a few inquiries were made. As a matter of fact, there are some manufacturers who actually favour the complete discontinuing of adding any colour whatsoever to butter. Then I wonder what the margarine people would want. I wonder what they'd want then. Because I don't think anyone can deny that this is an outright attack on the manufacturers of margarine to trade on a characteristic of butter, which is more than tradition. It's more than tradition. It's a trade mark that the cow herself has stamped on the product.

Now a lot has been said about the poor people who can't afford butter, and about the people who can't manage to squeeze that pellet of colour into the margarine bags. Well, I suggest that in other provinces in Canada there is a degree possibly of poverty that Manitoba doesn't know. I'd remind you that in Nova Scotia this question was put before the Provincial Legislature and it was defeated. It received a resounding defeat. And I expect that they have people down there who are old, who are aged. People who haven't any more to live on than the pension. And people who have difficulty squeezing the colouring through the packet of margarine. But they thought it was in the best interests of everyone to safeguard the dairy industry which is so important to their economy. And I'd like to point out to you that there are some people down on the farm, they don't maybe have the difficulty of mixing the margarine. Some of these people are old; some of them are tired. I know some who are crippled. Oh no, their worry isn't just squeezing a pellet into a bag of margarine. They've got to get up in the morning, and go down to the barn, and they've got to feed those cows up, milk them, clean the barn and put out, go to a great deal of effort, and in spite of physical incapacities and disabilities. And they're hanging on there. And they've hung on this long, and the world doesn't open up any golden gates of opportunity or offer any golden gates of opportunity to them. And their only alternative is to stay there and make a living the best way they know how. Most of these people in spite of all the hullabaloo that goes on in here from time to time about how terrible things are down on the farm, and not in any way discrediting the fact that times are difficult for people down on the farm in many cases, these people are happy to continue if we'll let them, and live their life out down there. But it seems to me that they have a case that's certainly equally valid to that of others who find it a little inconvenient to squeeze a bag of margarine. It seems to me that it's pretty superficial, it's pretty superficial to compare the inconvenience that some people have to go to in squeezing a bag of margarine with the inconvenience others of our citizens have to do in providing a national product and in keeping themselves self-supporting in the economy of our province.

There's another point that's been made here and a very valid one, that here we have a product manufactured in Manitoba by Manitoba people. A product that amounts to \$13 million a year and brings in over \$6 1/2 million of revenue to the Province of Manitoba. And here it seems that we're intent upon undermining this source of revenue for the Province of Manitoba, and rather substituting or giving an advantage to a product that is going to send money out of the province. Because 90 percent of the basic ingredients of margarine are brought in out of the province. Here we have, as has been said before, an industry that gives, if not almost the entire income, a substantial income to some 28,000 farmers. An important income to 28,000 farmers, which sustains 60 creameries throughout the Province of Manitoba. And too many of us are in favour of following a course of action which will tend to undermine that industry and to give a little boost to three big concerns and a very few people involved in the manufacturing of the margarine product in this province. It just doesn't make sense at this time. I think we're premature. I think that if we'll wait a little while we'll find that things will iron themselves out. I believe that the time is coming when the production of edible oils in Manitoba will be of significant importance and possibly the members of the Legislature won't have to thrash this thing out. Perhaps it might be better if we let the farm people thrash this

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd. ) . . . . thing out. Let them decide. I have a letter here from one group in Manitoba who have a real interest in edible oils. The Co-Op Vegetable Oils Limited. They wrote to me as follows: "The Board of Directors of Co-Op Vegetable Oils Limited, at a meeting on March 3rd, passed the following resolution regarding the question of colouring margarine at the factory. Whereas the membership of Co-Op Vegetable Oils Limited includes producers of dairy products as well as producers of oil seeds, be it resolved that the Board of Directors of Co-Op Vegetable Oils Limited, on behalf of the edible oil seed producers of Manitoba respectfully request of all members of the Manitoba Legislature that the question of coloured margarine be considered without reference to the edible oil seed industry as a proponent of factory colouring of margarine. We trust that the above statement will clarify the position of the edible oil seed producers in regard to this matter." They are not pressing because they know that the colouring of margarine in Manitoba is of no benefit to them at this time and can only be a detriment to the people associated with the dairy industry.

I have a letter here from a Chamber of Commerce in the Province of Manitoba, asking me to support the dairy industry in this province, and pointing out the importance of the 60 creameries that are scattered across the Province of Manitoba, and realizing that at times when we are trying to encourage and promote the rural industrialization of Manitoba, this is not the time to start off on a tack which in fact will weaken the position of an industry that has been important to rural Manitoba for generations.

I know that you all know about the birds and the bees. I'm going to talk to you a little bit about a very handy little -- brochure, I suppose. I must tell you it's put out by the Butter Advisory Committee of Canada. It has something to say about rabbits and humans, and it draws some interesting differences between them. This is the opinion stated by four prominent doctors on the place of butter in the good health of the people of this country -- and this is another thing that has been used, I feel, unjustly. The argument has been used in the past that butter was a product that could be detrimental to the health of the people, and that margarine was a product that had certain inherent qualities which were generally acknowledged by the best medical authorities in the country. And here are four medical authorities who take some issue with popular opinions that are held with regard to butter and margarine. These doctors are Dr. E.W. McHenry, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S., Professor of Nutrition, the University of Toronto, Dr. Boucher, Professor Emeritus, University of Montreal, Dr. Nadeau, Chief Professor of Nutrition, Laval University, Dr. Howard B. Sprague, Past-President of the American Heart Association, Boston. And here are some of the statements they make: "We either obtain cholesterol, pre-made from eaten foods, or we make it in our own tissues. This established fact is important to remember." A little farther on, "It has now been established that low-cholesterol diets have little effect on blood cholesterol." And then they have carried out some experiments on some rabbits by feeding them diets that were heavy in cholesterol, and the results were that the rabbits responded in an adverse manner, but these are the comments that Dr. McHenry has to say about this: "The business of jumping to conclusions about humans from the rabbit experiment was foolish. Rabbits are accustomed to live on plant-source fodder which never contains cholesterol. They are not habituated to handling food containing cholesterol. Rabbits lack the means of excreting cholesterol and, hence, excess amounts accumulate and cause damage. Humans can excrete cholesterol and have a means of preventing the accumulation of large amounts in the body. This fundamental difference between rabbits and humans was ignored by the people who wanted to apply the results obtained in rabbits to humans." -- (Interjection) -- "The fallacy of using coincident events as cause and effect can be illustrated easily with regard to heart disease. Information in government reports show that there was a very great increase in the percentage of deaths due to heart disease in Canada in 1939-40. From then on, a further but slower increase occurred each year until about 1950 when a small annual increase set in. The changes in the incidence of heart disease deaths in Canada cannot be explained as due to changes in fat consumption; average use of fat in Canada has remained fairly constant since 1935. Another item of official information could be used to explain changes in heart disease deaths if we wish to use the association procedure employed by Keys and others with regard to fat intake." This we will all find interesting. "Official publications show that the incidence of heart disease deaths in Canada between 1935 and 1955 paralleled the average per person income tax payment. Using the Keys method we can claim that death from heart

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . . disease is due to income tax." I thought that was very good.

And so he said, "There is no parallel between fat intakes on the one hand and the incidence of heart disease deaths on the other." Again he says, "There is no clear proof at present that any change in the kinds of foods used by Canadians will lessen deaths from heart disease." Then of course he gives me some very good advice. "There is, of course, only one cause of overweight; the eating of more food than is needed. The remedy and the means of prevention are equally simple." There are some comments here on the activities or the eating habits or living habits of people, and these doctors associate heart disease with the living habits of some of us. He says, "For some mad reason, too often ignorance, the executive type, who seems most prone to coronary attacks, will down six Scotches before lunch, then refuse a small pat of butter as being dangerous for his health. I ask you, compare the calories!" Further on here he says, "Twenty-five years ago when I was a young man in the Province of Quebec, farmers had few worries and heart disease was comparatively unknown. Today the farmer is struggling with rising costs just like everyone else. He has a car and a tractor and lives in an atmosphere of hurry and worry just like the city man. Today the incidence of heart trouble among farmers would appear to be rising. I have them among my patients. I doubt if there has been much change in the farm diet." He says, "Above all, let us be sensible. People who discontinue eating butter, for instance, because someone suggests in the popular press that it will lead to heart disease need really to have their heads examined. I quote from the Old Testament, Isaiah 7:15 - 'Butter and honey shall he eat that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good.' I would seem to me that what was good in those days is equally good today."

I have some other interesting examples and these are given by Dr. Howard B. Sprague of Boston. He says, "I myself recently saw a patient almost 80 years old with no coronary troubles, who for years has eaten 13 pieces of the fattest bacon he can get for his daily breakfast plus a quart of milk. He drinks another quart during the day, has ice cream for lunch, and his dinner begins at about 5 p. m. with the gradual drinking of five highballs, followed by a meal which again is high in fat." He says, "Man has an . . . . ." Oh yes, here's another case. "Some years ago I reported the case of a man who was then the oldest living graduate of Harvard College. He was, at that time, 101 years old, and I calculated that he had consumed 56,000 eggs during his lifetime, a food product which is approximately 50 percent animal fat. Man has an extraordinary adaptability to his environment, including his food environment and there are many beneficial effects of fat in the diet. Indeed fat is an absolute necessity both from the standpoint of energy production and also of vitamin transport, as well as protection against infections, and so on." "I believe", he said in closing, "I believe it unwise and unjustifiable to deprive healthy people of butter in the diet. It may be necessary to reduce the total calories in many people because in our sedentary population there is a growing tendency towards overweight." (Hear! Hear!) "To accomplish this the percentage of total food fat should be decreased. On the other hand, I see no reason why 50 percent of the fat in the diet should not be of animal origin, perhaps supplemented by a vegetable oil. Butter has the superb quality of increasing the palatability of food and there is no substitute for it in fine cooking. One of the most regrettable points in the eating habits of people of North America and British origin is their failure to recognize the high level experience of good eating. This is not true of those with a French background. The monotony of foods and the absence of an appreciation of fresh foods is appallingly apparent. The judicious use of butter would greatly remedy the first deficiency and I heartily recommend it."

I have used this argument with some humour mixed in, Mr. Speaker, but there's a lot of truth in it too. Butter is one of our top foods, and from time to time people get going on these fads, and they do hurt our consumption of butter, and the idea that is promoted here from time to time that this is a reason for the colouring of margarine in the Province of Manitoba, I don't think holds water. I say again, I plead it's premature to colour margarine in the Province of Manitoba. I plead that it's important to the Province of Manitoba that the dairy industry is protected and I think that it's wrong in principle, wrong in principle, and if my honourable friend who asked me about Dean Weis might ask him, he might find that that gentleman was not the one who carried out the study; it was Dean Waines, Dean Waines, but my feeling is that the principle involved here is that margarine wants to trade on the trade-mark of butter. Butter is not coloured artificially. The colouring is put there by providence, through the old cow.

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . . That's how it got there, and to back this up, at times they have to churn it a little long to bring it down to where the public has become used to it, and I say again to the members of this House, Mr. Speaker . . . . .

MR. ORLIKOW: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. HUTTON: I'm almost through. I say to the members of this House, Mr. Speaker, that the dairy industry is important to Manitoba, and you've got to weigh the importance of this industry and its importance to 28,000 people against the inconvenience, or convenience if you like, of the factory colouring of margarine.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister is it not true that at certain times of the year at least, some colouring is added to butter?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, this is true, but it's such a little bit, as I pointed out -- (Interjection) -- Just a minute. It's such a little bit that manufacturers are willing to consider not adding any at all, and will the manufacturers of margarine consider that?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . you call it 5:30, I wonder if I could have the indulgence of the House to give them a piece of interesting news in connection with the Treasury. It has been reported to me that as at the close of business today, the sales of Manitoba Savings Bonds were \$4,515,200.

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