

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, March 7th, 1963.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli): Introduced Bill No. 25, an Act to amend the Tuberculosis Act.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Introduced Bill No. 14, an Act for the Relief of Leslie Lidstone and Lucienne Marie Lidstone; and Bill No. 16, an Act to incorporate the Nelson Finance Corporation.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Introduced Bill No. 17, an Act to incorporate Bel Acres Golf & Country Club.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to draw your attention to the Speaker's Gallery where there is a group of nineteen young Progressive farmers from the Russell area under the leadership of their agricultural representative, Mr. Bill Uhryniuk. This group is sponsored by the United Grain Growers Limited. This group also resides in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. We are happy that you came to visit us today and we hope that you will enjoy the proceedings as you see them here. As you watch democracy in action it will increase your interest in this Assembly. We hope you come back and visit us again.

I would also like to attract your attention to the gallery on my right hand where there is a school from Arnaud, 20 pupils, from Grade V to VIII with their teacher, Mr. J. Nikkel. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member from Emerson. We hope that you will enjoy your stay with us here this afternoon; that you will learn something of the proceedings that go along in this House and that you will benefit by it in your studies, and come back and visit us again.

I also would like to attract your attention to the second section here on my left, a school of 25 pupils from Deer Lodge School. They are Grade V111 pupils under the direction of their teacher Mr. Ofield. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. James. We hope that you too will enjoy your stay with us this afternoon; that you will enjoy the proceedings; you will benefit by them, and that you will visit us again soon.

Orders of the Day.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Before the Orders of the Day there is a motion of condolence that I would like the privilege of moving at this time in connection with a former member of this House, the late Dr. Murdock MacKay. I did not sit during the time of Dr. MacKay's attendance in this House, although there are perhaps one or two members who did know him as a colleague, but he is widely known in this province as one of the leading citizens of Manitoba. Dr. MacKay came to this province from the Province of Nova Scotia as a young man of about twenty-one years of age. He taught school I think in Saskatchewan, took a medical course here in Manitoba, and for many years was one of the leading physicians of the province, being made a senior member of the Medical Association of Canada, a distinction indeed in that professional group. Dr. MacKay was a man of very wide interests. He began his working career as a coal miner. He was a worker in the harvest of the west, I think that's what originally brought him here, and so that, as well as his professional associations, he, by virtue of other experience, was a man of wide sympathy in all aspects of our community life. He was certainly one of the leaders of the community of Transcona in his time. Dr. MacKay sat in this House from 1927 'till 1932 and during the last year of that time he was the Leader of the Liberal Party in this Legislature. He has made a substantial contribution indeed to the progress of this province and we mourn his passing. I would therefore move, Madam Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Radisson, that this House convey to the family of the late Dr. Murdock MacKay, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)....appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service and that Madam Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Moved by the First Minister, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Radisson, that this House convey to the family of the late Dr. Murdock MacKay, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Madam Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

**MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson):** Madam Speaker, it is indeed an honour for me to be granted the privilege of seconding the motion of condolence to my very late and dear friend Dr. MacKay. I don't think, Madam, that in the whole of my career as a citizen or as a member in public life that I have met a more outstanding and respected individual than our late friend. I think it would be true to say that before the explosion in population in the City of Transcona, that our good friend Dr. MacKay, as he did pronounce his name, was responsible for bringing into the world almost half of the junior population of the City of Transcona. He was one of those outstanding doctors among many others who was so devoted to his chosen profession that it didn't matter what time of night or day, or how tired the doctor was, that he was readily available to aid and assist all of the people of the community. I'm proud to know, Madam Speaker, that one of my daughters was brought into the world by Dr. MacKay. He was always keenly interested in politics. As the First Minister has mentioned, he was the Leader of the Liberal Party in the Province of Manitoba for quite awhile. As a matter of fact, there was some confusion here just a year or so ago before a convention of the Liberal Party dropped the word "Progressive" as to whether or not our late friend was still, even at that time, the Leader of the Liberal Party because he was an out and out Liberal from the word go. I recall on many occasions when it was necessary for me to have medical treatment, that the doctor would deliberately wait until all of the patients had been attended to, with the exception of myself, and then I sometimes wonder whether he medically treated me or mentally treated me because I was in his company for three or four hours just discussing politics of the day.

I'm happy to be able to inform the House, Madam Speaker, that the community of the City of Transcona thought so much of our late doctor that they have decided now to name a new school in Division No. 12 in respect to the memory of the doctor. He is survived by his wife and four girls, and they, like the doctor, are carrying on the tradition that he set, and I am sure, Madam Speaker, that all of the community of Transcona, if they but knew that today we were honouring the memory of our late dear friend, they would be happy to know of the tributes that are being paid to him here in this House this afternoon.

**MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose):** Madam Speaker, I did not have the pleasure of knowing Dr. MacKay intimately as my friend, the Leader of the NDP, but certainly I'd heard a great deal of this man, not only of his contributions to the political life of the country but also his great contributions in the area of Transcona in particular, in the field of public affairs there and community enterprises. I realize that here in one of my predecessors in the leadership of this Party, was a man of great ability, a man of great principle, a man who did a great deal for the Province of Manitoba. It is my hope that as one of his successors that I can be as useful in my own career as he was. I know that the people of Transcona in particular, and that whole district, felt greatly the loss of Dr. MacKay, and it was certainly evident at the funeral that was held in Transcona at that time the very large group of people from a great section of Eastern Manitoba who turned out then. Our group associate ourselves with this motion to the family.

**MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside):** Certainly enough has been said by the preceding speakers to indicate the extremely high regard in which Dr. Murdock MacKay was held. I had the pleasure of sitting with him during the time he was in this House, and in his case, has not happened in all the cases, I maintained the connection right up until very recently. He made a great contribution to the community and public life of this province, but I think with all due respect to that contribution — and it was an outstanding one — that his greatest contribution was in the field that the Honourable leader of the New Democratic Party has mentioned --

(Mr. Campbell (cont'd)....and that as a medical doctor, because he certainly in that field maintained the very highest traditions of that noble profession. He was one of the fast disappearing race of general practitioners. I think it might be well if there were more general practitioners today, and if there were general practitioners -- a lot of them -- of both the ability and the tradition and the character of Dr. Murdock MacKay, it would be very well for the community. So, both in this House and in his own wide community and circle of friends, particularly as a medical doctor, Murdock MacKay's name will be long remembered with affection and regard. He had a host of friends; he had the capacity of making friends very easily, keeping them very long; and he had that other characteristic that is perhaps a little more rare in the public field, he had no capacity at all for making enemies -- just about everybody was a friend of Dr. Murdock MacKay. It is, I am sure, a nice tribute that this House will be able to pay to him in sending their regards and affection to his widow and his daughters. They will appreciate it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Will the honourable members rise. Before the Orders of the Day, I have another school to acknowledge. On my left, the Winkler Collegiate, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. J. Burgen -- 31 in number and Grade 12 students. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dufferin. We are pleased that you came to visit us today; very pleased that pupils of Grade 12 are interested in the Assembly. We hope you will learn something of the proceedings today; that you will take it home with you, discuss it, and come back again some other day to visit us once more.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, if I may have the leave of the House, I would like to make the usual motion about the Chairman of Committees.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have the leave of the House?

MR. ROBLIN: I beg to move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce, that William G. Martin, Esquire, member for the Electoral Division of St. Matthews, be Chairman of the Committees of the House and Deputy Speaker.

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

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I would like to lay on the table of the House the following reports: the annual report of the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation for the year ending March 31, 1962; the annual report of the Manitoba Water Supply Board for the year ending March 31, 1962; the Drainage Maintenance Districts in the Province of Manitoba annual report for year ending December 31, 1961; and a nil report for the Watershed Conservation Districts Act for the year ending December 31, 1962.

MR. CAMPBELL: .....could the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation indicate whether we will have individual copies of all of these reports; not necessarily the nil one, I would think.

MR. HUTTON: I can make reports available to you, as many as are required -- in some cases, there will be a report for every member of the House. In cases where you wish further reports, I will try and accommodate the members.

MR. ROBLIN: Before the Orders are called, may I rise on a matter of privilege in connection with an interpretation of something that I said yesterday. I noticed in the Winnipeg Free Press, and I believe it is also true on at least one of the radio stations, that I am credited with having said that the cost of the Grand Rapids project was "larger" than had it been estimated, when in truth I attempted to convey precisely the opposite impression. What I said was: "I say that it is no secret that our costs on Grand Rapids are much "better" than we had thought in many important particulars." What I meant by that was to indicate that the costs on Grand Rapids were less than the estimates, rather than greater. It may be that I did not express myself very clearly, but I would like to make that point at the present time, and hope that the information may be corrected in due course.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I would like to say that I was listening pretty carefully. I agree with the honourable gentleman's interpretation -- that's the way I understood it. When the press disagrees with both my honourable friend and me they're pretty sure to be wrong.

MADAM SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain for an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his

(Madam Speaker, cont'd.)....Speech at the Opening of the Session; and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto; and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party in amendment to the amendment. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, being a new member and not being acquainted with previous speakers in this Chamber, I too wish to add my compliments to the many congratulations you have received on your election as the first lady Speaker of our Assembly. As you know, I represent the constituency of Burrows, which after many years of wandering in the field of political wilderness, has finally expressed its faith, confidence and belief in the Liberal Party. And as you know, Madam Speaker, the people living in my constituency are primarily in the low to medium income group of wage earners. The property owners in my riding are deeply concerned about the alarming tax increases on their property. A large number of these people are retired and some are on old age pension. These people are accustomed to live on small returns and are truly in a low income bracket. They are unable to carry the heavy burden of the ever-increasing tax load on their properties. Some say that Canada is very prosperous and that: "the people never had it so good", but unfortunately, Madam Speaker, this is not the case in my constituency. Most of the people in my constituency have worked hard throughout their entire lives to have a home of their own, and at times this was done with a great deal of personal sacrifice to themselves and to their families. And now during the years of their retirement, they simply do not have sufficient income to pay for the ever-increasing taxes. I feel that the present tax system, specifically in my constituency, is unreasonable and most unjust. However, Madam Speaker, I do not propose to justify or deny the pros and cons as to whether or not this increased taxation is or is not due to the existence of Metro. However, the people whom I represent are very much discouraged with the heavy tax load, and where they had originally planned to retire in an honourable and decent manner, now find themselves in very frustrating financial circumstances. They themselves cannot solve, nor are they responsible for the increased burden of taxation. This tax burden is beyond the control of the property owner, and I feel that this is taking a very unfair advantage of those who can least afford to pay.

The present two levels of municipal government has been forced on to people of greater Winnipeg, without them having been given the opportunity to express their democratic right as to whether or not they really wanted Metro. This democratic right of expression was denied to the residents of Greater Winnipeg, and the architects of this system do not appear to be unduly concerned. I have many homeowners in my constituency, and I am certain that there must be others in Greater Winnipeg that simply cannot understand why they should have to be called upon to pay for two municipal governments while the rest of the province is only called upon to support one. The so-called experts in the field of Metro Government tell us and advise us that Metro is good for the planning of tomorrow and for a better and bigger Greater Winnipeg. And I say "so-called experts" because I do believe we are carrying out an experiment, and we have had a past study and are now having a present study, and I know that we will also have a future study -- and I use the word "so-called experts" advisedly, as many of these suggestions that have been offered; but very few or any have been based on actual experience or knowledge that any or all such suggestions will be practical. I also feel that the citizens of Greater Winnipeg when they were promised that the responsibility of Metro would be carried out in the most practical and in the most economical way for the good of all the half-million people that Metro serves and would reduce the overall cost of municipal governments. Metro owes a responsibility to the residents of Greater Winnipeg; and this responsibility is to see to it that we have lower taxes; to see to it that they provide efficient management. This experimental venture into Metro should have been conducted on a very careful and a very well-planned basis. Municipal government on two basis does cost more, and this fact cannot be denied. The operation of any business, as most of you know, if conducted from nine branches is always more costly as compared to the operation when conducted from one main office. If Metro is in need of financial assistance, or if it needs supervisory assistance to provide the central authority for essential services to the public in Greater Winnipeg, then I feel that this government should take immediate steps to remedy this situation. Surely, Madam Speaker, we must possess sufficient, knowledgeable and dedicated people who are in a

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd.)....position to take a positive direct leadership to make Metro work on an efficient and sound businesslike basis. However, we must also look on the other side of the coin. There could be other concealed and unknown factors working against and stalling the progress of Metro. There is something radically wrong, and this entire situation should not be allowed to continue at the expense of the Winnipeg taxpayers especially those who cannot afford to pay these taxes, and I say to you that to continue being inactive means that there will be no action taken at all. In order to give some immediate and special tax relief to the people of Greater Winnipeg, I would suggest a basic exemption of \$1,000 per property on all property assessments of \$7,000 or less. The loss of this revenue to the city or the Metropolitan Government should be made up in a form of a government grant. If such an approach is not possible then an outright grant should be made, so that Metro would be able to reduce the mill rate and thereby lower taxes in the Greater Winnipeg area in order to give immediate help for those residents who are on pension or who are on a limited income bracket.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to say something about the matter of pensions. I know that some have possibly expected me to speak on industry or some of the more closely things I am related with, but because I was elected by my people in Burrows, I felt that there are two very important items that concern every resident in the constituency of Burrows, and the other one is in reference to the pensions. As all of us know, pensions are of utmost importance to the prosperity of our economy. Every month this expenditure results in a steady flow of purchasing power and does contribute to the stabilization of our economy, and it does give a great deal of direct and indirect employment to our people in Manitoba. And as people live longer, and with the rapid growth of automation, it is becoming increasingly more difficult for people to set aside enough money, by individual savings or through group pension plans, for their retirement. While many companies have good pension schemes, there is a large number of workers who are not covered by pension plans of any nature whatsoever. The need for a better national pension plan is one of urgent necessity, and yet such a comprehensive pension scheme cannot be financed entirely by the taxpayer. Therefore, I propose that serious consideration be given to combining the existing old age pension with a satisfactory contributory plan which would be made available to all. A National pension plan can be arranged so that people can get a reasonable pension at the age of 65, if they so desire; however, if a man elects to work until the age of 70, then he should be entitled to a proportionately higher pension. Without increasing the cost of the present basic pension this together with a contributory plan could enable the average couple to retire at 65 on half pay. This means that a married man on a monthly wage of \$360 could retire on a pension of \$180 per month. If this same man wants to wait and retire at the age of 70, the total pension for a couple would build up to \$250 per month. If a contributor dies, the widow or orphans will receive the pension benefits. The equivalent pensions for single persons would be \$135 per month starting at the age of 65 or \$185 starting at the age of 70.

Madam Chairman, I also realize of course, that this plan cannot be made fully effective immediately, but that a transition period of several years would be necessary to build up the contributory plan and to give them time for existing pension plans to be incorporated into this new system. Some workers have union agreements under which the company pays the whole cost of pensions. In all fairness, and in all such cases, the company will be responsible for the individual's contribution as well as its own under such a pension scheme. No one would lose pension rights that he or she may have already built under previously existing pension plans. At present, workers who change or lose their jobs are in danger of losing their pension rights. This is very unfair to people moving between jobs and this is not conducive to good economic efficiency, and is certainly not fair to the worker. Therefore, all existing pension schemes must be made fully portable and consolidated into such a national pension plan. This pension plan will not discourage private pension plans nor other means of saving for the retirement of those who can afford to pay more. Furthermore, as an immediate help to retired people and especially some of whom are forced to seek other additional Social Welfare assistance I suggest that all people over the age of 70 be given help by a further immediate increase in the old age pension. Madam Speaker, a real government with a real genuine political principle and an honest desire to serve the common good of the average citizen of Manitoba, in order to improve their welfare and prosperity, should work for the

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd)....establishment of such a pension scheme.

Madam Speaker, I think that most all of the new members who have spoken so far, and I know that those who will speak in reference to the opening of this Session, must feel about Manitoba the way I do. I was born and raised in this province, and I think it's a wonderful province. It's a province that has an excellent future and it is a province where one with some initiative and determination can do wonders. Hard work will pay off just as well in the Province of Manitoba as it will pay off in eastern Canada or in the United States or in any other part of our world. Fair play to get things done and not to cry; not to complain because the odds might be stacked against us or because somebody does not agree with us; this is the very time when we must roll up our sleeves, go to work and create a better community for our children in which to grow up and a better community in which to have our older citizens retire with decency and honour, and this is truly what we should do with our own wonderful Manitoba.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): .....Is this your own personal opinion, or is this the opinion of .....

MR. SMERCHANSKI: I don't think I would want to answer it but I -- you know, Madam Speaker, this poses almost as difficult a problem as it posed to you on one or two occasions earlier in the session, and I quite honestly don't know what is expected of me to answer the Honourable Member for Inkster, but -- and I think I'll just leave it at that, Madam Speaker.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate you on your elevation to the responsible position of Speaker of this House, and I am convinced you will occupy it with dignity and ability. I would also like to add my good wishes to those of my other colleagues, to our two new ministers, and extend my compliments to the two members who so ably moved and seconded the Throne Speech. I found yesterday afternoon a most profitable period. It's obvious we have added some very able men in our midst and their contribution was indeed excellent, and I will certainly look forward to the time when I will hear them again.

But I have risen, Madam Speaker, to reply to one specific part of the sub-amendment as moved by the Honourable Leader of the NDP, the Member from Radisson. Actually the sub-amendment is so broad that one could talk about almost anything, but as I have spent considerable time gathering information about comprehensive health schemes, I would like to speak on this during my allotted time. Now when the NDP speaks about comprehensive medical care they are not concerned about a plan that respects the freedom of individuals. Their plan, like most of the others they advocate, has the element of compulsion, and I think that it is rather tragic that this party pursues the course that admittedly has a wide emotional appeal but little likelihood of true success. I am aware of the fact that we have a compulsory medical scheme in Saskatchewan but it is too early to judge the result and we must look elsewhere if we are going to get an insight into its chances of success or failure. The Saskatchewan government was re-elected actually on a minority vote. The CCF Party polled only 41 percent of the total vote cast and this would seem to indicate that 58 percent were opposed to any form of compulsion medical insurance Acts, but unfortunately the situation in that province was more complex than this. We cannot resolve this quite so neatly. However, I would like to refer you to an article appearing in the Tribune last August entitled: "Majority Vote Doesn't Make Medicare Right." It says: "The passing of a law regimenting the doctors of Saskatchewan without their consent was not based upon the rules of justice and respect for the rights of the individual in a democracy. It was based upon a socialistic ideology of politicians determined to have their own way with the people. Thus, the root of the trouble in Saskatchewan lies, not with the doctors, but with the politicians who, by certain limited democratic means, brought into existence an immoral law. That law is not in the interests of true democracy. That law is morally wrong. Such a law is an example of morality and legality being divorced from each other, which goes to prove that democratic means do not always produce democratic principles." Then the article goes on to say that the Romans, for instance, believing that "might makes right" legalized slavery with its necessary brutality. Legality however does not change the fact that slavery was morally wrong and upon the principle of love, slavery is a wicked practice, and the ballots of the majority cannot make it right. Therefore to say that any wicked practice is right just because the majority of the people voted for it is to add iniquity to iniquity.

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd)...Now my research into the results of national health schemes seems to indicate that they have the reverse results to their original intention. For example, I have here an article from the Winnipeg Free Press dated July 2nd, 1957, which says: "The welfare state was revealed today as an unwitting contributor to the critical problem of alcoholism in France. The Ministry of Health officials are pondering newly compiled statistics which indicate many French workers drink more than is good for them because they are aware that they can take the cure at the state's expense. Since 1951 the number of Frenchmen who have done so have more than doubled."

Madam Speaker, I suppose that outside of the iron curtain state medicine is perhaps the most advanced in the Scandinavian countries, but I would like to point out to my friends opposite that Sweden, for example, is not as socialistic as they would like us to believe. The economy is supported by over ninety percent of its industry and other business activity operating in a climate of free enterprise. They do, however, have a comprehensive health scheme but it is not a matter of record that there is an increase in national vigour, national happiness or improved moral standards. On the contrary, the Swedish authorities are greatly perturbed over the phenomenal increase in the suicide rate, and I would submit that the presence of a more advanced welfare state in that country has resulted in the loss of reason for living. Life has lost its challenge; too many people find no room for drive, for progress and achievement that is built into each human being and one cannot help wondering what life must be like in countries where the state controls all and overshadows every endeavour of the individual.

The Leader of the NDP Party manfully protested that he led the only party that has the answer to the problems of the people of Manitoba. It is now a matter of record that the majority of the voters did not agree with him. However, I would like to read two editorials from two separate but prominent Saskatchewan papers. The first is from the Humboldt Journal of June 2nd. It says: "By now every single citizen in Saskatchewan should have asked himself this one question: --Why is there so much antagonism towards the CCF and what are they trying to do?" The answer is simple because under a socialist government and in a welfare state there is no incentive for initiative, no desire or need to progress and develop as an individual. That is why anyone who supports and believes in free enterprise knows that ultimately they are doomed to be swallowed up in the welfare state. So what -- say some. Well, isn't it a funny thing that so many people make their living off free enterprise and so few really owe their livelihood to the socialist system? How many people would be living in Saskatchewan today if it wasn't for free enterprise? Okay, so we admit we still need free enterprise and can still have it under the CCF government, but that's not what Tommy Douglas says. He says, and we repeat again: -- "We must choose between socialism and free enterprise. And after what happened to the fisherman and the lumberman, to the owners of the box factory and of private bus lines, insurance agents and hotel keepers, the threat that now hangs over the head of every retailer in the province, and now the outlook for the medical profession, can there be any doubt as to what the CCF means." And it concludes by saying that "after sixteen long years in office the CCF have proved beyond all doubt that it is impossible for this province to keep up with the rest of Canada under a socialist government and the rest of Canada has definitely refused to accept socialism so why must we continue to be the suckers."

And from the Yorkton Enterprise we will find them agreeing to this extent, that the truth of the matter is that the CCF policies have made things worse rather than better for the young people of this province, large numbers of whom have been obliged to move elsewhere in search of employment which an expanding economy developed under the free enterprise system. This is proven by the fact that Saskatchewan has steadily lost population during the last sixteen years. From 1944 to 1960 it had a natural increase, that is, the excess of births over deaths, of 265,000. It also received some 50,000 immigrants with a net increase of only 66,000, it follows that a quarter of a million people have left the province since the CCF government took over. This is equivalent to the total population of Saskatchewan's three biggest cities, Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw.

But to return to my main point, the National Health scheme in Great Britain is perhaps the most familiar to us because of our associations with the Mother Country. I referred to this scheme once before, and even some of my own colleagues endeavoured to persuade me that I had to admit it works. Yes, I will accept this, but let me reveal to you how it is

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd)....working. In 1960, the Tribune reported that, "One difficulty with the Medical Act is that a young woman in an office in London can tell all the physicians in England that they must not use a certain drug because it is expensive. She also can decide whether or not an ambitious and hard-working doctor can have a chance to become a specialist. Both the doctors and the patients are unhappy because the work-load on each doctor is too great. It is so great that the doctor just cannot spend any time with the patient, because he gets only \$2.52 a year per patient. In order to make a living, he must take charge of at least 2,000 people a year. The average general practitioner now makes \$6,221 a year, and out of this moderate income he cannot afford to buy an X-ray machine or much equipment for his office. As a result, a patient who needs a careful examination has to wait for perhaps months until he can be admitted to a hospital. However, Madam Speaker, it is in the House of Lords' Hansard of November 29, 1961 that we gain our greatest revelation. In it, Lord Taylor, the very same gentleman who came to Saskatchewan to mediate the medical dispute, had this to say about the grave shortage of doctors in England. And Lord Taylor opened the debate by describing the present condition in England as a pretty ghastly, awful picture and as a new and desperate situation. He revealed that it is a very rare thing indeed that you will find the staff of mental hospitals now with an English or British staff. And then he goes on to say at one particular mental hospital, of eight posts, three are vacant at the present time and the quality of the applicants is invariably poor. And now with your permission, Madam Speaker, I would like to record his main paragraph to reveal the sad plight of the Medical Scheme in Great Britain. After disclosing that the number of medical students had dropped by 200 a year, or 10%, he said: "Remember, my Lord, that it is not in the great teaching hospitals that the shortage is showing itself. They have their own students eager for experience, though even here it has started to appear. Recently two of the great teaching hospitals had difficulty in selling senior registrars posts in general medicine, one of the finest stepping-off posts that our profession has to offer. It is in the peripheral of hospitals outside the large teaching centres where the great bulk of the people are treated that the situation is critical. I cannot recommend your Lordships to go into such a hospital as a casualty for there is in many cases no casualty officer. A house surgeon will have to leave the theatre when he can, to treat you, and his experience will be far less than that of your own general practitioner. When he comes, he will probably not be a British graduate, and he could well have difficulty in understanding what you say. This is at a time when speed and efficiency may be literally life-saving." Then he continues: "The whole of our hospital service would have collapsed had it not been for the enormous influx of junior doctors from India and Pakistan. There are now working in our hospitals between 3,000 and 4,000 such doctors trained in Indian and Pakistanian universities and medical schools and coming over here to get experience. They do not always understand patients or general practitioners on the telephone and that is very important indeed; nor do they always understand the relationship between the hospital and the general practitioner, but when all is said and done we are in their debt, for without them our whole scheme would collapse." And I think it is also worth recording the statement of Lord Beveridge, who said that the conditions of doctor service under the scheme as it now stands are sometimes such as to cause the doctors to retire. Some of your Lordships may have seen in the newspaper of last Sunday a statement of a doctor who was giving up the health service because he had far too much to do. There is a friend of mine, a doctor, who found he could never do any doctoring on a Monday because he spent every Monday filling up the forms he had to fill in order to get paid for the work he was doing. That arises out of the excess number of patients that doctors may have, and sometimes because they need the money too.

But I would like to point out to this House that this deterioration is not reflected itself on the overall cost. The original estimated yearly cost of 70 million pounds in England became actually 170 million pounds, and in ten years rose to 800 million pounds or an increase of 370 percent. Looking at Saskatchewan I found that their estimated cost of hospitalization from \$ 5 million grew to an estimated \$ 35 million in 1960, and I would presume the same story is true in this province and other areas as well. In other words, Madam Speaker, what I am actually saying is that we just cannot afford to have so-called free medicine. How better it would be to approach this problem of health in a climate of freedom than compulsion. The Leader of the Official Opposition and the Honourable Member from Radisson condemned this

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd).... government for lack of initiative, and I am reminded that the Liberal Leader, the Honourable Louis St. Laurent is reported to have called the NDP, or the then CCF as Liberals in a hurry. In reverse, this could mean of course, that the Liberals could be considered slow pokes by the NDP, so one gets rather confused at the peculiar criticism of this government. However I have an article from the Tribune for June 13, 1960, which reports this government as presenting the first specific plan in Canada to provide free and comprehensive medical care to needy persons which will go into effect by the end of June, and in referring to this article I would like to re-echo the words of the Minister of Health that "where there is impoverishment, society has reached a position of affluence to help these people, and if we meet the needs of the people who have nothing, then I think we have the answer," to which I heartily agree.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I also, with the others, wish to congratulate you on attaining the office that you now hold, where you are the presiding officer of this Chamber. I wish you every success during your term of office. I would also like to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I wasn't present at the time that they made their speeches. However, I took the opportunity of reading them later on and I wish to congratulate them on their efforts. I would also like to extend congratulations to the other new members of this House, some of them have already made their contribution and I find them very interesting and I hope that they will also find the business of this House interesting and rewarding. Then I would also like to add my congratulations to the new Ministers in their portfolios, particularly so the former Speaker of this House who has made a wonderful contribution during his term of office as Speaker. I am sure that he will find his new office less strenuous so that he will be able to enjoy work in this House much more than heretofore. I was going to make a few remarks in reference to what the member for River Heights had to say yesterday, however, he is not in his seat today so I'll pass the opportunity this time and do it some other time.

Before I speak on the main motion of the Throne Speech, I would briefly like to comment on the amendment as proposed by the Leader of the NDP because I cannot see fit to support their amendment, especially so the first part of it which reads as follows: "For failing to provide measures such as: (1) A Universal Comprehensive Health Plan; (2) The easing of the burden of real property taxation at the local level; and (3) The making it financially possible for every Manitoban to acquire education to the highest level he or she can attain." Certainly I'll be dwelling further on this matter of a health plan later on and in regards to making education available at least to the highest level for everyone that wishes to do so in Manitoba. I think the mechanics that I would advise would be contrary to what he would be proposing, so those are briefly a few comments regarding the amendment to the amendment.

In perusing the Speech from the Throne, I find at the outline a very bad picture for this province for the coming year, yet they have every confidence in its growth of business and so on. I was especially interested in connection with the reference made to the industrial growth and also in regard to the number of new agencies and programs that they will assist in speeding the expansion of Manitoba industries, with special emphasis on those using our own primary products. It certainly is something to look forward to, but when you go further into it you find that these are going to be government agencies and I, for one, deplore the growth of government. We have too much business -- we should have more business in government and not government in business. I find that government bureaucracy is creeping on us; in fact, I think it is more than creeping, it's growing on us very fast; and I find that government in business is wielding an unfair advantage over private business. Now they have various means by which they can defeat private business. We know that through our Agricultural Credit Corporation they provide low interest loans to farmers. Well, in order to do that they subsidize the interest rates. We know about the Manitoba Development Fund. The same thing is happening there, where the government is subsidizing the program by \$1/4 million each year. Private business is unable to do this so, therefore, we are, as government business, exercising advantages in this respect. We not only find ourselves in those two types of business, in fact we have a whole list of businesses in which our government is actively engaged. We have the Development Fund; we have the Agricultural Credit Corporation; we now have the Crop Insurance

(Mr. Froese, cont'd) . . . . Corporation; we have Hospital Insurance; we have telephones; the Hydro, and we now have water -- the Water Supply Board. And now we are going to add some more on to it, so I think this is going at a very fast rate.

In connection with being in the financing field, certainly, we as government do not have any large reserves or monies on hand to invest. In contrary, we borrow, and I think when the Throne Speech lists all the accomplishments that they have done, achieved, during the past year -- and there is a whole list in one of the paragraphs -- I think they could have added this one, that they have also achieved the highest debt in the province in history. So they left one of them out. As I already mentioned, we do not have reserves, we have to borrow all the money that we make available to these corporations; and it seems rather odd that a government would first borrow money from the people and finance houses through the issuance and sale of bonds or debentures, and then make these monies available to the people for industrial development, establishing business, buying farms, etc. Why should these funds not be available to them in the first place? Why does a government have to go into debt to bring about the available capital? To me, it seems it's simply a matter of our banks and financial institutions not performing their natural function. If they did, there would be no need to go into this business of financing. This is also one reason why credit unions were brought into being because a common man was unable to get credit, and I feel that rather than to go into business all the time, we should encourage these finance houses and the banks to do their proper job and to encourage them in these fields of endeavour. If it is the risk factor involved it would have been better to set up some insurance fund to offset losses sustained, such as the Federal Government has under the Farm Improvement Loans Act whereby they insure losses under the Act up to 50 percent of the overall loans outstanding. To my knowledge the experience has been very good; there's hardly any write-offs, and in our local area I know of only one occasion where the bank seized the chattels and sold it in order to try to get their money back. It appears under the present circumstances it is then more profitable to invest in the debt structure of the province than in its good. Insurance companies and other finance houses by investing in government bonds thereby skip the risk, the risk factor, and are receiving a guaranteed return on their investment. So that I think in this area a good deal should be done, and changes should be made. We also know that under The Farm Improvement Loans Act, farmers are able to get advances, or make loans for farm dwellings; but here again the amount available to them is too small. I feel that this government should make representation to have that changed, to have it increased, so that more farmers could take advantage of it. We find today that people living in the cities can get loans under National Housing, but this source is not available to the farmers and, therefore, they are unable to take advantage of it.

It seems to me that today more and more people rely on government for help and assistance. Increased welfare assistance encourages and I think has contributed towards this attitude. We have, in my estimation, failed to reward initiative properly. Our people -- especially so in the rural areas and I think this is also true into a large extent in the urban centres -- our people are reluctant to invest and risk capital to start off secondary industries. The payoff is very often slow in coming and, on many occasions, they have lost what they invested, and this has been a deterrent to investing in local industry.

There is also another trend developing, and this to me seems to be alarming -- and that is that people do not want to own their own homes, but are only interested in larger take-home pay to be used for better living and, so to speak, "living it up". And if they do buy, people will trade their homes as soon as a small equity has been built up just to be in a better position to sell, because once the mortgage has reached a certain point that the purchaser will need more capital to buy your home, you're at a disadvantage and, therefore, people are selling and there is a large turnover in this area. This attitude can become a deterrent to local investment and I think it is quite prevalent -- at least I know in certain areas it is -- and I think we should, as a government, not try to encourage it but try to remedy it.

Government in business -- government perpetuates itself by these various agencies. There are certain advantages and we know from past experience, especially so in the Federal Government through its agencies such as the . . . . ., when it comes to election time they will empty the kitty and pass out cheques to the farmers. This money does not belong to the government, it is the farmer's money that has been withheld, but when it goes out and the

(Mr. Froese, cont'd) . . . . papers play it up, it is always the impression there that this is a hand-out from the government, whereas it's just the farmer's own money. People, other than farmers, certainly have that feeling that the government is handing out cash to the farmers. There is also another angle to this, in that by creating these agencies they are creating monopolies, and that once these agencies are set up they can do as they please and charge whatever rates they please, because they're in a non-competitive business and you have no yardstick to measure whether they are efficient or not. They can spend whatever they like; and here again I think there is an area which should be looked into and checks should be made. As I already mentioned, government through these agencies is competing with private enterprise in certain areas and they certainly have an advantage by providing subsidies where they are in competition.

I note from the Speech from the Throne that a substantial increase in funds for the support of the educational system are going to be forthcoming, and I trust something is coming forward for the non-division schools who have, so far, received nothing in the way of increased grants from this government. The Minister knows fully well what these school districts are up against and the difficulties they face, and I have yet to see the two other representatives from the government side of the House representing parts of these areas making their wishes known or raising their voices in protest. Certainly, this injustice exercised by our present government should not be carried on any longer for the government is collecting licenses -- motor vehicles, fuel taxes, income and other taxes from the people of these various areas and is not returning a just share to the people back home in support of education. Not only that, our government is and has been receiving per capita grants from the Federal Government that are not justly distributed. This has been going on for several years while this government has been in office and it is getting to be more aggravating every year as time goes on. Our high school enrolment is going down and would-be students are denied the opportunity of a high school education because of lack of proper facilities and provincial financial support. The blame is right on this government, by creating an impossible situation through lack of financial support to the non-division areas. I trust something will be done to remedy this situation during this session.

Another area I wish to comment on is the matter of centralization. Too much centralization government and its agencies have been evident through the various plans that have been brought into being by this government, such as the division plan for schools, the hospitalization scheme, the Metropolitan Government, the level of government for Greater Winnipeg and quite a few more. The non-acceptance of the division plan in our area is largely due to the centralization feature, and now that the Murray Fisher Report is out, I think it substantiates the ultimate objectives of the planners in centralization, the very fear of our people back home and the reservations they had to this plan, and I am referring to the matter of doing away with school boards and the setting up of the county system. Contrary to common belief, centralization costs more and not less to operate. Through centralization you are taking away, or eliminating, the incentives to save or economize on local or smaller bodies of administration. We saw what happened when the division plan came in. The 100 percent teacher grants immediately went to the top of the scale. Other districts immediately followed suit because it would stand to reason that if these monies are available, that the maximum amount will be used. We also see this evidenced in the hospital administration. Hospital operation used to cost only a fraction of the cost that it is today. The attitude resulting from payment into an overall scheme robs the locals of any incentive to do without or to operate at minimum cost. If one unit can have certain luxuries the next one is also entitled to it, so that you have a condition there which will just always encourage increased costs.

We have another good example in Metro. When The Metro Act came into being the officers immediately took top salaries too, and here we now get the centralization feature that so far denies the people concerned the right to a ballot, and today we find the government hiding for its failures behind a commission. While down east the other week I noticed from the papers there that Metro Toronto is also troubled and that they had large headlines saying: "Get Metro . . . . .", so that all is not well wherever you have Metro.

In perusing the Speech from the Throne I found a number of matters very interesting and others on which I would like to comment, but I will wait until the particular bills or legislation

(Mr. Froese, cont'd) ..... is coming forward and I will make my comments at that time. I notice that they're going to bring financial agreements that I can offer some amendments to. I don't know whether the government is afraid to proceed with the Bill as it was passed at the last Session or what causes them to hesitate.

One other item I just wish to briefly comment on is the Hydro project that they are proposing on the Nelson River. According to the Throne Speech, preliminary surveys have been made and they now have consummated an agreement with the Federal Government whereby they are going to have further studies of the power potential and investigate the markets. Here, in this respect, I would ask the Minister, the First Minister, to do what he has done in the past and to follow the example of B.C. We know that Mr. Roblin, our First Minister, followed B.C.'s example in the parity bonds. He then followed suit with labor legislation. Now we see him going ahead with the Nelson River project. I wish to congratulate him on one point and that is that he will now at least look towards -- and have a change in policy so that power can be exported to other provinces.

MR. ROBLIN: ..... kind intentions but I am not able to accept his congratulations because his facts are not right.

MR. FROESE: I just hope that he follows suit and that he will take advice in what Mr. Bennett did in that he will not go ahead with the power project unless he has at least got markets for the power before he starts selling and not create a large debt and then have surplus power on hand and not be able to sell it.

I also notice the remarks made in the Speech from the Throne on the Manitoba Economic Report which was distributed yesterday. Naturally I haven't had the time to read it or peruse it, but it seems to me that this report took a lot of planning and I for one like to do things on my own and not have someone else plan things for me. I feel that this House should give direction in these various matters and not have one planning committee after another come in with reports and dealing with them. I think we are well able to speak for ourselves and think for ourselves so that we should have more legislation coming out of this House directed by these members as such.

I notice that there is nothing for special crops mentioned in the legislation proposed. I hope that the Minister of Agriculture sees fit to do something about it though because there are areas in which we need a lot of action, especially in the special crops and the soybean field. This I've brought up repeatedly over the last couple of years. We are importing all the raw products that are processed at the Altona plant, as far as soybeans are concerned, from the United States. This plant was built to extract oil, and here we have had this plant now for many years and still nothing has been done by this government to give us a variety of soybeans that we can grow and grow successfully in this province to provide the necessary beans for our own industry. Surely if we spend the time and energy and the cost of building a plant, this government should have sense enough to spend some money on developing varieties of beans that we can grow successfully in Manitoba. Not only does this apply to soybeans, I feel that we are lacking in other grains. Manitoba used to be a good barley province but look at it now. You hardly see a field of barley in Manitoba and I think that we need better varieties and more disease-resistant varieties in Manitoba so that we can go back to growing a better crop of barley.

Now I will have more to say on the various matters pertaining to the Throne Speech as we proceed in this House, so that at this time I will suffice with what I have said. Thank you.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, will the last speaker permit a question?

MADAM SPEAKER: Will the speaker permit a question?

MR. GRAY: Speaking on your last proposition, I'd like to ask the honourable member, in all sincerity, a question which is of great importance. As a member of the Social Credit national organization, does he support the statement of the national deputy leader favoring Hitler and Mussolini who are responsible for the millions of graves in this world?

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, ..... that the deputy national leader has never said that, or never supported that, and neither do I.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, may I also add my congratulations to the many that have spoken before me to your election to the office of Speaker of this House. I would also like to add my congratulations to the mover and seconder in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I think they did an excellent job and I think that we'll hear from them in the future. I would also like to congratulate all the new members that have spoken so far. They have done, I think, a wonderful job and it augurs well for this Legislature that we have members of their calibre here with us.

Madam Speaker, I would like to deal only with one part of our amendment, and that is on the comprehensive health. I would first like to deal with a statement attributed to Dr. MacCharles in an article in The Tribune on Saturday July 7th, 1962. He says today in most parts of Canada, and particularly in Manitoba, medical services were within reach of almost all people and where gaps existed they could be closed. People who could afford to pay the cost of these personal medical services do so either directly or through the Manitoba Medical Service. For those who could not pay service was available through the provincial Medicare plan. I think Dr. MacCharles better be told the facts of life because under the social allowances I wonder how many people there are getting medicare cards. In Manitoba we have 25,000 people that earn less than \$2,000 a year. I wonder how many of those have medicare cards, how many of those can go to a doctor and say, "My wife is sick, my children are sick -- I want you to come and examine them." They won't go to the doctor or phone the doctor because they haven't got the money and they don't want to be obligated in any way. (Interjection) I'll get to you in a little while.

Now what about the private insurance plans? What do they cover you for? The private insurance company is out for profit. That's all they're out for. They're not there to give you a service; they're out to make money; and brother, they make money, plenty of it, because they print in their contracts and they have the finest print -- they have the best salesmen that go out and tell people, "You buy this plan; it'll cost you less than what you can get from Manitoba Medical Service, but we'll give you the same coverage," until they find out that when they go to use their plan that they are not covered for half the things that they were told that they were covered. What about people -- Dr. MacCharles mentions that the plans are available for everyone. What about a person working in a place where there are many employees and they could form a group under the Manitoba Medical Service? They cannot sign up because they won't sign them up because there could be a group formed there. Therefore they have to go to a private insurance company. And what do you get from the private insurance company? I have just one case here and if you like I can bring you hundreds more, of what the insurance company pays, and this is a fellow who paid a premium of \$9.00 a month and his wife had to go to the clinic -- she was seeing her own doctor and he advised her that she should go to the clinic. The total cost of the bill was \$56.00. The insurance company paid \$34.15. He had to pay \$21.85 out of his own pocket. That's great coverage! Yet Mr. Kilgour from the Great West Life will tell you that's what we have to have. Free enterprise we don't need. Socialized medicine or socialized health plans! What about Great Britain? The Honourable Member from Wellington had a lot to say about Great Britain. The plan went into operation in 1948 -- it's still in operation! You've had a change of government. If it's still no good, why don't they dare take that plan out? Why don't they take it out anywhere else? Because they don't dare do it. They know the people want it; and the people want it and they're going to get it! You had your spark in Saskatchewan. You're going to get a spark. The federal government has a royal commission looking into health services. The Ontario government is looking into it; Saskatchewan already has it; Alberta has a commission studying it; British Columbia has a commission studying it. Why do we always have to be last? We always claim we're first in everything we do, but somehow or other we're dragging our feet when it comes to health. It's true, Madam Speaker, that some of the doctors will accept the payment that is given them by an insurance company. They are mostly general practitioners. They will accept whatever . . . they might put in for \$20.00 or \$30.00 and get paid half of it, and they don't bother their patients for the rest. But they are far and few between. It's when you have to go to the clinics where you have to pay.

Now, I'd like to refer to the article in The Tribune, Wednesday, July 25th -- I want the member from Wellington to listen because this was made by the president of the British

(Mr. Peters, Cont'd.) . . . . Medical Association -- and this is what he had to say. Speaking at the Association's annual convention dinner, Dr. Ian Fraser said Saskatchewan's compulsory government insurance plan pointed a way to the future for North America. "There is simply no alternative to state medicine in Saskatchewan, I believe, and in America either, in the fairly near future", Fraser said. He said people simply cannot afford to carry on with the system now in operation and have to have some form of state service. That is the head of the British Medical Association. It seems to disagree with the Honourable Member from Wellington, and I think the Honourable Member from Wellington should get together with the Minister of Health, because before the last election the Minister of Health, speaking at the nominating convention of the Conservative candidate in Elmwood said that health plans would improve -- and here's what it said: "Provincial Health Minister, George Johnson, hinted Monday that a bigger majority in the Roblin government in the coming election would be a "shot in the arm" for the health and welfare program he had pioneered for three years." I don't see that "shot in the arm" in the Throne Speech. --(Interjection)-- Well, you should have. He also went on to say he called Manitoba hospitalization the greatest piece of social legislation since Confederation. And 1700 people in Elmwood believed him! Thank God there were more that didn't believe him! And he also said -- (Interjection) -- Where was it? -- (Interjection) -- He also took credit . . . he says that the day that the Roblin government took office this hospitalization plan came into effect. Now I don't care who brought it in. I know it wasn't them, because they weren't in power when this legislation was passed. But I'm glad to see it in operation. But, what do we find now with hospitalization with hospitals? I was shocked. I hadn't been near a hospital for quite some time. A friend of mine, I found out, was sick and I went to see him. Found out I couldn't park unless a private parking company had the right to collect the parking. I was shocked. I thought this was only going on in one hospital, but I found out that it was going on all over! -- (Interjection) -- I may as well. From where I had to park, I may as well have walked there, I'll tell you that!

Madam Chairman, when the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was speaking the other day, he mentioned that he was glad to see that the Conservative Government had taken quite a few planks out of the Liberal platform. Well, we took one out of theirs -- you can accuse us of it too, because it was in 1919 that the Liberals promised comprehensive health. So it was long before the CCF was even formed that they promised comprehensive health. We're still waiting, and -- oh, it's coming -- sure, since January 1961, between Ontario and the Federal Liberal Association, they've had four different plans. Then -- oh yes, Mr. Pearson, in Fredericton just the other day, says oh no, we can't go ahead with this here program because we haven't got -- our economy can't stand it now. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, did he change it again today? Oh well, I didn't see that! --(Interjection) -- That makes it fifth now! Anyway, -- (Interjection) -- Oh well, I've got a little more here yet. I'm not quite finished. I want to talk about the Saskatchewan Health Plan and tell you what it's done up to now.

The Medical Care Plan, before it changed to . . . . Saskatchewan, and the people were paying \$18 million for their medical care, and only half the province was covered. Now the whole province is covered it is going to cost an additional \$3 million to institute the plan. It will be financed by premiums costing \$12.00 for a single person and \$24.00 for a family, a one percent tax on income and corporate profits and an increase of 1.5% in provincial sales tax. A family of three earning \$3,000 a year would pay \$40.00 a year. The same sized family earning \$7,000 would pay \$100.00 a year. A provision is made for a social aid fund to pay costs of Medicare for senior citizens and the indigent. There may be reasons to quarrel with the methods of financing this plan, Madam Chairman, but there's no doubt of the popularity of the plan with the people there. With the doctors, it's altogether different. As the plan went into effect the 1st of July, 1962, the Saskatchewan Medical Association did the expected when the plan was approved by the Saskatchewan Legislature. Like the Canadian Medical Association at the time of the National Hospitalization Plan, the Saskatchewan doctors predicted doom and disaster. Last May the Saskatchewan doctors called a two-day protest convention in Regina. All medical offices were closed and only emergency services were available. The doctors threatened to leave Saskatchewan en masse. Despite this and a massive anti-campaign in the press and on TV, the government went ahead. As the plan went into effect in July it was met by the doctors' boycott. Only 280 of Saskatchewan's 900 doctors showed up at . . . . .

(Mr. Peters, Cont'd.) . . . . Saskatchewan's doctors raised all the standard protests about interference with the doctor-patient relationship, and asserted their distaste for a fixed fee schedule. The Saskatchewan government held firm. Oh, there was a division among a frightened people. After 23 days the doctors' boycott ended with certain concessions to the doctors, but with the basic plan intact. The Saskatchewan experience was again proof that the doctors do not hesitate to impose their own brand of political medicine with all weapons at their command. There were compromises, but a state system of health has come to stay in Canada. So far there is little evidence of any massive out-migration by the doctors in Saskatchewan. Some are already finding that neither their incomes nor their freedom have been assaulted. As in Britain, the Saskatchewan plan calls for a "pay according to a fee schedule" set by a public commission. Doctors continue practice much as they did before the plan came into effect, and patients choose their doctors the same as they did. I don't think that we've seen the exodus of doctors from Saskatchewan as everybody said that there would be, and I think that when the plan comes into effect, or when they start instituting a plan in Manitoba, you will have the same cry from the doctors here as you did in Saskatchewan, but they will learn to live with it, because they have to live with it; because I don't want this kind of doctor-patient relationship when I could get a bill for \$56.00 and only \$34.00 is paid. If that's the kind of doctor-patient relationship the doctors want I want no part of it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the member permit a question?

MR. SEABORN: The member probably knows Lord Taylor's outstanding closeness to Great Britain, and evidently highly respected by the NDP Party in this country, and I would like to ask him if he would contradict and deny his findings that the shortage of doctors in Britain is desperate and the scheme in jeopardy.

MR. PETERS: There is a shortage of doctors if the training pot is not . . . . even like here in Manitoba and in Canada.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Madam Speaker, I would like also to offer my congratulations to you in your election to the office of Speaker to this Legislature. I am sure that you will do a very excellent job in your new post. I am very sorry, though, to miss seeing you in this row in front of me as you were here for three sessions, and many times we would be able to converse with our problems on our adjoining constituencies together, but now we will have to forget about that and look after our own on our own basis. I would also like to congratulate the new ministers who are sitting in front of me, on their new posts. I know them very well over a period of years, and I know they will do an excellent job in their new duties. I would also like to offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne and say to them that they did a worthy job and we will be hearing from them many times in the future. Also, to the newly-elected members in this Chamber I would like to offer my congratulations to them on being first, elected to the Chamber and then on the worthy job they have done speaking to us the last few days. Many of your thoughts have been very interesting from all the different parties that have spoken, and I know that we will be hearing from you many times in the future. During this last election -- I think there are about twelve new members in this Chamber, and when we look back and think about some of the members -- when you are looking across the Chamber -- some of the members who were here during the last four years, it brings back memories, and one particular member who I was always greatly interested in in the New Democratic Party was the Member for Fisher and I will never forget him as long as I live the day that he got his "bombs" and "bottles" mixed up, and I think that was one day when it brought a little interest into the Chamber, and I am sure that our good Minister of Agriculture, now that he has been moved from the second row down into the front row, would have greatly enjoyed the Member for Fisher had they been as close now rather than the far greater distance they were in the past, because they would have been able to get closer together with their discussions. The Member for Fisher was always looking for a drain or a bridge or a little road and he never let us forget what his interests were.

We listened yesterday with great interest to the Member for St. George and I think I could assure the members in the Chamber that I don't think the Member for St. George has any chance of winning the Nobel Peace Prize in this Chamber especially from members of this side. Every time he gets up to speak he seems to irritate us a little and while when we're out

(Mr. McKellar, Cont'd.) . . . in the hallways we forget about it, but I would assure him that the Nobel Peace Award is -- he lost it yesterday, immediately from yesterday. So I think that today I would like to just say a few words on the amendment to the amendment to the Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the speech that the Leader of the New Democratic Party made, and many of his thoughts have not changed during the past few years. He is greatly interested in Medicare or health schemes for all of Manitoba such as they have in Saskatchewan. He is greatly interested in a little of the farmers' problems, although very little as he only mentioned one paragraph. He went on -- he mentioned the high taxes the taxpayers are paying, property taxes and so on -- his usual good speech put over in his usually good manner and one which we always look forward to from him, but I would like to say to him that in his great interest for the people of Manitoba I would wonder if his interests are not set out in the wrong manner. I was wondering if he would not give serious thought to changing his pleas after the last election when his party decreased from ten seats to seven. His version of socialism I consider is becoming more Liberal and I would suggest to him that he as a left-wing Liberal that he represent there and the right-wing Liberals to his right, that they would get together and form one party rather than have his party be all wiped out in the near future.

MR. PAULLEY: Even if it happened, I wouldn't join that.

MR. McKELLAR: He suggested as the answer to the farmers' problem producers' co-ops and marketing boards, but I would say to him that maybe his dream is coming true in Brandon this coming year regarding producers' co-ops where the co-op elevators are starting a new packing plant in there which will look after that part of Manitoba. Regarding marketing boards, I would suggest to him that I think farmers in Manitoba will stay with their present systems for a long while, and one of the reasons is, that as soon as you have marketing boards that deal with livestock you begin to lose some of your freedom that we have enjoyed over the past years, and those freedoms are such that we will have not as much say in disposing of our livestock. In my constituency we have a large number of dairy and beef cattle producers, a number of which supply milk for the district in Brandon and vicinities, and I would like to say to the people here -- and I was greatly interested in the speeches of the Honourable Member for Swan River and the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain -- that while we may not have as many pure-bred livestock producers, we do have in our constituency the largest herd in the Province of Manitoba, and the person who owns this herd is Elwood Downie of Wawanesa. We feel greatly proud of this, as Elwood has made a great business in increasing his herd so that he has the largest number in the Province of Manitoba.

Regarding property taxes, I would like to say just a word or two on that, and I was wondering, of all the crying and hollering we had about four years ago when the new school divisions' program was brought into existence, it was brought to our attention at that time that many of the farmers would be put off their farms due to the high taxes that this new program brought in. But I have never heard of any complaints in the past two or three years since this program was brought in about greatly increased taxes. Most of the people are happy over the greatly increased program that it has brought about; it has brought in transportation and has given every high school pupil a chance to obtain their education in their home district so they can remain with their families until they get their Grade 12 complete. I would also suggest to the Leader of the New Democratic Party that in Saskatchewan where they do have the five percent sales tax to assist in their education costs, that their property taxes are higher than Manitoba's, and they also pay this five percent sales tax, so that they, too, are not free from property taxes just because they have the New Democratic Party ruling them. I think that the property taxes are high in most cases, but the benefits that we are receiving both on a municipal level and on a school level are -- we are getting good value for our money.

Next that I would like to just say a few words on, was the Leader of the New Democratic Party mentioned that it is financially impossible to acquire education at the highest level if his parents -- he suggested that the parents could not pay for this education. I would like to suggest to him or refer to him that at the present time bursaries, scholarships and interest free loans are available to university students and to nurses and other people taking technical courses, and I have never heard at any time of anyone in my constituency that had to remain out of university for the reason that he could not obtain funds to finance him. I would like also to say to the Leader of the New Democratic Party just one more word in regard to our farm

(Mr. McKellar, Cont'd.) . . . policy in our province, by our party. When you look around this Chamber you wonder what each member does for a living other than sitting here for two months, and I began to count the number of farmers in our party and in all the other three parties, and I found there were twelve active farmers in this Chamber. I found there was one in the Liberal Party who runs a turkey ranch -- I think he's the most active farmer in the Liberal Party -- the one in the Social Credit Party, and ten in our party here, ten active farmers, and I wondered why the farmers, most of them, were elected by the Conservative Party. The one reason on which I came to my conclusion, that we were the only ones who had a policy on agriculture, and I began to think what those policies have been since we came into power, and in 1958 we remember the Agricultural Credit Corporation being set up; we remember the crop insurance being set up; we remember the water supply board being set up; we remember the drainage board being set up, and other policies regarding agriculture in our province; and I thought then that the farmers of our province have been wise in their acceptance of these policies, and also too that the farmers have been good enough to let their names stand for Premier Roblin and his government. In my opinion we have a policy which will stand for a number of years to come and meet the needs of the farmers in our province. I think that's all I have to say to the Leader of the Opposition at this time but I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition, as I said before, that he get together with the right-wing Liberals and form a Liberal Party which may be of some merit and stand for many years to come. I don't think his party will exist after the next election. They've gone down from ten to six and I think the next time we'll see them down to practically nothing because socialism will not work in times of prosperity.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Seven Oaks.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, my congratulations and best wishes to you on assuming the duties of your high office. I wish to compliment the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain and the Honourable Member for Swan River for the capable manner in which they moved and seconded the Address in Reply. To the two new Cabinet Ministers my sincere good wishes and last, but by no means least, I extend the hands of friendship to the new members of the House. I hope they will enjoy the good fellowship that prevails here and which transcends our political differences. I think I would like to say at this time, Madam Chairman, my best wishes to the Honourable Minister from Rock Lake and to congratulate the government for appointing him in the position he now holds. I always had a friendly feeling toward him and I think it would be a sense of comfort to the two new ministers who will no doubt be consulting him very often.

In rising to speak in support of the amendment to the amendment I am reminded of the old saying "The anvil of truth has worn out many hammers." Every reform in history has had bitter opposition, from the emancipation of the slave to the suffragist movement to the anti-fluoridationist. The opposition to a universal, comprehensive and compulsory plan of health care is no exception. We have come a long way from the time King Knute was supposed to have sat by the edge of the sea and commanded the tides to stop, and yet today we find better-educated people trying to stem the tide of a popular reform. It is no accident that health insurance should be so much in the public mind. There has, without a doubt, been a much greater pre-occupation with good health and health care in the last generation than any time in human history. The reasons for this are not hard to find. The last generation has seen a phenomenal development in the medical arts. Medical knowledge and skills have increased to a degree unimaginable even half a century ago. Great discoveries have been made in medical techniques, in the development of new drugs, in the control of disease and in relationship between environment and well-being. The improvements in living standards which have taken place during and since the last war have also played their part in making people realize that good health is a practical objective. Higher income, a greater degree of leisure, the availability of goods and services, which make for a more comfortable life, have all underlined the importance of good health. For what value are the good things of life if good health, which makes their enjoyment possible, is lacking? Good health is part and parcel of a good standard of living and now that people are aware of this knowledge that can make them healthy they are inclined to look askance at any artificial barriers which stand in their way of getting it. There are such barriers now and they are unnecessary. Furthermore, the experience of insurance techniques has by now

(Mr. Wright, Cont'd.) . . . made it clear that there is no longer any need for anyone to have to rely exclusively on his own limited resources to protect himself against the hazards of illness and accident.

What we are concerned about here, Madam Speaker, is not so much whether good health care is to be had but in what context. In large measure it is the institutional framework within which medicine is to be practiced that matters, as well as its availability. It is not the insurance principle alone we are concerned about. Removing the fear of the cost of illness is important, and for that reason alone health insurance could be justified, but merely to superimpose a procedure of pre-payment on the status quo would be to betray the health needs of the people. The economic burden of ill health might be taken care of but the degree and quality of medical care would remain unchanged. In our estimation the emphasis in the term "health insurance" is not so much on the insurance as on the health aspect, and since our emphasis is on health, Madam Speaker, we feel we owe you a definition of what constitutes good health. We can do no better than to quote the definition of the World Health Organization constitution, Article 1, which reads, "A state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity." This definition may appear to go beyond what we hope to achieve in the near future but we submit that this is the kind of goal that every government should seek to achieve, and in the words of Sir Arthur N. . . . , and this was taken from the booklet "Medicine and the State - The Relation Between the Private and Official Practice of Medicine", Sir Arthur says, and I quote, "The health of every individual is a social concern and responsibility, and its following from this medical care in its widest sense for every individual it is an essential condition of maximum efficiency and happiness in a civilized community." We assert that it can and should be the right of every citizen, without regard to his social and economic status, to have access to all those services and facilities which are or should be available to keep him in good health as long as possible and to aid him in recovering his health when he is struck down by illness or accident.

In other words, Madam Speaker, we believe that the fullest possible range of health care should be available to the citizens of this province as a right by virtue of legislative action. It is to some extent an anomaly that we should, during the latter half of the twentieth century, have to appear before such a body and speak to justify something like health insurance. We would be disposed to argue that it should be the other way around. Cause should be shown for the failure to have introduced it much sooner. Canada introduced hospital insurance relatively late in the day, largely as a result of the example set by the Province of Saskatchewan, and it is in effect in Canada, but so far as health insurance as a whole is concerned Canada remains one of the few countries of the world which does not have a public program of health insurance. It would be hard to claim that health insurance is a novel proposition in Canada at this time. Not only has it been a subject of political agitation but it has actually been on the agenda as a matter of serious consideration by the federal and provincial governments. We refer to the so-called green book, proposals of the Government of Canada at the Dominion-Provincial Conference on Re-construction in 1945. In this document the Federal Government stated, and I quote, "Health Insurance has been widely adopted because it is regarded as the best means of meeting and distributing fairly the cost of illness and in conjunction with preventive services, of improving the general health of the nation." It is worth recalling that the Federal Government's proposal for a first stage of the introduction of health insurance included general practitioners' services, hospital care and visiting nursing service. Subsequently the Government proposed to substitute laboratory and radiological diagnostic services or nursing services in the first stage. Accordingly, fifteen years after this proposal we have just reached the stage of hospital care. The rest is yet to come, Madam Speaker, as it is just as inevitable that comprehensive medical care will come about as it was that hospital insurance was to become a reality, a reality despite the fact that most provincial governments were loath to accept it at first. An editorial dated February 20th, 1960, in the Toronto Star Weekly, quotes ex-premier Douglas of Saskatchewan as predicting that "national health insurance will be a fact by 1970." It goes on to say that, and I quote again, "If Saskatchewan adopts medical insurance, it will spur demands for similar legislation across Canada just as hospital insurance did when it was introduced in 1947." Because hospital insurance lived up to its advance promises, it can be hoped that the appeal of medical insurance will spread at an accelerated pace. I believe it was

(Mr. Wright, Cont'd.) . . . Oscar Wilde who said that "Patriotism is the last resort of a scoundrel" and I'm not inferring, Madam Speaker, that my next bet is that the people are scoundrels, but the last resort of those who oppose legislation for the common good is the stubborn rejection of the word "compulsory." Is it not compulsory for children to attend school? Is it not compulsory to have a driver's licence, or to pay taxes or to contribute to the unemployment insurance fund? Just as the infant objects to any restriction to the movement of its limbs it seems as though we all have a built-in aversion to change, but is it not a sign of the mental maturity of the human species when people can rise above the law of the jungle and consider those things which might restrict private desire but do much public good. Findings just published by the United States Department of Health Education show that in 1958 Americans spent 4.4 billions of dollars for drugs and 4.3 billions of dollars for physicians' services. Madam Speaker, both figures are a record but for the first time drugs are costlier. I know of one lady eighty years of age whose only income is the old age pension and who manages somehow to pay for medical care under the MMS of roughly \$58.00 per year. She's living with relatives, that's the reason she's able to carry on at all. Her main medical need is for drugs and these she is denied under the provisions of the plan. Is this the kind of scheme we want to perpetuate? Do private schemes fill the bill? This so-called non-profit plan produces palatial administrative buildings but it is pitifully inadequate in most cases. I would like to quote, Madam Speaker, from the official journal of the Canadian Labour Congress, an article headed "M. D.'s should participate." Dr. E. Kirkland, Deputy to the President of the Canadian Medical Association, told a Montreal meeting of the College of General Practitioners of Canada, and I quote, "I sometimes have difficulty trying to determine what the doctors of Canada want." Discussing the relationship between government and the profession, Dr. Lyon said, "Would we go back to the days of poor public health measures, to the days of no government assistance to hospitals or to medical education? I think not. Call it co-existence if you will, but it is here to stay and we would be better occupying our time bending our efforts to guiding, assisting and directing all measures genuinely designed to improve the health of the people of Canada than opposing new ideas simply for the sake of opposing them or because we have not tried them."

Few Canadians are so rich that they can escape a haunting fear that sickness or accident might loose a landslide of medical bills on top of them. No matter how thrifty, most cannot save enough to guarantee against all medical emergencies; or if they have a nest egg put by for old age it can be wiped out in a month by sudden illness. Medical insurance vanishes this fear. We all pay a small sum and when a few of us fall sick our expenses are covered. The magic of averages comes to the rescue of millions. As well as being humanitarian it is also financially possible, and without ruinous taxation -- a conclusion drawn in a study two years ago by the reputable Canadian Tax Foundation.

Our record here, Madam Speaker, in Manitoba, in regard to the acceptance of new ideas is not particularly bright, but I hope some of the theory and the willingness to try when there seems to be so much to gain and so little to lose, will rub off on us here in Manitoba from our neighbours to the west, because in Saskatchewan today "humanity first" flies proudly from the masthead. Madam Speaker, I support the amendment to the amendment.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Education.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Education)(Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I join with the others in congratulating you upon your election to the office of Speaker of this Assembly. I'm one who has long admired your capacity as a member of this House and looked forward to your establishing an enviable reputation as the Residing Officer here.

I was much interested in your announcement made the other day, and again today concerning the classes which you intend to hold. Since this comes directly, of course, in the sphere of education, I should like to offer you the assistance of our department in the form of bursaries to the members who attend; transportation if they need it; perhaps certificates to those who are successful; and maybe even a system of merit rating for the instructors.

Madam Speaker, I had intended to confine my remarks to one portion of the sub-amendment presented by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. I divert from that original intention only briefly because of an interesting address that was made in this House this afternoon by the Honourable the Member for Burrows. He intrigued me, Madam Speaker, with his plea for relief from property taxes, a course to be brought about by grants from the

(Mr. McLean, Cont'd.) . . . Province of Manitoba, without ever once suggesting how this money might be forthcoming. He is all in favour of lower taxes, and I assume he would be in favour of lower taxes, period, while at the same time making an obvious appeal to those to whom he might think don't think too carefully about the public business of this province, and suggesting that these matters, that public affairs may be done without the necessity of raising public monies by way of taxation. Madam Speaker, there "ain't no such thing" as services being provided without some form of taxation, and I think a very elementary obligation upon the honourable member would have been to suggest how he would raise the funds which he considers would be necessary to carry out his suggestion.

But more particularly, Madam Speaker, I was interested in his reference to what a real government should do; that a real government should work for the establishment of a pension scheme which he proceeded to discuss in some detail during the course of his address. Now, Madam Speaker, I have news for the honourable member, because if he will turn to the journals of this House he will find that on February 28th last year, during the Session of this House, a resolution on that very subjection was presented to the House by the Honourable Mr. Christianson, the then Minister of Welfare. And so that it may be part of the records of today's proceedings, because I do agree with him that a real government should be interesting itself in this, I want to read in full into the records this afternoon the resolution which was presented on that occasion by a member of the present administration dealing with that very same subject, and I now quote the resolution in full, moved, as I say, by the Honourable Mr. Christianson, who at that time was the Minister of Welfare. I quote, "Whereas the Government of Canada has advised the Government of Manitoba that it is prepared to recommend to the Parliament of Canada the enactment of legislation to improve the Canadian social security system by inter alia, providing for (a) graduated old age pensions on a contributory basis for those who can afford additional provision for their old age, and who have not undertaken it under private plans, contractual or otherwise; and (b) the payment of benefits under certain circumstances, (i) to the widows and children of contributors who die, and (ii) to former contributors who become permanently disabled; And whereas it appears that Parliament cannot validly enact legislation for the purpose mentioned in Clause (b) of the next preceding paragraph unless an appropriate amendment is made to the British North America Act 1867; And whereas it is desirable that the Parliament of Canada should be enabled to enact legislation for the purpose aforesaid; Now therefore be it resolved that this House concurs in a draft being made by the Government of Canada to Her Majesty The Queen requesting the enactment by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of legislation to repeal the present Section 94 (a) of the British North America Act 1867, and to substitute therefor the following Section 94 (a). It is hereby declared that the Parliament of Canada may from time to time make laws in relation to (a) old age pension, and (b) pensions and other benefits incidental to, or conducive to the better operation and administration of a scheme of old age pensions, but no law made by the Parliament of Canada under the authority of this section affects the operation of any law enacted by the legislature of a province in relation to any of the matters specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Section; And be it further resolved that in the opinion of this House it is desirable that, failing the enactment of the amendment to the British North America Act 1867 here and before approved, the Parliament of Canada should enact legislation to establish a plan for the payment of contributory old age pensions, as mentioned in Clause (a) of the first paragraph of this resolution."

Now, Madam Speaker, the point that I want to make is that this resolution was presented to this House by this government, and were it not, one might speculate that were it not for the activities of certain of the political friends and associates of the Honourable the Member for Burrows in seeking some short-term advantage in bringing about the defeat of the government at Ottawa, that this matter might be before the Federal Parliament at this time. However, I think we may live in good hope, Madam Speaker, that following the 8th of April a real government composed of the Progressive-Conservative Party in Ottawa will move on with the suggestions which are contained in this resolution.

Now, Madam Speaker, if I had not been here and seen with my own eyes and heard with my own ears the sub-amendment moved by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, in one particular at least, I would have refused to believe that it actually happened, because as I read this -- as I heard it and as I read it, I find that he is proposing the defeat of

(Mr. McLean, Cont'd.) . . . the present administration of Manitoba for, among other reasons, he says, failing to make it financially possible for every Manitoban to acquire education to the highest level he or she can attain. Now I know that that's a great -- it makes some sort of grammatical sense, it doesn't make any other kind of sense -- but as I say, I just refuse to believe that such a thing could be actually suggested in seriousness to this House as a basis for the defeat of the government; and I wanted to say something about it before the matter got too far away -- and of course before the government got defeated.

Madam Speaker, surely if there is one thing, if there is one thing that has been done by the present administration in Manitoba, it is to have transformed -- and I mean that word -- transformed the educational system of the Province of Manitoba. There is absolutely no resemblance to the educational facilities which are available to the boys and girls and the young men of this province today to those that existed as short a time ago as when this government took office.

And may I say, Madam Speaker, because this is not a matter one perhaps might accuse me of wanting to claim some credit, and I want to deny any such intention, but may I point out to the members of this House and indeed to the people of Manitoba, that on many occasions my colleagues in this government, all of whom have had responsible jobs to perform in their departments and indeed great plans that they would like to carry out, on many cases have they stood aside in order that the finances required for our educational system would be made available. It's been very easy for me as the Minister of Education to do certain things because of the understanding and the preparedness of those who were associated with me to give first place, first place at all times to the requirements, and legitimate requirements of our educational system. Now it's true that the whole Province of Manitoba wasn't turned over to the Department of Education but certainly the largest part of our finances, the largest part in every year for which we have had the responsibility of government in this province, has been devoted to the needs of education in Manitoba. Something was said by the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party about administration -- and indeed he had some unkind words to say about our school trustees. Well, I don't say anything unkind about them.

MR. PAULLEY: On a point of privilege I did not imply anything in respect of holding the trustees in disrepute of the Province of Manitoba -- as a matter of fact if I recall correctly, I mentioned the fact that I hold them in my highest esteem and that they have done a good job over the years, and I resent the Honourable the Minister of Education imputing any such motive to me.

MR. McLEAN: My apologies to the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, Madam Speaker, perhaps I can content myself with reminding the House that he said there were too many of them. Now, Madam Speaker, . . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . there's no comparison with what the Minister has just said and his original statement.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, it's difficult to make comparisons for the benefit of the Leader of the New Democratic Party, because the only comparison we have is rapidly disappearing, but the Province of Saskatchewan, if he wants to make a comparison, it might be interesting to note that although they have been engaged in the re-organization of their school system for many more years than we have in Manitoba, still do not have as large a percentage of the Province of Saskatchewan covered by school units, as they are called there, as we have with school divisions in Manitoba and many of the municipal units -- municipal corporations in Saskatchewan, cities and towns -- lie outside or are not included in their school units. So for whatever it's worth, I make that comment, that we've done somewhat better in a shorter period of time than the province to the west of us and where I presume the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party would consider that they have enlightened capable government.

In the sphere of finances, Madam Speaker, I want to point out that in total appropriations for educational purposes in Manitoba, and this includes both capital and operating grants, we have increased from \$16.9 million in 1958 to \$40.8 million in the provincial fiscal year which is just drawing to a close -- 16.9 in 1958; \$40.8 million in the current fiscal year and that's better than twice as much money, that's two and a half times the amount appropriated for the purposes of our educational system. In that same period of time the grants to school districts and school divisions have increased from \$10.6 million -- now these are the grants that are

(Mr. McLean, cont'd) . . . . paid directly to school districts and school divisions in Manitoba and used by them in discharging their functions. An increase from \$10.6 million in 1958 to \$27 million in the current fiscal year -- almost three times the amount of money, an increase of almost three times is the amount of money which is paid to school districts and school divisions for the discharge of their obligations. During that time an entirely new policy -- under an entirely new policy which was one of the things which we have dealt with here -- \$3 million have been spent by the Province of Manitoba on school textbooks alone which have been given to the students of the Province of Manitoba. So I answer the contention or the allegation of the sub-amendment by directing the attention of the members of this House to these important facts, because the sub-amendment does use the term "financially possible" and I suggest that we have been doing very well in that regard.

In the -- (Interjection) -- I'll get to that, I'll make this speech without too much help, thank you. In the matter of the physical arrangements for the boys and girls, in order that this education might be given, there has been constructed in Manitoba since this government took office, 3,519 classrooms or classroom equivalents, and that has provided 90, and I hesitate, I re-emphasize this figure, 90 new high schools in the Province of Manitoba -- 90 of them, Madam Speaker, 18 more are planned and in the course of getting ready to be constructed. One Hundred and Eight new high schools in the Province of Manitoba in the short period of time since this government has been in office. Along with that -- along at the same time -- 82 new elementary schools; 15 additional are now under construction or being prepared for construction and I have not mentioned the additions to existing high schools or the additions to the existing elementary schools and so -- (Interjection) -- After I've concluded my remarks, thank you. -- (Interjection) -- The point I'm making here, Madam Speaker, is that in the way of providing the necessary facilities, this has been and is being done and I remind the members of the Legislature that with regard to those 108 high schools that approximately -- it doesn't come out to the full 75 percent, it's just slightly over 70 percent of the total cost has been paid by the Province of Manitoba under our grant system.

In the matter of getting the students to the schools, we have made tremendous strides. In 1958 when we came into office there were 10 buses owned by school districts -- there were no school divisions at that time -- 10 buses. Today there are 184 division-owned or school district-owned buses drawing students to and from school every day, to say nothing about the privately-owned vehicles which are used for the same purpose. Of that 184, the difference between 10 and 184 has been paid for 60 percent from funds of the Province of Manitoba. The number of students has increased -- the number of students actually transported has increased from 7,000 in 1958 to 25,000 today -- an increase of 18,000 students transported to school, day by day, in order that they might avail themselves of the educational facilities which are provided.

Still dealing with the financial aspect of the provision of educational facilities. We have increased more than two-fold, better than two-fold, the amount of money spent by the province in the provision of schools in what are known as undeveloped settlements -- in those parts of the province where they are unable to have any organized school districts and where they have no basis for paying school taxes -- and we have provided additional facilities at many places throughout the Province of Manitoba and I only mention three for sake of illustration at this time. Duck Bay, and indeed within a matter of two weeks we will be opening an additional two rooms in addition to the rooms which already exist at that school. At Moose Lake and at Pelican Rapids and one of the interesting things about this particular development, Madam Speaker, is that these schools serve a combination, Indian, Metis and white population. We have a completely integrated school system in these points where we are actually putting into operation the ideas and the philosophy which we believe should be part and parcel of our educational system in this province, if we are to do something for our Indian citizens, and boys and girls of our Indian citizens, and the boys and girls of our Metis citizens as well.

Somebody said something about the university, and now I come to talk about the university because we have taken, and let me remind the members of this House, Madam Speaker, that everything I have said costs no student -- it is provided by taxation, local and provincial for every student. Every student who wishes to attend school, and can attend school, is able to do so and for those who live in the country with regard to our high schools they are transported

(Mr. McLean, cont'd) . . . . as I have indicated and all students are provided with the authorized textbooks. So -- (Interjection) -- with the students after they have completed the opportunities which are available to them in the high schools of the province, there then comes the matter of what they may do with regard to further training if they should wish it. Here we have, of course, a similar record of increases, both with regard to capital grants and operating grants to the University of Manitoba. On the capital side, the increase has been from \$1.6 in 1957-58 to \$2.4 million in the current fiscal year. And in actual fact in two of the years since that time the capital has exceeded what it is in the current year because the building program at the University calls for additional sums. I read them to you quickly, Madam Speaker: 1.6 million in 57-58, and then 2.4 million, 3.8 million, 4.2 million, 1.7 million, 2.4 million, all for the capital expansion at the University of Manitoba. And on the operating side the money for the operation of the University of Manitoba has increased from 1.6 million in 1957-58 to just over \$5 million in the current fiscal year.

And, Madam Speaker, it may not be out of order to point out that the assistance, the financial assistance to the University of Manitoba amounts to approximately, give or take a dollar or two, \$1,000 per student who attends the University of Manitoba. Now I must warn you about that figure because that's the average. Undoubtedly -- well, it is a fact that in some of the faculties the cost of education is higher than in others, and so the subsidy, if one may call it that, by the province is higher toward the education, for example, of a student in medicine than it is towards the education of a student in the Faculty of Education or Arts and Science. But on the average, on the average the people of Manitoba are contributing from their tax resources \$1,000 per student per year, to those students in attendance at the University of Manitoba. This capital -- (Interjection) -- so what? It's in answer to the amendment which you presented to this House in which you said that the financial contribution was not satisfactory. Under the Capital Projects Assistance, the capital money that has been made available to the university, there have been constructed, as the members of this House well know, many new buildings at the University of Manitoba; to name only a few of them, the Education Building, the Pharmacy Building, Animal Science, Chemistry, Physics and the Arms Lecture Building, and additions to the Engineering Building.

Now I was interested, Madam Speaker, that the Honourable the Member for St. John's doesn't like the system of having the university go out and gather up money and be receiving money from the province in proportion to the money which they are able to raise themselves. Well, Madam Speaker, I think this is a wonderful idea because surely we have not come to the time in this province when we are afraid to do some things voluntarily. I appreciate, of course, that some there may be who would like to have us in a socialist straight-jacket where the government would be doing everything, and running everything. That is not something that appeals to me, and I'm sure doesn't appeal to the people of Manitoba. But this is an idea, Madam Speaker, which commends itself to other places in Canada and I cite as example Exhibit "A", the Province of Saskatchewan, the only difference being that the province does not support the voluntary work of the University of Saskatchewan in this regard to the same extent as we do in Manitoba. Indeed, the President of the University of Manitoba has pointed out that the two-for-one arrangement, that is, whereby the province will contribute \$2.00 for each \$1.00 collected under the voluntary program up to a maximum of \$8 million contributed by the Province of Manitoba -- he has described that as the best plan of any university in any province in the Dominion of Canada, and indeed it is. This, I suggest, is a fine example of the co-operative working of the University of Manitoba, the people of Manitoba, and the Government of Manitoba, and I commend it to the members of this House and say that in my opinion it is worthwhile; it has vision; and will bring great benefits to this province. Not only is higher education provided by the University of Manitoba but there is the education of equal importance which is provided by the affiliated colleges. And here again we have had a policy of support, Brandon College, which provides for them \$2 1/2 million for capital expansion of that college, and under which they have made some substantial and worthwhile improvements and enabling them to increase their enrolment. And along with the Brandon College, capital grants to the affiliated colleges of approximately \$2 million expended to date under that program. All of these, Madam Speaker, making provision for the young men and women who wish to go on and carry on their education after they have completed high school.

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

In vocational education -- general field of vocational education -- we have as you well know the Institute of Technology presently under construction at a cost of \$5 million, and which will be occupied by part of the students who will be using it on the 18th day of March this year. These will be the students who will be in the Trade School section of the school and the school itself will be officially in full operation in September 1963.

And may I say here, Madam Speaker, that we here in Manitoba do not deserve the entire credit for this institute because three-quarters of the cost of this fine institution are being paid under an enlightened policy which was instituted by the present administration at Ottawa, and 75 percent of the cost will be paid from federal sources. This institute will provide training opportunities for some 2,000 students, and will, in its own right, hold a place somewhat similar to the university in post-high school education in Manitoba.

May I say with regard to the various -- I've talked about the physical facilities, about the money -- what about some of the things that are going on in the school. It is of interest to report that 22 divisions in Manitoba, 22 school divisions, are now offering one or more vocational options or courses in their respective high schools and that 21 school divisions have classes in the new General Course in Grade X. In this particular regard I should like to report to this House the splendid response, and indeed the fine progress, which is being made with regard to the General Course. I know that it is perhaps a temptation for some to downgrade the General Course -- that is unfortunate because it is receiving a fine response.

I read, Madam Speaker, from a report given to me by two persons especially detailed to make an inspection of the operation of this course throughout Manitoba. Here is what they have reported: Reactions to the course, first by the teachers: A growing recognition of the worth of the course and its long-range benefits for students; an enthusiasm for the materials contained in text and outlined -- evidence of this enthusiasm is contained in the fact that a number of requests were made to allow the use of the General Course materials in the teaching of the university entrance course; a good professional attitude was apparent in teachers' desire for an evaluation of their handling of the course -- some expressed relief on discovering that the General Course was not a dead-end venture, that opportunities for employment and further education were open to students who successfully completed the course; an appreciation of the help given to them by the Department of Education in the form of briefing sessions, course outline and supervisory assistance. That's the reaction by the teachers. What about the pupils? Here's what they have to say. A high degree of interest is expressed by students themselves and was evident through their use of text. Contrary to the expectations of some students, who felt originally that they were entering a snap course, all have now come to the realization that the course is challenging. Many students who are below average ability seem to have been aroused. An often expressed sentiment was, "Yes, I find the course hard, but I am enjoying it." And what about the reaction of principals? Almost without exception principals have shown their concern for the success of the course by selecting capable teachers for the General Course classes. Principals are pleased with the evidence of a successful beginning to the General Course as shown in their own schools, and those throughout the province.

A leader reports on meetings held with teachers. It shows -- and I won't take time to go over it in detail -- that we have far greater interest on the part of teachers in Manitoba with regard to the course than had been hoped for even under the most optimistic arrangement.

Now, Madam Speaker, there's one point that I should mention, and that is with regard to assistance to students who wish to go to university or Teacher's College, or whatever the case might be, and to report to this House that in the current fiscal year there are 1,846 students who are receiving financial assistance to assist them in their education and that over \$1/2 million in this year alone is being spent for this purpose. Indeed, in three years we have spent a million and a half dollars in helping, and the number of students has been gradually increasing -- and that goes all the way through, agriculture, health, welfare and education, including Teacher's College, and others. And I'm not aware, Madam Speaker, of any occasion, of any student who, with a satisfactory academic record, and I underline that expression, satisfactory academic record, who has been prevented from securing education, either at the university or Teacher's College for financial reasons, and this assistance is available and every help is given to them.

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

One final comment, Madam Speaker, is with regard to the rather intriguing suggestion made by the Honourable the Member for St. John's in which he said -- and of course how nice it is to say that someone else should pay the taxes -- he said the cost of education, and of course he included health and other things, should be paid from the income tax. Madam Speaker, does he realize that to pay the cost of education alone -- forget about health and these others -- to pay the cost of education alone in Manitoba would require three times -- 300 per cent increase in the income tax, in the personal income tax in Manitoba, and those people who earn less than \$1,000 that he says now pay something like 11 percent of income tax would be paying 33 percent and those who earn less than . . . . . than \$4,000 who are now paying 14 percent, would be paying 42 percent, and those who earn over that, that are now paying 24 percent, would be paying 72 percent income tax in order to support the educational system in the Province of Manitoba on the basis of the payment of income tax. We would drive every citizen out of this Province, Madam Speaker -- drive every citizen out of this province. To indicate the impracticability and indeed the -- I mustn't use the word I'm thinking of because I'd be called by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, but the pie in the sky nonsense that is spouted around the Province of Manitoba by the New Democratic Party who want to suggest that if you change the system, of course you get away from paying taxes. Well you don't and I think there's some obligation on them to suggest how these monies might and should be raised if they think that there should be no local taxation for school purposes.

I find, Madam Speaker, that I have run out of my time, perhaps some other occasion I'll have an opportunity to speak.

MR. PAULLEY: If the Minister would answer a question or two that I might have -- I don't want to have a debate with him, but there are one or two questions I would like to ask of my honourable friend.

MR. McLEAN: You might ask them.

MR. PAULLEY: Well first of all, Madam Speaker, as you know, I wanted to interject at a point where the Honourable the Minister was dealing with the question of expanded facilities that were required in the educational system of Manitoba and he asked me to wait until he had finished. He has now finished and I would like to ask him, would not these facilities have been built irrespective of what government was in power here in the Province of Manitoba and is it not a fact that this was only made necessary because of the expanding population in Manitoba?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, the answer to the question is no. -- (Interjection) --

MADAM SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and I leave the Chair till 8:00 o'clock.

French Speech, March 6th, 1963, Page 63.

M. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Tout d'abord je tiens à féliciter Monsieur le Premier Ministre ainsi que les autres Ministres et députés qui connaissent assez bien la langue française pour me suivre. Je ne suis pas sans savoir que cela demande un réel effort d'apprendre une seconde langue surtout quand on est rendu à un âge avancé. Cependant étant donné que nous vivons dans un pays bilingue et bi-culturel je crois qu'il est le devoir de tous, des Ministres et des députés spécialement, de faire un effort réel pour apprendre les deux langues officielles du pays et en connaître . . . . . Etant donné que nous approchons rapidement vers le centenaire de la Confédération je crois qu'il y a avantage tout aussi bien au Manitoba qu'au Canada tout entier de faire de la Confédération un pacte qui respecte les droits et les traditions des deux groupes qui l'ont conçue. Et à cet effet, c'est avec plaisir que j'ai noté dans le discours du Trône que le gouvernement du Manitoba avait accepté de participer à la conférence fédérale-provinciale sur le bilinguisme et le bi-culturalisme. J'ai aussi remarqué dans le discours du Trône qu'il y aura des mesures prises pour que le bureau des aviseurs sur l'éducation voit à la révision du curriculum. J'espère que dans la révision qu'on envisagera on tiendra compte du français et que l'on considérera sérieusement les changements nécessaires pour que nos enfants de langue française puissent légalement apprendre d'autres sujets tel que l'histoire et la géographie dans leur propre langue.

English Translation: First of all I want to congratulate the Prime Minister as well as the other Ministers and MLA's who know the French language well enough to follow what I say. I

(Mr. Vielaure, cont'd) ..... am not without knowing that it takes a real effort to learn a second language especially when you are older. However in view of the fact that we live in a bilingual and bicultural country, I believe it is everyone's duty, the Ministers and MLA's especially, to learn the two official languages of our country and to know ..... Seeing that we are rapidly nearing the centennial of our Confederation, I believe it is as much to Manitoba's advantage as to Canada as a whole to make of Confederation an agreement which will respect the rights and traditions of the two groups which brought it into existence. To this end, I noted with pleasure in the Speech from the Throne that the Government of Manitoba had accepted an invitation to participate in a Dominion-Provincial Conference on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. I also noticed in the Speech from the Throne that there will be measures taken by the Advisory Board of the Department of Education relative to the revision of the curriculum. I hope that this revision will take into consideration the French language and that serious thought will be given to changes so that our French-speaking children can legally learn other subjects such as history and geography in their mother tongue.