

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 15, 1966

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the House would allow me to make an announcement before we proceed with our business.

The Industrial Relations Committee has already been called for 9:30 Monday morning and I think that that committee should probably continue with its intention to sit. The House would not sit Monday morning but commence Monday afternoon as usual, thus making room for the committee that's got some work to do. So if there's no objection to that, I would suggest that we follow that course and I would like to make the announcement.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we start our afternoon sitting, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 51 Grade 7 students from the Talmud Torah School under the direction of Mrs. Smordin, Mrs. Soudack and Mrs. Lennox. This school is from the Inkster constituency. On behalf of all members in this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, when I was speaking to this resolution the other day when 5:30 was called, it was on the matter of how and why an inquiry should be called. There has been an inquiry set up to investigate the matter of Totogan Farms and whether or not this farm was bought to produce someone a profit or not. Well we heard a great discourse this morning about this was not really the concern of this government to inquire into whether or not someone is going to make a profit out of selling goods or services to this government. However, this government did see fit to set up an inquiry and I posed the question earlier while speaking on this resolution as to what sort of a demand or why was the inquiry set up, and I expect to perhaps have an answer during the course of this debate.

Madam Speaker, I contend that when this inquiry was set up there was no particular cry from the public; there was no questions being asked about it either in the House or outside or in the newspapers; however, for reasons of its own, this government decided to institute an inquiry known as the Totogan Farms Inquiry. So in my resolution I ask that they expand this inquiry to look into another matter in the same district and concerned with the same question, as to whether or not someone had bought with the hope of a quick gain out of this government, and in the resolution it spells out what the quick gain was in dollars and cents.

Now I've mentioned before what some of the constituents have been saying in my riding and I quoted at length from a letter from one constituent. We have heard earlier today and last night that perhaps the press can be criticized for making editorial comment on certain decisions that are taken by officialdom. Well I for one do not go along with this. If there's a question that has to do with the public domain, the press has every right to ask questions and demand answers.

I have here an editorial from the Free Press. I do not have the date to this editorial, but it's quite a lengthy one and it is questioning this government's stand on whether or not there should be an inquiry into the matter of the purchase of the Bain estate, and I would like to refresh members' memory by reading the editorial comment. The title of it is called "Not Convincing." The Provincial Government's reply on Monday to opposition charges of incompetence in the acquisition of land for waterfowl preserve was long, involved and detailed, but not 100 percent convincing. The charges as outlined last week by Opposition Leader Gildas Molgat appear to be relatively straightforward. He said that the government had paid \$245,000 for three parcels of land at Delta, Grosse Isle and Portage la Prairie to a private company. This company had acquired the land a short time before for \$102,500, the appraised value of the land. The appraised value of the land, Mr. Molgat said, was \$91,786.00, thus he claimed the government had paid far too much and had wasted the taxpayers' money. The government, he said, should have expropriated the land as it has expropriated land for other uses.

"The situation as seen through the government eyes was not quite so simple. Mr. Lyon, the Minister of Mines and Resources, contended in his reply that the government had no authority to expropriate land for this purpose before September 1, 1963, when The Wildlife Act was proclaimed. He said that if the government had instituted expropriation proceedings after that date it would have had to pay much more for the property than it did pay as a result of its negotiations.

"As to the appraised value, Mr. Lyon introduced other appraisals which had been made,

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . . all of them much closer to the figure the government had paid. Furthermore, he said, the Federal Government, through the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act, had put up half the price of the properties at Delta and Grosse Isle, and probably would do likewise in the case of the Portage property. Thus instead of paying \$175,000 for the property at Delta and Grosse Isle, the Provincial Government had paid only \$85,000 and a comparable adjustment would probably be made on the third piece of property.

"Mr. Lyon's reply has not daunted the Opposition and it raises some questions in the minds of the laymen. The participation of the Federal Government to the extent of paying half the cost of the land is peripheral to the main argument. The Provincial Government cannot fairly claim any virtue as a result of this action of the Federal Government. If ARDA did not exist, the province would presumably have cheerfully paid the full amount, and no matter how the cost is split, it is still tax money that was used.

"The Liberals vigorously dispute Mr. Lyon's contention that the government could not have expropriated the land before The Wildlife Act was proclaimed. Such authority, they say, is contained in The Expropriation Act. Section 3 of this Act permits the Minister to expropriate any land which he deems necessary for any public works or purpose connected therewith or any public purpose of the Government of Manitoba. Mr. Lyon claimed that he had been informed that this section would not work, but surely if the government wants to set up a waterfowl preserve, this is a public purpose of the government. Yet the government, for its own reasons, was not willing to put this to the test although it had little to lose and perhaps much to gain.

"The appraisal figures used by Mr. Molgat were dismissed by Mr. Lyon as the value obtained for the purpose of valuing the estate for succession duty purposes. It was therefore obviously in the interests of the estate to obtain as low an evaluation as possible. Does this mean that the figures in question were inaccurate; that the value of the land was deliberately underestimated; that the value given for tax purposes was not the true value of the land? This is what Mr. Lyon would appear to be implying.

"He then noted that a government appraiser valued the two parcels of land at Delta and Grosse Isle, for which the government had paid \$170,000, at \$157,000. Another appraisal made by the agents of the company who owned the land and which was selling it to the government, placed a value of \$379,000 on the three parcels of land for which the government paid \$245,000. Mr. Lyon used the last figure to show that the government had saved money rather than squandered it, but if he insists on discounting the first appraisal as too low because it was in the interest of the party who then owned the land to have it set low, then he cannot use the latter figure to substantiate his case, because it was clearly just as much in the interests of the party who then owned the land to have the value set as high as possible. Mr. Lyon cannot have it both ways." I think we heard that phrase this morning - "you can't have it both ways."

"The Minister may introduce as many figures as he likes, but he cannot talk his way around one fact. The company, which through the exercise of \$100 option obtained ownership of the land, paid \$70,000 for the property at Delta and Grosse Isle. Very shortly thereafter the government paid the company \$170,000 for this land. Mr. Lyon may claim that the price paid for the land, whether a few months before or not, does not by itself establish the price that would have to be paid under expropriation proceedings. But surely in normal circumstances it is some sort of an indication of the value of the land, and equally surely the land in question did not appreciate \$100,000 in value in so short a period.

"The government defence against the charge of inefficiency does not stand up. It is particularly weak when the waterfowl preserve case is set alongside the government's earlier record of land acquisition. As Mr. T. P. Hillhouse summed it up for the Opposition, 'First it becomes known that the government is interested in buying a piece of property, then it is disclosed that the government will not expropriate. After that, two or three individuals set up a corporation and take an option on the property. Then they sell to the government at a price higher than they paid originally.' That is what one newspaper has to say about this particular transaction.

Now, Madam Speaker, I would like to examine just one phase of this transaction in some detail. This is the farm, 219 acre farm located at the water tower just west of Portage at the Assiniboine River. This farm was bought by the Department of Agriculture through the Minister of Agriculture. This piece of land was acquired for his department. Now this farm consists of 219 acres, of which 125 acres were cleared. One-half of the uncleared portion could be

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . . cleared and used for production. Now of the 125 acres that is cleared, 45 acres would be suitable for early root crops; 18 acres suitable for all crops; and 60 acres suitable for vegetables and some grains. So when we examine this piece of land we find that after carrying out more clearing, there would be about 172 acres of arable land; there would be 47 acres of land unfit for farming of any description. That 47 acres was sandy, and/or swampland. It had water in it the year round.

Now during the debate last year the Minister of Agriculture rose in his place to defend this particular transaction saying that this land was suitable for housing development. Well I suppose anyone could use this argument about any piece of land. If the land is reasonably dry, on a road near a town, it could be called suitable for housing development. But as I understand the appraisal methods that are being used presently by this government, they do not suppose ahead of time that land will be suitable for a housing development; it must be established. At least this has been the basis of some of their actions at Birds Hill. It must be established if it's a housing development. It can't be in somebody's mind or it can't be an idea of some high pressure salesman; it must be an established fact that you are dealing with a housing development land if you are going to pay a housing development lot price.

Now this piece of land - let us look at the location again. It is about two miles from Portage. It has been there since Portage was established and never used as a housing development; parts of it are swampy and full of water; parts of it are sandy; and then the fact it is adjacent to a small Indian village, in some people's mind at least, this would not be desirable for a housing development. If it had of been, it would have been developed, because over the past 15 years there has been a good amount of development going on around Portage, and I cite the . . . . . plats development, where there is a beautiful subdivision with about 70 or 80 homes and room for two or 300 more.

Yet the Minister of Agriculture pays for this land, by his own admission last year, he pays an outrageous price, because in his opinion it was a housing development location. And what did he pay for this land? We know that the appraised value, as done by the Bain Estate people, was something over \$29,000 for 219 acres. We know that the Octave Enterprises who optioned the land gave a little bit more by way of option, although no cash. I think they paid \$100 down on three parcels of land. So for a very few dollars, the Octave optioned this 219 acre farm - of which 172 was useful - they optioned it for \$32,000 or thereabouts - \$32,500 perhaps. And what did this government pay for this land? Just a few months later, what did they pay? They paid \$65,000 for it, or \$287 an acre. This was the over-all price per acre, bearing in mind that 47 acres were absolutely useless without an expensive drainage program, or without replacing of the sandy soil.

So my honourable friend the Minister of Mines passed around pictures and showed buildings. Certainly there were buildings on it like any other farm. On this farm there was a fairly good barn, a substantial brick house, albeit an old one, and a number of turkey pens that were made out of secondhand lumber. How Honourable Ministers opposite can defend a buy of this nature, is beyond me. All they had to do was check the Land Titles Office to see what the sworn value was, or was that too difficult for them? Is it any wonder, Madam Speaker, that people question this transaction? I ask this government again - they saw fit to set up an inquiry on a piece of land that isn't purchased, yet they blithely ignore this type of a purchase.

We heard from the lips of the Minister of Utilities this morning that he is not concerned with profit. He's not concerned with the profit that anybody makes on a contract or on a dealing with the government. Well after examining this deal, Madam Speaker, I believe him. I certainly do believe him, that he's not concerned with whatever kind of profit is made. I think it's high time that there was some attention paid to some of the deals that were made, and if they need examination, let us examine them.

So, Madam Speaker, I have presented the reasons for my resolution. I back them up with facts and I ask the government to vote for this resolution if you are so interested in saving the taxpayers' money.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood,

WHEREAS motor vehicle accidents are taking an ever increasing toll of life and property; and

WHEREAS there are many examples of hardship to innocent parties due to motor vehicles being driven without insurance or adequate financial responsibility; and

WHEREAS it is not compulsory for drivers to prove financial responsibility; and

WHEREAS the \$25.00 assessment to be credited to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, where motor vehicle insurance is not in effect it is felt to be an unsatisfactory deterrent, rather than a solution; and

WHEREAS notwithstanding the \$25.00 fee assessed against drivers without adequate insurance or financial responsibility the government has reimposed a levy upon drivers who have insurance, said levy to be credited to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government be requested to consider the advisability of instituting compulsory motor vehicle insurance before motor vehicles can be registered, and that the Government be the insurer.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, this resolution has been on the Order Paper for some considerable period of time because it had been indicated in the Throne Speech that the government was going to propose some measures in respect of automobile insurance, and I had hoped that this question of automobile insurance, being compulsory and operated by the government, would have been contained in the introduction of any resolution from the government as a result of the matter being referred to in the Throne Speech.

However, it appears, Madam Speaker, that such is not the case, although I do note that there is a resolution being sponsored by the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities that a committee be set up to investigate the question of rate increases in automobile insurance over the past few years, and the government questions whether or not, in their very resolution, as to whether these increases have been justified. Then the government further goes on to indicate that they intend to investigate all aspects of government insurance as it deems appropriate for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the public, and then to make recommendations.

So I say, Madam Speaker, first of all I held my resolution back because I had hoped that the government would do something this year in respect to automobile insurance whereby automobile insurance would be compulsory before a motor vehicle was permitted to travel on our highways. This is a matter, Madam Speaker, which I have introduced into the House, and colleagues of mine, for some considerable period of years. The question has been debated, and as yet the government has not seen fit to adopt the proposition that we sponsor.

It is well known, Madam Speaker, that in the Province of Saskatchewan that a compulsory government-operated insurance plan has been in vogue for some considerable period of time, and that in the Province of Saskatchewan all persons involved in accidents with respect to motor vehicles are covered. The other day we had a debate in the House in respect of the situation of relatives of persons driving an automobile who become injured, and under our present law the insurance companies, unless there is special coverage made priorly, are not liable for third party damage or liability. In the Province of Saskatchewan, under the governmently-operated system, every person involved in an accident, Madam Speaker, be they related to the individual concerned or not, be the driver guilty of an offence or not, the injured party is compensated for any injury.

Two or three years ago the government introduced a plan into the Province of Manitoba which in effect attempted to place a sort of a limited insurance on every automobile by instituting the payment of \$25.00 into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund by any operator of a motor vehicle who did not have automobile insurance. This apparently hasn't worked, Madam Speaker, because this year the government itself decided that once again it should soak those who take out automobile insurance an additional amount to go back into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. This to me is an indicator that even the payment of the \$25.00 into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund by those not having insurance is not sufficient to carry the fund on a proper basis.

I might say, Madam Speaker, too, that I have had drawn to my attention many complaints of the actions of automobile insurance companies terminating policies mid-season, refusing to promptly pay claims; and indeed, Madam Speaker, I sometimes suspect that there is a considerable amount of collusion between the automobile insurance companies because quite frequently

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... those whose insurance has terminated mid-term make application to another insurance company and they find themselves having to pay increased premiums without any reasonable explanation at all.

I've had a number of cases drawn to my attention where persons have had minor damages done to their vehicles who have not put in claims because of the fear that if they do claim damages, either to their own car or to a car that they might damage, that if the claim is small, chances are that the premiums soon will be raised by the insurance companies, and many people, rather than run the risk of having to be placed on the Assigned Risk Plan, pay out of their own pockets these smaller amounts of money as a result.

Madam Speaker, too, the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund is not the answer to the problem. I had a case drawn to my attention a few days ago by a party who had had his car parked legitimately on the side of the street. His car was hit by a hit-and-run driver who was not insured. He had paid however, in accordance with the law, the \$25.00 Unsatisfied Judgment Fund amount. The total damage to the parked car was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$100.00. The delinquent driver was charged for leaving the scene of an accident, failure to report an accident, and he was fined \$100.00 and costs.

The party whose car was damaged, after the hit-and-run driver was located, attempted to obtain from him sufficient monies to pay for the damages of his car. The delinquent driver did not have the financial resources to do so, because, Madam Speaker, the only resource he actually had was his car. He was faced with a fine of \$100.00 as a result of leaving the accident; the net result was that he had to sell his car in order to pay the law the fine. This was the first claim on any moneys that the delinquent driver had, and of course the Crown got its pound of flesh. My friend, whose car was hurt, made enquiries as to how he could get his car fixed through the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, and after receiving preliminary legal advice, came to the conclusion that it would cost him more to make a recovery under the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund than the damage of his car would be in any case.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Would the honourable member advise me what would have happened had that accident occurred in Saskatchewan with \$200 deductible?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, the accident did not happen in Saskatchewan and I am not here to discuss a case that might happen in Saskatchewan because I'm not conversant or have my material before me at the present time, but I want to say though, Madam Speaker, to my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk, that in the Province of Saskatchewan, which now has a Liberal Government - at least up until now - are maintaining and retaining the compulsory automobile insurance plan operated by the government.

MR. ROBLIN: They had to raise the premiums.

MR. PAULLEY: They had to raise the premiums, yes, Madam Speaker, but there again - there, Madam Speaker, is the very point behind my resolution. Sure in Saskatchewan if the accident incidence goes up, the rates are based on that incidence of accident. My friend the member for Selkirk nods his head in agreement, but, Madam Speaker, the reverse is also true, that if the incidence goes down or the claims on the fund goes down, so do the premiums charged to the operator of the motor vehicle. Now this just isn't happening here in Manitoba.

A week or two ago, or sometime back, the members of the House here were all given, with the exception of the five members of the New Democratic Party, a brochure from the All-Canada Insurance Company drawing to the attention of the members of the House the fears - the danger of establishing a compulsory automobile insurance scheme. You know, Madam Speaker, it grieves me, it makes my heart bleed to know that the likes of the All-Canada Insurance Company, as I understand it it is a federation of automobile insurance companies, who claim every year to be losing millions of dollars in the field of automobile insurance, so want to perpetuate their losses that they'll go even to the extent of supplying this House with 50 brochures in opposition to the proposition which I am making to this House.

Madam Speaker, the resolution which we will be discussing beforelong proposed by the Minister of Public Utilities indicates to me, as I'm sure it will to this House, that the government of Manitoba will not or can not take at face value the insurance rates that are being charged in the Province of Manitoba. The resolution says there will probably be increases this year; in recent years there have been a number; and they say it is deemed advisable in the public interest to study and investigate into these matters. I'm sure that this resolution will pass this House, but I say to the government, a couple of years or so ago you endeavoured to partially solve the problem by instituting the \$25.00 fee to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund for those who are not carrying automobile insurance. It hasn't worked out.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)...

This year, as I said in my opening remarks, because it hasn't worked out and because of the charges against the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, those who are paying automobile insurance had their rate increased, not by the insurance company, Madam Speaker, but by the government as well through an additional charge into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. It's well to say, Madam Speaker, that 95 percent of the drivers of motor vehicles or some figure of that nature are insured through private companies. It's well to say, but there's still a considerable percentage who are not, but more important I think even than that, Madam Speaker, is the fact that the way automobile insurance rates have increased, despite the contribution that these companies are making through their annual losses of a million dollars, we still do not have a satisfactory situation in the province.

So I ask, Madam Speaker, the members of the House to give earnest consideration to this proposal. I know full well, Madam Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Selkirk in all likelihood will get up and say something about the State of Massachusetts where they have compulsory automobile insurance or someplace else where they might have it. --(Interjection)-- Yes, my friend might talk of Saskatchewan, and in my wind-up I intend to too, so I forewarn my honourable friend to be accurate in his statements.

But, Madam Speaker, Saskatchewan is the only place to my knowledge that has adopted and still retains a compulsory automobile insurance scheme. The rates there are based - operated by the government - the rates there are based on incident. No profit is necessary, and I know as far as Massachusetts is concerned, the reasons for the high rates there are first of all the density of traffic; and secondly - secondly, because the scheme is still operated by and under the free enterprise system of society.

Of course this morning, Madam Speaker -- now I don't know whether or not my friends on my right may change their mind and come along with me in this resolution which is often considered a socialist resolution because it asks the state to do something. We're going to try, through this resolution, to have automobile insurance conducted under the auspices of the government so there is no profit, just the same as my honourable friends to the right suggested should have happened insofar as certain aspects of Grand Rapids were concerned. So I say to my honourable friends let's take the profit motive out of our system of society; let us adopt a system of automobile insurance without the profit motive but with adequate protection to all of the people who may be involved in an accident as the result of a motor vehicle being on or off of the highway.

Now, Madam Speaker I've now introduced this resolution. I trust and hope it will be given the earnest consideration of all members of the House. I note with great interest, being a follower of what happens at conventions, that this matter has been considered two or three times at least at the Liberal conventions and is receiving more support each year at their convention.

Now I invite my honourable friends to my right, who are no longer concerned with non-profit organizations, that they should support me, my group, and maybe if the member for Selkirk makes an eloquent appeal as he did the other day on a certain surgical case, he might even convince the government that if they won't accept my resolution, at least it should be a matter for consideration of the committee that is going to be set up.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution as amended by the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I was prompted to make a couple of comments on this resolution because of two stories that have appeared in the Neepawa Press - and they're true ones - since the first of this year.

MR. ROBLIN: What was the name of that publication?

MR. SHOEMAKER: The Neepawa Press -- (Interjection) -- What was the question - the last question. Where is Neepawa? Is that the question? I will proceed to tell my honourable friend.

The first one is January 28, 1966-- '66. I'm only going to refer to it briefly. It says, "Canadians, according to most observers on the national scene, are enjoying a period of

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd). . . unprecedented prosperity. Business and industry are booming and the outlook for the future is bright." That's the first paragraph, and then it goes on to say that they can not say this about Neepawa and that something should be done.

The last article is dated April 8. Now that's not long ago, Madam Speaker - I would think about a week ago today - and it is headed, "War on Poverty." It says, "The Federal Government recently announced plans for 'War on Poverty' which apparently is designed to eradicate the so-called pockets of poverty in this country. Most people would hesitate to call Neepawa a pocket of poverty, but there are cases in the town which would qualify for that description." And it goes on and points up the various areas.

Now the resolution that is before us has something to say in respect to the relationship between the social sphere and the economic sphere. There's no doubt about that; there is a definite relationship, and the Neepawa Press points this out. "The following figures give pause for thought", they say. "A survey of average wages carried out in 1961 shows Neepawa at the bottom of the list, including Winnipeg, Brandon, Rivers and Minnedosa." The figures, it says, are probably out of date because they were 1961 figures, but they are still interesting. "The average male yearly wage in Minnedosa was listed at \$3,244 while Neepawa had an average male yearly wage of \$3,035. Rivers was considerably higher at \$3,497." What they're saying here is that in an 18 mile distance the average male rate in Neepawa is \$250 less than it is in Minnedosa, and a good deal below Rivers, Winnipeg and Brandon. They go on to say there's little doubt that Neepawa has a serious problem. It might be stretching the case to say that it is a 'poverty pocket', but it is a problem and there's no doubt about that. They recommend that a study will have to be made and will require a lot of work.

Now, Madam Speaker, just about a year ago now, certainly a year ago during the Session of a year ago, we were told by the Minister of Industry and Commerce that 12 Manitoba towns were going to be placed under "a microscope," and I'm referring now to a propaganda sheet dated February 26, 1965, headed just as I have stated, "Twelve Manitoba Towns under Microscope." Neepawa is one of them according to this. It says "The business makeup of 12 Manitoba communities will be subjected to a searching analysis during the next year to determine if they have achieved their full potential in respect to drawing people within their orbit and if they are providing adequate services."

At the bottom of the page it says, "Communities which will be studied during the months ahead include Roblin, Steinbach, Souris and Gimli, and after that the towns of Beausejour, Neepawa, Morden, Carberry, Lac du Bonnet," and so on. That was dated February 26, 1965. Well, it's a fair question to ask my honourable friend if in fact the survey was made and are we going to have it tabled, because that is 14 months ago now and surely - surely in 14 months they have proceeded to do what they said they were going to do 14 months ago, and this is what the Neepawa editorial is all about.

On the very same day, namely February 26, 1965, included in the same envelope as the previous propaganda sheet was another one. "Questionnaires have been mailed," this one says. The other one says they're about to do it. This one dated the same day said they've already mailed them out - these questionnaires - to 75 communities in a province-wide business opportunity survey. "Industry and Commerce Minister, Honourable Gurney Evans, said this concerted effort is being made to ferret out opportunities for development in these selected communities." and I suppose. . .

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Would my honourable friend give me the date of that press release?

MR. SHOEMAKER: February 26, 1965.

MR. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. SHOEMAKER: There's two of them. As a matter of fact -- no, there's just two that I have with me - February 26, 1965.

"The answers to the questionnaires, when they are returned" - and no doubt most of them have returned in 14 months - well if they haven't been filled out and returned in 15 months they are in somebody's wastepaper basket long long ago. "The answers to the questionnaires will enable departmental planners and others to study the communities and to point out to local people lost or wasted opportunities that may exist. The remedy, if there is one, will be brought to the attention of those most vitally concerned, the local Chambers or other booster groups to take action. The questionnaires will not solve community problems, Mr. Evans said, but will be used for the basis of studies to determine where opportunities for development do exist. Remedial action will be up to local initiative" -- not up to my honourable friend but up to local

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)... initiative, and they could use him as a springboard, I think one of them says. And then it says, "Questionnaires are being mailed out to managers of service businesses, to professional men and to a selected percentage of the consumer public." Well surely, Madam Speaker, it is not unfair to ask if that survey has been made and to let us have the results of this.

Now another thing that has prompted me to speak on this occasion is this, the Third Annual Report that we received the other day from the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board. It was termed by most of the daily papers as a shocking report, and on Page 5 of that report, it says in fact that Winnipeg is a depressed area.

Now, Madam Speaker, the resolution requests that the entire province be declared one - you can call it a depressed area if you like - or one that certainly needs some incentives to bring the growth in Manitoba up to the national average. That's actually what it says, and my honourable friends for some reason or other do not like to admit that the entire province is in fact a depressed area, but when every member up to this point that has spoken has said that in fact his own area was not keeping pace with the rest of Canada; when the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board's Third Annual Report says that Winnipeg is in fact a depressed area; then Dr. Menzies in the report that we dealt with at some length when we were dealing with Agricultural estimates, points up in very shocking terms the depressed condition of agriculture, and says on Page 6, "Approximately 50 percent of the farmers in the study area, if provided with suitable alternative employment and the training required for it, could leave the agricultural industry to the benefit of themselves and the net gain to the remaining farm community and the national economy. That's what he says.

Now I'm not saying that I agree with it and I'm certain my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture, when I gave him a lecture the other day, got up and said his name was George Hutton. That didn't answer my question, but if Winnipeg which has a population in excess of - that is Greater Winnipeg - in excess of 50 percent of the population of Manitoba and all of the farm community is in a depressed area, and the Honourable Member for Portage says his area is a depressed area, I'm saying mine is a depressed area, well maybe we should have worded the resolution to read something like this: That it should include all areas that are not -- that is exclude all areas that are really in the chips. So I would like my honourable friend to get up and point out to us, whoever intends to speak on this, to point out what areas of the province do not need or would not benefit from the assistance and the incentives that are offered by the Federal Government program.

Now my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce would probably like to have the date of this document as well, and it is the Volume 17, No. 4, Manitoba Industry and Commerce Bulletin dated July/August, 1965, and it points up the incentives to industry under the Area Development Program. I don't know why, Madam Speaker, but I only tore off the first page of it and these documents are generally about ten pages - consist of about ten pages.

The incentives under the program offered by the Federal Government are quite extensive. It says, "Outright grants will be made to manufacturing and processing enterprises establishing or expanding in their areas between July 1, 1965, and March 31, 1971, and if a suitable rate of economic growth has been achieved, an area may be removed from the designated list and the incentives would then cease to apply. In any event, the list will probably be reviewed in the light of circumstances that are existing in 1967. The investment costs to which the grants will apply are new buildings; equipment and machinery; and company expenditures for facilities such as water supply, sewage disposal, electrical power, wharfs and docks, where these are company-owned. Contributions to the cost of publicly-owned facilities of a similar kind may also qualify. The amounts of such grants are as follows: 33 1/3 percent on the first quarter of a million dollars; 25 percent on the next 3/4 million; and 20 percent on investments about one million dollars." These seem to me to be very substantial grants and certainly are incentives to industry as my honourable friend has pointed up in this release of last July and August.

Now perhaps my honourable friend will say, well what am I beefing about, Neepawa is presently in - presently in the designated area - and the map that I have before me would indicate that although the lines are not too clear here, but it would look like that the only area in the province actually that is excluded is that area north of Cranberry Portage, and Greater Winnipeg, Stonewall, Carman, Morris, Morden, Gretna, Emerson, and Steinbach is right on the edge. Transcona is out, so there's just a little pocket there of course, but it covers about three-quarters of the population of the province that is excluded.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.)

Now the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural -- No, the Honourable -- Yes, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, he isn't in his seat at the moment. -- (Interjection) -- Is he over there? Well, Madam Speaker, you will recall the other night that he thought that I had said that the Liberals would have to run like mad to stand still, and he and I didn't have a foot race or anything like that, but it was my honourable friend the First Minister that made that statement and I have repeated it a half a dozen times since that. That was the origin of that statement, and if he wants the date of this one I will give him this one as well.

The Free Press, February 9, 1965, there is an article says, 'Manitoba Runs for Jobs -- Roblin.' Roblin is the man that is the author of that, and it wasn't the Liberal Party that had to run like mad, it's the Province of Manitoba that's got to run like mad to keep pace with the rest of Canada. It was the Honourable the First Minister that said it, and if you want to go into the Library and look it up for yourselves, that's the date of the publication and the author is the First Minister of this province. That's the author. 'Our gains in the last few years', Mr. Roblin says, 'have been distressingly small.' Mr. Roblin said that only in 1964 have we shown any advance at all. 'Our problem has been to run like mad to stay in the same place.' 'I'm not the author of that, my honourable friend the First Minister is the author of that. But even he recognizes that - he doesn't exclude any of Manitoba here - even he recognizes that Manitoba is lagging behind the national average.

So, Madam Speaker, I don't know what we have to do to this resolution or what else we must say in order to get my honourable friends opposite to vote with us, or at least agree with us, but perhaps we will now be treated to a lecture from my honourable friends opposite and they will now proceed to tell us what they are going to do, not only for Neepawa but for all of those depressed areas in the Province of Manitoba, and which in fact includes all of Manitoba according to the Third Annual Report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments in reference to the advisability of making all of Manitoba a designated area. Madam Speaker, we heard much about the announcement of the development of the W and W in Northern Manitoba, which is wood and water apparently, and it is interesting to note, Madam Speaker, that this government does not hesitate to draw attention and place a great deal of emphasis on the fact that some \$5 million for this project will come under the terms of the designated area.

Now, Madam Speaker, there is nothing more convincing than if this applies and if this is so necessary to the establishment of an industry in Northern Manitoba, it is equally as true and that much more applicable to the southern part of Manitoba. I think that the people in the Greater Winnipeg area, and the surrounding area that are now not within the designated area, are being treated most unfairly by the present government, because it does not cost this government a cent to request to have this area declared a designated area. Why is it, Madam Speaker, that in one instance it's such a necessary bonus to the establishment of new industry in one area of our province and not in another. I think that the government, if it classifies itself as being responsible, then I think that the responsibility of this leadership should not be pushed too far, because if you do, your luck will start to run out, and quite frankly it is this same government that has permitted this situation to get out of hand.

Madam Speaker, for the last eight years, from the beginning of the Throne Speech throughout the sitting of this House, and all that has been said in connection with Industry and Commerce has been with that expectancy of something new to come momentarily. Madam Speaker, we have been on this threshold of economic development for the last eight years. What will it take to move this government off the threshold of economic development. Are we going to be petrified and standing still at the daylight or the dawn of economic development? I think that we have heard too much of standing on the threshold of industrial development and nothing much is being done.

The rural industrial development program in this province of ours has been a dismal failure. There has been an inability on the part of this government to properly support local initiative, local talent, local businessmen who can do good for the Province of Manitoba. Instead, Madam Speaker, it seems that we have to have outsiders come into our province and extend to these outsiders conditions far in excess of that which we are prepared to give our own people in the Province of Manitoba, and I say most advisedly, Madam Speaker, that our pioneers in industrial development of this province have not been treated properly by this government.

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd.)

I have no quarrel with outside money coming into the province, Madam Speaker, I think it's an excellent idea, but when you look at some of these figures, Madam Speaker, and we seem to be dazzled by the remark that some \$500,000 are going to be deposited towards a capital subscription of a new industry to be established in the province, and when you look at the other side of the page and you see this same industry receiving a government grant in the amount of \$5 million, there is something radically wrong. The First Minister can, together with the Minister of Industry and Commerce, both of them can clothe themselves in all the white cloaks of innocence that they want, but I again make the statement that at the next election the taxpayers of Manitoba will make this decision, and it's the proper decision to be made because it has been an unfair decision which this government has made in terms of discriminating against the local pioneer development of industry in Manitoba, and I'll have more to say on it under Industry and Commerce and I'll bring out the facts.

The First Minister said yesterday that there was a ray of sunshine coming into his thinking on job training. Madam Speaker, we need a flood of sunshine; a ray is not enough. We have had some rays coming through for the last eight years - eight years on the threshold of economic development; eight years on the threshold of rural industrial development; and study after study with nothing definitely accomplished.

Madam Speaker, you can describe a day by saying it's a wonderful day, or you can describe it by saying that it's a wonderful, beautiful, delightful day, but the fact of the matter is that it is still a day and it's a nice day. Now this government seems to elect to go into all sorts of adverbs and adjectives and that's about where it ends. I think that the entire area of Manitoba should be classed as a designated area and I think that the Manitoba Development Fund, its responsibility should be extended, not to act as a bank alone, and I've said this for the past three years, and now we're getting some action that it is going to be extended in that direction.

But, Madam Speaker, I did not mean to have it extended in the direction to discriminate against local pioneering industrialists in this province. We have many very ambitious and very capable businessmen in the various rural parts of Manitoba who have been neglected, who have in some instances had their backs broken by the Manitoba Development Fund, and this is a most unfair situation. If it is the function of this body to develop new industry and if there is a loss of one or five or eight percent, it is a small amount to pay for the industrial development of rural Manitoba.

We hear much in reference to electricity and all the excess electricity we will be producing in the Province of Manitoba at a reasonable rate, and we have some question about our ability to export this electricity. We're talking about exporting it into Toronto, into the United States, and it is questionable whether we can because of the existing mill rate in these areas.

Now, Madam Speaker, the approach in the use of electricity in the winning of metals and ores is unlimited. There has been a great deal of studying done in the province in reference to a smelter, in reference to the electroplating of primary metals. Now surely we can lower the rate - our electrical rate - and balance it off with new industries that will contribute tax dollars to the Province of Manitoba, and then the secondary industries will follow shortly behind.

Madam Speaker, our designated area means that you are working, you're getting a one dollar value with an investment of 75 cents out of our own pocket, because the Federal Government gives us an outside grant and an outright grant of 25 cents on every dollar; or if you so desire, you can have a tax exempt period of three years, and this may work far more to one's advantage than the 25 cents per dollar outright grant.

Now, Madam Speaker, I have yet to find any man who is in business that will deny the fact that it is not to his advantage to take this 25 cent grant and develop industry in the designated area. This is being done from the Atlantic in the Province of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick right into the Province of British Columbia. I can show you letters that come in from each one of these provinces asking and extending conditions to industries to locate in these designated areas. How can we in Manitoba develop industry in an area such as we have in Winnipeg, and surrounding Winnipeg, when we haven't got the advantage that the other designated areas in Canada have. And is it not only reasonable, Madam Speaker, that this government should request and should press the Federal Government to declare the entire province as being a designated area?

We can go into the electrical smelting and refining of ores; we can then develop the

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd.) . . . . production of special ingots of special steels that we can export to the world markets with very little competition, because we possess one of the largest deposits of nickel in the world. This in turn would develop a refractory industry that would run into the hundreds of millions of dollars per year, and we have these deposits of refractory material that can be developed, and can only be developed if we have the demand for it in the electrical smelting industry.

Madam Speaker, this would also call in unlimited amounts of carbon production for electrodes in connection with the electrical smelting industry. You can go on and on in these things, and what amazes me is that we have such a forward, progressive, conservative program in connection with our rural industrial development, but it seems that once it gets beyond the stage of the newspapers, the radio, and putting out a publicity sheet, that at that point it's dead. There's nobody that is interested, or maybe they don't want to, but it seems that there's a lack of interest to put the thing into its final form and make it a reality. To develop business is like anything else. It has many pitfalls, and at times determination and hard work will overcome it and will result in success.

For this reason, Madam Speaker, I would strongly advise the present government that they have nothing to lose; it won't cost them any money to approach the Federal Government and urge that they declare all of Manitoba as a designated area. From the standpoint of transportation alone, an industry cannot locate north of the designated area as it's shown today because you have a transportation cost into the City of Winnipeg. But our City of Winnipeg does play an important function as a distributing centre for Western Canada, Northern Manitoba and into the southern parts of the United States, and this would be of tremendous benefit to the industrial development of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, could we have this matter stand. If anyone else wishes to speak, we have no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I adjourned this debate the other day because it seemed obvious to me that this matter was not receiving the consideration that it should because we had only one contribution as I recall it from a member, other than the Member for Elmwood who introduced the resolution, make any contribution to the debate, and that was the Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre. I realize, Madam Speaker, as I am here today discussing this resolution, that there's not only a lack of interest in this resolution but a general lack of interest in all of the proceedings of the House until now.

I do wish, Madam Speaker, that rather than having the male member of humanity here, the members of this Assembly, that I had their wives so I could talk to them, because I'm sure, Madam Speaker, that the wives would be far more concerned over the basic concept of this resolution than are their husbands, because it is generally speaking the women who have the problems of purchasing goods and services that we require for our everyday living. So, Madam Speaker, while it is true, I think, that the male is not particularly interested in the question of setting up a Department of Consumer Affairs in order to give information in respect of consumer purchasing, I feel that I must re-emphasize the position of the New Democratic Party in this important field, and I would say, Madam Speaker, that if the New Democratic Party were to form the government as a result of the next provincial election, a Department of Consumer Affairs most assuredly would be set up post haste.

The other day I was chastized by the First Minister because I supported the Honourable Member for Lakeside in another debate in regard to the setting up of another department of government. My objection there, Madam Speaker, was because we already had the field covered in other departments, but not so is the case insofar as consumer protection is concerned. While speaking on this resolution or a similar resolution a couple of years ago, Madam Speaker,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . I drew to the attention of the House that a number of states in the United States of America had set up inside of their Attorneys-General department a person responsible so far as consumer protection was concerned, a person to whom complaints could be made and investigations carried out. But as I said a couple of years ago, Madam Speaker, this was only being done so far as I am aware in the Western Hemisphere in the United States of America.

I was informed yesterday that some of the Canadian bodies are now considering this matter of such importance that they are passing legislation setting up a Department of Consumer Affairs, and in the present session of Nova Scotia a resolution has been passed setting up a Department of Consumer Affairs. This is the breakthrough for Canada. In Ontario, a committee sat for some considerable period of time to consider all aspects of consumer credit and consumer protection, and in their recommendations to the government, Madam Speaker, they suggest that there be set up a Department of Consumer Affairs in the Province of Ontario.

Lest anyone have the idea that this would be an onerous burden on our presently overburdened government, let me hasten to assure them that I have an ombudsman already picked out - an ombudsman in the field of consumer affairs - a gentleman, Madam Speaker, who I think would be more than capable of fulfilling this task, and I refer to the Honourable the Minister Without Portfolio. I think this would be an admirable job for the honourable member to undertake. It would relieve the Attorney-General, as some of them have to do - Attorneys-General in other places have this under their ambit. I would say that the Honourable the Minister Without Portfolio has the qualifications, has the intellect, and I am sure would perform the tasks very very capably.

Madam Speaker, today the consumer in Canada faces vast problems as she or he goes about making purchases. Restrictive trade practices by producers; hundreds of millions of dollars spent on advertising which is more confusing than enlightening; fancy packages which effectively hide the nature of the goods they enclose; all make buying today more difficult than ever. The production of most commodities is dominated by a few large corporations and the complex plant and machinery of which corporations are able to exert tremendous influence on the market.

And may I just by illustration, Madam Speaker, ask the House to consider the matter of soap flakes. Procter and Gamble, I think, have on the market half a dozen or more different brands of soap flakes, each being advertised at considerable expense which the consumer eventually has to pay for the product. -- (Interjection) -- Yet, my colleague from Elmwood reminds me, that each of the various types of soap flakes is better than the other one. And as my honourable friend the Member for Brandon has just interjected, Madam Speaker, that it pays to advertise. Pays who? It certainly doesn't pay the housewife. She has to pay through the nose. She is the one who suffers as a result.

Extensive use of advertising and public relations techniques have enabled producers to effectively differentiate their product from that of their few competitors. The application of modern psychology to advertising has tended to make producers depend not on the intrinsic values of their product but rather, Madam Speaker, on the skill of advertising specialists to present a favourable impression of their goods. Goods are not sold by their high quality or their low price but rather by how well their image appeals to the consumer. Wasn't it necessary just recently, Madam Speaker, for the federal authority in respect of bacon to change the method and type of packaging for bacon? The Federal Government took action as the result of the activities of the Consumer Association of Canada and there is many fields yet untouched, for modern advertising appeals more to the emotions than to the intellect.

What about the question of consumer goods in the field of safety and of health? Every now and again, Madam Speaker, we hear of a necessity of taking off of the market certain drugs because of the fact that they have been proven to be injurious or harmful to people. We really yet have not got into the field, Madam Speaker, of investigating other commodities which may be harmful to consumers, glasses for instance, Madam Speaker. Time after time we are reminded by the optical people that there are glasses on the market that are harmful, particularly to the children if they wear them, particularly sun glasses, that they will not screen out the harmful rays for which they are advertised.

Madam Speaker, anybody can be misled by the advertising in this field alone. Now wouldn't it be beneficial if there were a section of government who were conducting research, even at the provincial level, into the various types of sunglasses and eyeglasses and point out harmful effects that might result by the use of, as I illustrate, sunglasses. A safety code for

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . all consumer goods should be drawn up and enacted into law, to which all manufactured goods would conform.

I appreciate, Madam Speaker, and I realize that I'm speaking here in the Provincial Legislative Assembly, that many of the problems that the consumers face are under the control of the federal authority, but, Madam Speaker, until such time as the matter is approached at the federal level in all fields of consumer buying, it would be well, I think, for us here in Manitoba to at least have somebody to guide the consumer. I know for a while that many here may turn around and say, well gosh, you can't legislate - you can't lead the gullible. But, Madam Speaker, you can inform them, and this is the purpose which we have in suggesting support for this resolution.

In the field of textiles, Madam Speaker, vast progress has been made in the manufacture of yard goods. Today, Madam Speaker, it's very hard for anyone, even an expert in the field, to tell the difference between some of the synthetic materials and some of the natural materials that are in woven goods. A Department of Consumer Affairs, Madam Speaker, could conduct an educational program in order that the housewife and the purchaser would be able to differentiate between the various yard goods and fabrics that are in use today.

What about eggs and meat? We have today a system of grading of eggs. You walk into a store and you pick up a dozen eggs - they may be "A", they may be "B" or "C"; the "large", "extra large", "medium" - and to the average person, Madam Speaker, this means nothing. I suggest that it would be no hardship on merchants to have a sign indicating to the purchaser what was meant by "Grade A" or "Grade B" and so on in respect of eggs.

What about the question of canned goods - canned fruits and vegetables. The names are used here - fancy, choice, high quality - but really what does it mean? It doesn't really mean too much to the consumer in the purchasing because there is no uniformity in the grading of these commodities. There should be established a uniform system of grades either by letter or number which could be applied to all commodities. It is also essential that the grades of merchandise should be clearly marked so that people can differentiate between various types of the same, or almost same, goods.

And then, Madam Speaker, the very important field of packaging and labelling. There's many complaints arise from time to time because of the fact that the packages are large but the contents are small; the weight may be different in the same size container; the sizes in which goods are packaged are not in convenient amounts, particularly for comparing prices; and the labels quite frequently give incomplete information. Some producers deliberately use too large a packet to make a consumer think he is getting more than is actually in the package.

There are many instances, Madam Speaker, that I could draw to the attention of the House as to a service that could be rendered to the consumer, and particularly the buyer of goods, by way of information. It is said probably that we do have an organization called the Better Business Bureau; it is said that they do good work. I partially agree with this, and I say partially, Madam Speaker, because of the fact that while they can receive the complaint, they can't do anything about it. The job is only being half done.

I appreciate the fact that one of the committees that sat on consumer credit recommended that the Better Business Bureau and one or two other organizations should band themselves together, be subsidized by the government, in order to carry on an educational program on behalf of the consumers of the province. I say to the government, this is a proper place for government, who have the facilities, to enter into this field. Where better? Where better place would there be than our university to have the various materials analyzed and checked so that proper information could be forwarded to the consumer. The government is the logical agency for this, Madam Speaker, and I think that it is long overdue that the government, be it local or be it provincial or federal, is long overdue that they haven't recognized the need for greater protection and information to the purchasing public.

I'm not going to dwell with the matter of the gimmick - my friend from Brandon mentioned free towels, free this, free that, free trading stamps. Oh, Madam Speaker, free trading stamps, free dinosaur tickets - my goodness gracious - it's all free isn't it, Madam Speaker? -- (Interjection) -- Yeah, even the tiger in Tide is one of the gimmicks today, and when that gimmick, Madam Speaker - the tiger in Tide - has lost its effectiveness after having cost the consumer millions of dollars in advertising, they'll bring out the Jig in Jigger or some other catch phrase in order to confuse the consumer at higher costs than are necessary for their products.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)

I say, Madam Speaker, despite the laughter that I'm receiving from the right from the Liberal Party who apparently are not a bit interested in consumer protection because this resolution was going to be voted on the other day without any contribution at all by the Liberal Party, I can understand their laughter. I wonder whether it will be accepted though by the public of Manitoba who are being fleeced every hour of the day by gimmicks, free tokens, high-priced advertising, without any protection for the consumer.

So I say, Madam Speaker, this is a matter that should receive the attention of government. It has in other jurisdictions already. It is now going to be done, a department set up as I mentioned earlier in Nova Scotia; it's been recommended to Ontario; and I suggest Manitoba should not be last in this field as they have been in so many others before.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wish to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

. . . . . continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Carillon. The Honourable the Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, this resolution has been discussed fairly thoroughly. I do not intend to repeat too much of what has been said. However, I thought I would add my contribution because to me this is an important resolution and until last week, or was it the week before, I don't think we had heard too much from the Government side at that time that we were given some of the costs involved in this method of remitting. However, I cannot find out as far as I am concerned, exactly how much the cost is, because from the figures that were given to us, they apparently range from \$40,000 to \$100,000. This is certainly a factor because we are talking of giving back \$8 million and the cost of giving it back is certainly borne by the taxpayer.

However, to me one of the most important aspects of this method is the fact that the taxpayer first has to pay the amount and then wait til he gets it back and no matter if it's only \$50 to a lot of people, digging up \$50 to pay it out for a certain time is certainly inconvenient to them. As far as I am concerned, and I said this when we voted this Legislation at the Special Session in '64, I was not of the opinion that this was the right attitude for any government to tax more in order to give back part of it. This is not the discussion now I understand but it is still part of it, the fact that government giving back money to people, by taxing them more to give them back part of it, to me is not the right attitude for any government to take. However, this is what is going on now and the discussion is the form of remitting it, and as far as I am concerned it would be beneficial to the taxpayers to have it deducted at the municipal level. I am sure it would not cost as much as it does now, and I'm also convinced that it would accommodate a lot of people who have to dig out this particular amount so that they can get it back a little later and I certainly support this resolution.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker if nobody else wishes to speak I intend to close the debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member is closing the debate.

MR. BARKMAN: Madam Speaker, first of all I want to thank all the members who took part in this debate, and although it's possibly been a long time since it was introduced, I appreciate the fact that so many took part. I think it has been an exciting and possibly even an educational debate, even from another source than the money direct from the Education Department and I think it has been this to both sides of the House. I doubt however, if we have gained very much ground. In fact, I'm even a bit concerned if our discussions during the debate in this House have not possibly even lowered the confidence of the people of Manitoba in our so-called democratic discussion that we had on this debate, and certainly it must to a large percentage of municipal people, I believe they must feel pretty silly, with some of the statements that have been made in this House against them, really.

Well, Madam Speaker, I think perhaps, or possibly certain facts have been established during this debate, but I doubt that too many. As my colleague just mentioned that the figures of the cost of administration have been guessed at all the ways from \$40,000 to \$100,000. I think I would even go further than that and suggest that possibly we have talked of figures from \$40,000 to \$400,000 during this debate, although I doubt if any of us or any of the figures that have been mentioned other than possibly the Minister of Municipal Affairs figures, who mentioned approximately \$100,000, I doubt if the other figures are very factual.

If certain other costs could be or had been taken into consideration, such as computer costs or such as using some of the present employed help in this work directly, help that may not have been otherwise directly designated for this purpose and I'm sure that there are many other factors which are very hard to evaluate when we try to reach a cost of administration in this respect. In fact, if some of these factors were taken into consideration, I wonder what the total cost might really be.

My belief is still that municipalities would be glad to handle these rebates for the government. I think that most municipalities are very close to their taxpayers and I think this government knows that a large number of questions that have been posed to the clerks and the secretary-treasurers of our municipalities, have required a lot of correspondence between the department of municipal affairs and the municipalities. I'm sure a lot of this correspondence - not only has it been costly time-wise but also directly money-wise and I think it would have been to a great advantage - and I talk now in the past tense, I should still have hope that the other side will be voting for this resolution although the way I speak I guess it hardly indicates my thinking in that direction. However, I think we would have to admit that if rebates

(MR. BARKMAN, cont'd) . . . could be made right on the spot at the municipal level this would certainly be to an advantage.

The other point I wish to make or leave with this House is a simple fact, that it is just too time consuming. It simply just takes too long for these tax rebates to come back to the ones that are to receive them, regardless of what the Honourable Member for Brandon has said - and I hope what he has said will come true if this resolution should not pass - but at this time it certainly is not a fact. Just last week a party dropped in to my office, who had sent in for two rebates on two pieces of property at the end of December, still had not received his rebate. Well, why not then just give it to the taxpayer right there and then. I think this is the solution. Not only would the taxpayers of Manitoba save approximately - another angle that I don't think has been brought up during this debate - save approximately \$30,000 of interest, but many aged people who pay their taxes by the month or on a budget basis and this creates exactly I understand from the opposite side, the opposite of what this tax rebate is intended for. You may ask me how I arrive at this \$30,000 I figured in interest. I think it is quite clear and simple. If there is still approximately \$2 million not paid out, and if we take the total figure of \$10 million and take an average waiting period of roughly two months, I should say three months, leave alone six months as some have averaged, you figure that out at three percent - or six percent I should say - and you get a total of \$30,000.

Another point that has not been brought up in this debate is the fact that the total amounts the municipalities have paid out for procuring or getting the statement and demand tax forms. I understand they cost the municipalities 7-1/2¢ and taking the First Minister's figure of 450,000 applications, this is another roughly \$35,000 that we haven't even considered. So my guess is this, Madam Speaker, the total cost for administration in this respect would be very very much closer to \$200,000, or even more; but apparently we will have to keep on guessing and we could take a number of things into consideration, taking the Minister's figure for example of \$100,000 plus the fact of a loss of \$35,000 concerning the interest . . . for the cost of obtaining these rebate forms to the municipalities and leave alone the fact that somebody mentioned another 20,000 for stamps, and I'm sure there's a lot of money been exchanged for correspondence and I'm sure many other things could be mentioned. This plus all the ill-will that is being created to the municipalities and to the people of Manitoba, I think is sufficient reason for all of us to vote for this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. BARKMAN: Yeas and nays, please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Carillon.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 17; Nays, 29.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks, and the proposed amendment by the Honourable the Minister of Health. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate for my colleague from St. John's.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, first I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Carillon for bringing his resolution to a vote. For the moment I have a captive audience, but of course as you see, it is starting to dissipate even as I am saying these words. Just earlier this afternoon I counted one Cabinet Minister and fifteen government members in their seats, and then I don't know whether the situation deteriorated or improved because I found three Cabinet Ministers and nine members in their seats.

MADAM SPEAKER: I just do not understand why we should take a count of the House when we are discussing the amendment before us.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, Madam Speaker, I am sorry, I was not counting the House now; I was reporting what I had observed earlier and I was going to express . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: I disagree with the honourable member that he is not speaking on the proposed amendment. I'd like him to restrict his statements to the amendment, please.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Madam Speaker, I wanted to say only that I was happy that the Honourable Minister of Health was here because he was the one who spoke last on this matter and I was glad that I had the opportunity to address him as well as other members of the House on, what I think is a very important question, and what I assume the government thinks is an important question because the government and the Honourable Minister for Health purported to deal with this question.

Now when we first heard the Speech from the Throne we remembered the fact that our party has been bringing forth resolutions of this type for a number of years and included this type of program in its platform for many years. And although we are accustomed to seeing proposals that we make become law gradually and be adopted by the various parties, we were of course waiting to see what would happen with this health resolution; and we saw in the Speech from the Throne, a direct reference which reads that negotiations are under way with the Federal Government and with others respecting Manitoba's participation in the program of medical services insurance; and he stated: "My Ministers will inform the House in respect of these matters and the policy that my government is pursuing." So we sat back and we waited for the report from the Ministers as to the policy the government is pursuing, and some time later the Honourable Minister for Health in introducing his estimates, mentioned that there was a plan proposed by the Federal Government setting up four principles and that the government, which doesn't quite agree with those four principles, is planning to fall in with the proposals, hopefully, by making certain changes in it.

Well I think anybody reviewing what was said by the Honourable Minister will realize that he really said nothing about the plan or the program which the government planned to adopt. Absolutely nothing, Madam Speaker. That is why, I assume, there was no problem really about bringing this resolution before the House to discuss it, because this resolution had concrete words and specific recommendations, and they said, in effect, we want a plan of comprehensive, universal health insurance, preferably national; if not, jointly federal-provincial; and if not, then provincial. After the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks spoke at some length about the need the Honourable Minister of Health adjourned debate, and we thought, well this is good, he is now going to tell us what he didn't tell us when he spoke on his estimates; and he will now reveal what is the program considered and about to be proposed by the government. But he almost added insult to injury, because when he spoke on this resolution in debate he said that his comments would be brief. And he was right. He was right. Because he said that the resolution made the three suggestions that I've just recounted, and now in effect he said, there having been an announcement made in his estimates that a program of medical health insurance was being proposed, he feels it necessary to amend this resolution to review what is being done, quote: "Which in effect is similar to that that was suggested by the honourable member as his second proposal." But when the Honourable Minister spoke he called it a medical health insurance, but when he quoted the resolution it spoke of a universal comprehensive health insurance. And I like to think that the Honourable Minister knows the difference. I like to think that the Honourable Minister does appreciate that there is a difference. But I am not really sure, because going back to the statement that he made on his estimates where he introduced this program, he made certain expressions which, as I say, didn't mean much but still he said something. He said that the province would prefer a plan which depends on voluntary enrollment. That's pretty clear. That means to me that this government does not believe in universal coverage, because the moment it accepts the principle of a voluntary plan then it means that the individual exercises his responsibility -- I am now quoting the Minister -- "Exercises his responsibility to maintain his own health and that of his family." Then it is no longer a universal coverage. Now he may say, "Well, we meant it would be offered universally." Well we have that now. We have complete coverage offered to all people, universally offered to all people; but it isn't universal coverage as long as it is voluntary.

And if one goes back to what the Honourable Minister said in his statement, just the page opposite from the item I quoted, he spoke about the full development of the human resources of Manitoba as being a main aim of policy. He spoke about education being a first priority, and he said, and these words sound good, "The preservation of the health of the population is also of prime concern to society for the seeds of education only attain full fruition in a healthy people." That's very well put, Madam Speaker. Need I remind the Honourable Minister of Health that our policy in education, which needs healthy people to attain full fruition, is one which is

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . compulsory; is one which is universal; is one to which every-one contributes and from which everyone derives benefit.

Education has been accepted by this province as a responsibility of the people and of the state, and just as it is necessary to provide healthy people to permit the seeds of education to attain full fruition, so should it be the responsibility of this government to make sure that it is providing a comprehensive universal health plan -- and I'm not talking about medical health insurance as he referred to it. He said, We believe in a voluntary plan and that it can be formulated at a cost within the reach of the majority of our people. For those who could not meet the cost public assistance will be provided. But a voluntary plan therefore must mean one in his mind, as I have said, one that would be universally available and this I think is a confusion in the mind of the public, because they must realize that universally available is not a universal coverage and possibly it's because he's afraid of the use "compulsion". But if there are going to be only part of the people involved, not all the people involved, but nearly all the people involved, then how much is "nearly".

We are told that the government in the first year, the Federal Government, expects 95 percent coverage and in the next year, 100 percent coverage. Well now, the government I'm guessing is planning to work out a deal whereby they could water it down to a lesser coverage and I did not see this figure anywhere but I have heard it said that the Minister has used the figure of 85 percent coverage. Now I may be wrong and maybe it wasn't said in this House, but somewhere or other I understand that he suggested 85 percent coverage might be bargained out with the Federal Government as being satisfactory. He's shaking his head, so I may have been misinformed. Maybe he said less, I'm not sure. But whatever he said, he clearly felt that it being voluntary there would have to be a deal made of less than 100 percent coverage.

Now assuming he makes this deal, that he wants to make, what happens if the coverage drops to below the percentage point? Does the government then drop its scheme; does the government attempt to renegotiate; does the government then take over the full cost - I don't know. Certainly this is something that would have been good to have heard answered, had the Minister given us the credit of telling us what he had in mind, which as I say he did not do.

I would like to point out that the argument for universal coverage is simply that by making a bulk purchase, that is for all health services, and by averaging out the cost of this bulk service by all age risks and all health risks, then each individual will over his lifetime be able to pay the lowest possible cost for the maximum coverage. If you have a voluntary subsidized plan such as the Minister apparently envisions then he is talking about the fact that people will opt out. Now we can be reasonably sure that people who voluntarily decide not to participate in the plan are the people who would be low risk people and they would say to themselves, well I don't think that this next year my medical and health costs for my family will be as great as my contribution, my premium; therefore they'll say, well I'm better off not to make the payment and I'll save the money, because I don't expect to require the need. So these would be low risk people. Which means then that this plan will be weighted, this voluntary plan would be weighted on the high risk side so that the per capita costs are necessarily higher than under a universal plan, which would average out these costs amongst all the groups, including the low risk group; and since it would be as envisioned in our resolution it would be one that would cover all people and to which all people will contribute no matter what their age or health conditions are.

Then the Minister says, consequently - and I'm not sure, just what it's in consequence to, because as I suggest he didn't say anything before that, except that they would like it to be voluntary - he says discussions have already been initiated with the Medical Association. I'm sorry he didn't let us in on those discussions so that we can't help him in his problems and in his program, so that we can't comment on the deal which may well be a fait accompli by the time we hear about it later. But in any event he said that there is an attempt to devise a means for establishing medical health services with the greatest benefit to the people, while at the same time respecting the rights and the position of the medical profession. Well that's fine, I think one should do that. I think one has to respect the rights and position of all members of society. But is it something that this Minister feels gives to the medical profession a special interest? To the extent that the medical profession may have a special interest or a vested interest in this then I would suggest that they are the people who are trained and qualified and equipped and able to supply a health service to the people of Manitoba and the people whom they supply are the consumers of that service and this government represents the people; and to the extent that it is necessary to protect the interests of the medical profession, it is equally

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . necessary to protect the interests of the people that this government represents. And it may well reach the stage - and I should warn the Minister, if he's not aware of it - that he may yet have to bargain with the medical profession, across the table, and discuss just what services will be offered and what the cost will be and how it will be financed. He may have to do it as indeed every government has to do it when they institute this type of a program.

Well I don't even know just what he means by the rights and position, the rights of the medical profession. I'm not clear that I understand what he means. The medical profession have certain principles that they set out. One is the question of the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship. Well that's something that has to be considered. I'm not sure whether the doctor must be so insistent on this sanctity as the patient must be. It seems to me the patient should have the same insistence on the protection of the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship. You don't really hear much about the patients insisting on it; I suppose they rely on the doctors doing it. But there are insurance reports that are made, there are various reports that are made in hospitals which sometime interfere with the sanctity of this relationship; but surely that's not one that would be attacked by this kind of a scheme.

The doctors speak of the importance of freedom of choice on the part of the patient in selecting his physician. I don't think there is any problem with that, because the fact is that almost anywhere that I know of - I would say nowhere is there interference with the freedom of choice of the patient, not in Europe, not in America. Maybe in Russia there is, but I can't speak with any knowledge about what goes on there. There I think there is not that freedom of choice. But throughout the democratic countries where there are schemes of this type, there is freedom of choice; except of course in those areas where you find one doctor in a town or in a larger area than a town and then of course there is no freedom of choice, except travel. So then we must recognize that there are many occasions when there is not freedom of choice; but yet the principle that is there is one that one should respect.

The other thing that some doctors speak of is that they want the right to operate outside the plan, something I have yet to learn, something I don't quite understand and possibly the Minister could have given us some clarification on problems such as this, I'm not aware of anybody, anywhere, any doctor that operates outside the plan, because if you use a patient or a private plan to act as a post office between government and the doctor so that the doctor doesn't bill the government, or the government commission direct, but rather through the patient, the doctor is still getting paid out of the plan and he is not outside the plan because he is still practicing within the plan as long as he gets paid from the plan, no matter through what means or what post office.

The only way a doctor could work outside the plan would be a doctor who does not in any way bill the government or submit his bill to the patient in such a manner that the patient can collect from the government. I don't think this applies in Saskatchewan. I don't think it applies anywhere where doctors say I will so organize my financial arrangement with my patient whereby I will not, nor will the patient be reimbursed for, any of the monies payable to me for my bill. There of course is going to be a problem when the Minister faces up to the physician, if he does indeed face up to them, on the question of setting of fees. This is something that many doctors say they want the exclusive right to do. Of course I understand they have a tariff today where fees are set for the individual doctors by the association. I believe the Manitoba Medical Service does indeed set fees for doctors; permits them to bill in excess of those - but this is very seldom done - and the danger of permitting these additional bills I think creates a discrepancy in the minds of the patients as to what service they are paying for when there is a difference in the fees that they may have to pay.

Now one of the important things I would like to touch on is the insistence that the physician wishes to be free to exercise his own judgment. This is a very important and a very complicated issue on which I do not wish to dwell. I would only say this, that if there is going to be any control of the costs then there has to be control over the expenses and the expenses are based on a number of factors, but certainly the cost of the service is influenced by the service given by the physician. Now I don't believe that there is any plan, profit or non-profit which does not have some method of analyzing what the costs should be. I think it was made clear a year or two ago that the Manitoba Medical Service does indeed run certain profiles on doctors' services to ascertain whether the services they offer are comparable with the average of services offered for similar types of practice to similar types of patients. So I'm not sure just what it means but if the Minister thinks that this is going to be something that is just going to

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . happen, he is wrong, and therefore I feel that in view of what little he has told us in this light, that either he has not reached the stage of really grappling with the problem or he has grappled with the problem and doesn't know what to do, because indeed we still don't know what the plan is. We are not even sure just how this would work in relation to the Federal qualifications, the four principles which were enunciated by the Honourable Minister. If he were to conform to the plan the scope of benefits would have to be clarified; the plan should offer all services provided by physicians both general practitioner and specialist. Now does the Minister know what that means exactly? Does he agree with me that this seems to discuss only medical bills and not health services, such as mentioned in our plan. Does he not realize that when he assumed that his amendment just confirmed what we have said in our resolution, that we talked about health services, not medical services insurance; and does he visualize that health services includes paramedical facilities, and if he agrees that health services does, does he visualize that the scope of the benefit for all services provided by physicians does that include paramedical services? Does it include lab and X Ray technicians; does it include physiotherapy; does it include a psychiatrist's services? Should we not have this spelled out. Because we must realize that in order to understand what comprehensive means then we must know what is included in this prepaid medical coverage and I would very much like to know just how it is that the Minister would spell it out.

What about Health Services which is what we were talking about, drugs, prosthetics, physical aids, equipment involved in it, eyeglasses, physiotherapy, I mentioned - are these part of what is needed; because if you are going to look after the health needs of the people, you cannot limit yourself to medical, to payment for physician's services.

Now let me touch for a moment on universal coverage, because it is another principle of the Federal Government's proposal. There must be universal coverage, which means I suppose that every person in the population has the right to receive the benefits provided by the plan and that the services would be paid in some way. Now if there is this scheme then we must find out again what I ask - universal coverage or universal availability; and if it's availability, to what extent and what percentage would satisfy both this government and the Federal Government.

The next principle is public administration: a universal plan with federal contributions must be a plan for which the Provincial Government takes full responsibility. What does that mean? Who plans what will be offered? Who will be responsible for deciding the full gamut of policy formulation? Who will decide on coverage, benefits, costs and financing? Is it going to be the responsibility of the Provincial Government? And if so, will it be the same as that offered in the other provinces; the same as is offered in Saskatchewan; the same as is in Ontario; the same as in Alberta? It would be pretty important, because if there isn't national agreement, then surely the final principle, transferability of benefit, will fail because a person who is a member - who is a resident of Manitoba and who moves mid-year to Saskatchewan, if the coverage - the benefits are not the same, then there won't be a complete transferability. If on the other hand, it is planned that this government will pay its cost for services provided to residents who move outside of the province, then there will be again a discrepancy between what is offered in that province and what this government is prepared to pay.

Now we have not been given the benefit of knowing just how the government plans to finance this cost. There are, of course, different ways: there are premiums; there are full premiums to pay the full cost; there are subsidized premiums coming out of general revenue; there might be premiums coming out of income tax -- I mean coverage coming out of income tax. We have no idea. But to the extent that the governments pay money out of income tax, and especially the Federal Government is clearly paying for this out of income tax, to that extent it no longer becomes voluntary; because to that extent every person who pay taxes is contributing to the scheme, whether he accepts it or not -- and I suppose this would be a selling point to the Honourable Minister when he goes out to sell a voluntary scheme, to say to somebody, "You don't have to join if you don't want to. This is completely voluntary. It's up to you, but, you might as well because you're paying for it anyway. You are paying for it anyway, because to the extent the Federal Government contributes, and to the extent the Provincial Government may contribute, you voluntary persons are still paying for the cost." Of course there may be a premium added which may therefore mean that he is paying part of the cost, not all of the cost. Of course the richer he is, the more he is paying to it.

Now I have touched on the fact that if the benefit package is not the same in the different provinces, there is no transferability and this transferability I think is pretty important. As a matter of fact there are many time waiting periods - as I think we have in the Hospital

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . . Services plan - and therefore it may well be that if I move from Manitoba to Ontario I may lose the benefits on Manitoba when I leave the province; I may not acquire them in Ontario for some waiting period. This of course is a detail which I expect will be revealed to us at some time or other - probably not for quite some time.

I have raised these points. Some I don't expect that the Minister could have dealt with because they are more in detail. But some I feel he should have dealt with and he didn't. And to that extent, I am sorry that he didn't let us in to the information which he has, no doubt, as to what their thinking is on all these things. Instead of that, he has just made a statement. The Federal Government has set up four principles; we intend to work within those four principles, if we can't bargain out a better deal - because he made it clear that he wants to bargain out a better deal.

Now I want to move on and just take a few moments on again the fact that when we speak of health services, we do not in our minds limit ourselves to medical provision of physicians' bills, or indeed medical health services, because mental health services, as the Minister well knows, very well knows, is a very important aspect of the health needs of this province. Now we have heard that he has decided in his wisdom to delay bringing forward -- no, I shouldn't say that, Madam Speaker. It has been decided to the government's wisdom, that there will be delay in bringing forward discussion on the Report of the Committee on Dental Health Services. And I am suggesting to the Minister that since I don't expect him -- well he's made it clear he's not going to vote for our resolution in the sense that we have presented it, because he has amended it. Since therefore he is not going to be bound to undertake the responsibility of a proper comprehensive and universal health insurance scheme, that he better get busy and do something in the interval on this dental health field. I suggest to him that he should not leave that report filed in somewhere and let it lie, because that report aside from the question of the legalization of denturists, deals with all sorts of aspects of dental health which has to be done and has to be done quickly.

And that report includes matters such as expanded curriculum in the dental faculty, where paridental people will be trained to do many things which they are equipped to do, which they can do and which a dentist need not have to do because a lesser skilled person can do them. And I think that that ought to be done quickly, the discussions and the financing discussed and planned for expanding the facilities of the dental faculty in order to provide these trained paridental people who will be proper aides to the dentists in the formation of a proper dental team which will provide the full service on the principle, which I want to suggest has a great deal of merit, and that is that you should take the least trained person to do a job which he is qualified to do. In other words, you don't take a dentist with his training and put him to cleaning teeth, because it's a waste of his experience and ability to do a job which others who are less trained than he, can do as well. And therefore this field is one which I think the Minister has to undertake whether or not he accepts our proposal for a complete health insurance plan.

And I think that this Minister ought to get busy while he's talking to the doctors, to find some time talking to the dentists and discussing with them some concrete plans that would result from the acceptance and recommendations in that dental health report, which of course we are not now discussing. I think that this is something that he ought to do now because this is a challenge; this whole problem is a challenge both to the government and to the dental fraternity, to get busy and straighten out their problems; to provide proper dental health services to the people who need them. And if they're not willing to do it on a dental health insurance scheme - and I forecast that's the only way it can be done. But if they're not willing to do it, then by the time the Minister brings in his own report on the plans on - if I may call it medicare - and I shouldn't call it that, but the Federal Government's proposal - that he should be able then to assure us that although he is not bringing in a health insurance scheme, he has at least made certain efforts which are within his ability and his province; and that is, aside from the medical aspect, the dental aspect, of seeing to it that the dental profession recognizes its horrible public relations and gets busy in creating the atmosphere for a dental health team which would provide these services and make use of all the facilities, the chair-side assistant, the dental technician, the present illegal denturist, all these people who are in the field legally or otherwise, in the dental health field, to bring them in and make them part of the team where the dentist who is most highly skilled would still be able to provide these services.

So I urge him, if he will not accept our resolution - and apparently he won't - let him at least make these giant strides forward so that when we come to discuss the specifics - and who knows when that will be - we will at least be able to say that all of us have had some effort and

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . some contribution to make in the problem of dealing with the health needs of our people and making them available to all according to their needs, but without any relationship to their ability to pay for these needs.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the vote is taken, I'd like to say a few words on this resolution.

When the Minister spoke in the House during his estimates, as I recall it, when he was speaking about the question of medical care for our people, it seemed to me that the propositions of the government were extremely vague: that there was really no policy set out at all by the Minister and it was merely a very general statement which appeared to be one designed for the purposes of an election campaign in which the government could say, "Yes, we're in favour of this in principle." but that there was no outline at all of what the government's policy was. I must say I am still disappointed that there isn't a clearer position of what it is that the government intends to do in this particular field. So far as I am concerned, the prime consideration must be the health of our people.

I have been in favour of a medical plan for the people of Manitoba and I have said so in this House and other platforms for some time. The position that I have taken all along is that this was something that had to be done on a joint federal and provincial basis; that the Federal Government here has a responsibility; that they had more access to funds than we had; and that a plan should be developed in conjunction between the federal and the provinces.

There is the further point that unless you have a national plan, then anyone who moves from province to province is obviously inhibited. And that has been the position that our party has taken, the position that we hold to now. The Federal Government has decided to go along and proceed with a national plan.

It seems to me that the Province of Manitoba, having been involved in the discussions with the Federal Government now for some time, should be in a position to tell this House a great deal more about the details of their plan rather than the very vague general statement, because surely in the course of the discussions with Ottawa, some specifics had to be laid down.

Now I must quite honestly confess - and I suppose in this I differ from my friends to the left - but I prefer a voluntary plan. I prefer a voluntary plan. I would rather see this on a basis that people do this on a voluntary basis. But if a voluntary plan will not work, and if it is impossible to give our people proper health services on a voluntary plan, then I will support a compulsory plan. But I would want to make every effort first to see if we can make a voluntary plan work - and this is why I hoped that the Minister having enunciated that policy, would be in a position to give us some more details than what he has given so far.

It seems to me that we have in the Province of Manitoba with the Manitoba Medical Service, a vehicle which would permit us to set up a plan. There has been a plan there in operation now for many years. While there have been some complaints, I think that in general it has been a very useful plan for our citizens. The matter now is to extend this plan to cover all of our citizens. But obviously those that need the coverage most are usually the ones that are not covered now, because in many cases they cannot afford the coverage, and in those cases, then there must be assistance to those people to make them eligible for the plan. So it seems to me that our first efforts should be to see if we can work through the Manitoba Medical Service to develop a comprehensive plan for the Province of Manitoba that would be available to all of the citizens and that those who are unable to cover the cost would be assisted so that they would get the coverage.

This it seems to me is a feasible proposition, one that would provide that freedom of choice on the part of the patient, so that he would continue to have the choice of the doctor that he wishes; the freedom of the doctor to continue to operate in his profession, which I think is important, that he has the feeling that he is his own - the profession is within the hands of the medical group, that is, that they are the ones who decide what is good in the field of health. I think that there will be some difficulties if our doctors were to become civil servants. I think there would be difficulties in holding many of them. I'm told that the experience in some areas has been that the quality of health care has fallen when that has happened, and I think it is essential that any plan that we put in, does not reduce the quality of care -- while I want to see the care available to everyone, it is essential that the quality not fall during that time. We have found for example in the case of the hospital plan, that while there is universal coverage in the province of Manitoba, the facts are that not all the people can get hospital coverage, because they can't get into the hospital on many occasions. I'm not suggesting that the quality of hospital

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) . . . care has dropped - the facts are that there aren't enough beds. People who want to enter the hospital cannot do so. I don't want to see the situation happen in the Medical field where if a plan goes in, we find that people who need medical care cannot get a doctor. It is very important therefore that the steps that are taken to set this up are taken in conjunction with the medical people, so that there will be their wholehearted co-operation to make the plan work.

So these it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, are details that the Minister can tell us about. Surely he has investigated many of these areas and would be in a position to tell us what it is that the government intends to do. But I say that the prime consideration must be the health of our people; that the government should now come out with precise details of what they are going to do, having had their consultation. But as far as I am concerned I prefer a voluntary plan, but if a voluntary plan will not work, then I say we must make it a compulsory plan. The key must be the health of the people of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Arthur. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I have not a long address but on the other hand I could not finish it in ten minutes, so I will ask that this item be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Springfield, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): I move, Madam Speaker, that this be stood.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan,

WHEREAS the Workmen's Compensation Act is designed, in part, to allow workmen who have sustained injuries in the course of their employment to maintain themselves and their families in the event their injury caused them to suffer loss of income; and

WHEREAS an injury may not result in loss of work until several years after its occurrence; and

WHEREAS it is undesirable and unjust to require persons suffering such misfortune to sustain a substantial reduction in their standard of living;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government be requested to consider the advisability of amending the "Workmen's Compensation Act" to provide that compensation in respect of an injury be calculated on the basis of the earnings of the workman at the time he ceases to work rather than at the time of injury.

Madam Speaker, having introduced the resolution I am sure that you are going to rule it out of order. I put it on the record. I am pleased to know that the government has accepted my recommendation.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . on a point of order, possibly the Resolution is in order. Having perused it very carefully, I think it might be advised if you would consider that it might be in order.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I leave it in your capable hands.

MADAM SPEAKER: I'll take the Honourable Member's motion under consideration.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I will be a little bit longer than seven minutes, but I am willing to take a chance. I would like to congratulate, Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. John's on bringing this Resolution into this House. I would also like to thank him for the loan of the material he obtained from England.

(MR. COWAN, cont'd) . . . .

The resolution has two parts to it and the member proposed that those parts be dealt with in different ways. We spend many millions of dollars and a great deal of time trying to help those who perpetrate crimes in this country, but we spend little time trying to help the innocent victims of those criminal activities. Crimes are the concern of the whole society and it would seem that a natural extension of this proposition is that the whole society should also be concerned with the innocent victims of those crimes.

Only in Saturday's Free Press, last Saturday's Free Press, did we read of one young man who helped - this refers to 2nd Lieutenant R. J. Lucas, 21 years of age, serving at Fort Osborne Barracks, who came to the aid of two young men who were being attacked in their car by other youths last November, near his home in Winnipeg. Lieutenant Lucas subdued one youth who was wielding an axe, while the attacker's accomplice ran off to help to continue the fight. The citation says that the courageous action of this young officer in going to the aid of the two young men was most commendable and averted what could have been a very serious incident. He was fortunate enough to be only injured to the extent that his nose was broken and he suffered bruises. But he might have been injured very badly and under the law, as we stand today in Canada, there would be no compensation for him or for his family, if he had been maimed for life or if he had been killed.

Last October in New York, a young 28 year old employee of Pan American Airways was on the subway and he put off the subway a drunk who was annoying people and the drunk lurched back on the train and stabbed the young man to death. As a result his wife had to go to work at a low-paying job and sent their child off to her mother in Germany for care. The people of New York were so incensed about this that the City of New York passed a law providing for compensation to families of persons who might be killed when assisting the police or trying to prevent crimes and on the same basis that they pay families of policemen in that city. And so in New York, starting on January 1st of this year, we have the first municipal law to help victims of criminal activities.

As the Honourable Member for St. John's pointed out the only other laws up until that time were in New Zealand, where the law came into effect January 1, 1964; and in Great Britain, where the law came into effect on August 1, 1964. In California they have another law along this line which came into effect on January 1st of this year; and in Western Australia there is some help to those who assist persons in preventing crimes. But excepting for these five laws no other country or jurisdiction has similar laws, but they are now being studied, not only by New York but in the States of Michigan, Illinois, Massachusetts and New Jersey.

In Ottawa on January 20 of this year, a resolution was introduced into the House to provide for compensation to victims of criminal activities where the persons who helped, suffered permanent disabilities. In Ottawa they are not quite so fortunate as we are in one respect, and although that resolution was introduced by a private member on January 20th, it hasn't been debated as yet. It hasn't come to the House as yet for discussion.

However, before we get into this legislation - before we pass legislation with respect to these matters, there are quite a few different aspects to the law which should be considered. In England the law resulted from a proposal back in 1959 by a Miss Margery Fry and as a result a Committee was set up to study the question and in 1961 a report was made and finally in 1964, the law came into effect. So that in that country they gave it a great deal of consideration over some five years before a law was passed.

Many of the questions which should be discussed include whether or not the law should be limited to those who assist law enforcement officers as is proposed in the first part of this resolution or whether or not it should be more restrictive, as is proposed in the amendment by the Honourable Member for Selkirk who proposes that compensation should be limited to those who assist law enforcement officers after having reasonable notice that they are required to assist. Now it would seem that that is narrowing the group to a great extent as to those who might receive assistance under the proposed resolution and it is, I think, narrowing it to too great an extent. In some jurisdictions - Madam Speaker I'll have to finish another day.

HON: GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker I think it might be useful if I reminded the House that the hour of meeting tomorrow morning is 9:30, not as we are accustomed to meet in the morning at 10 o'clock.

Madam Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Saturday morning.