

| ELECTORAL DIVISION | NAME | ADDRESS |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| ARTHUR | J. D. Watt | Reston, Manitoba |
| ASSINIBOIA | Steve Patrick | 189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12 |
| BIRTLE-RUSSELL | Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C. | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| BRANDON | R. O. Lissaman | 832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man. |
| BROKENHEAD | E. R. Schreyer | 2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16 |
| BURROWS | Mark G. Smerchanski | 102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29 |
| CARILLON | Leonard A. Barkman | Steinbach, Man. |
| CHURCHILL | Gordon W. Beard | Thompson, Man. |
| CYPRESS | Hon. Thelma Forbes | Rathwell, Man. |
| DAUPHIN | Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C. | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| DUFFERIN | William Homer Hamilton | Sperling, Man. |
| ELMWOOD | S. Peters | 225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15 |
| EMERSON | John P. Tanchak | Ridgeville, Man. |
| ETHELBERT-PLAINS | M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C. | Ethelbert, Man. |
| FISHER | Emil Moeller | Teulon, Man. |
| FLIN FLON | Hon. Charles H. Witney | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| FORT GARRY | Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C. | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| FORT ROUGE | Hon. Gurney Evans | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| GIMLI | Hon. George Johnson | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| GLADSTONE | Nelson Shoemaker | Neepawa, Man. |
| HAMIOTA | B. P. Strickland | Hamiota, Man. |
| INKSTER | Morris A. Gray | 406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2 |
| KILDONAN | James T. Mills | 142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15 |
| LAC DU BONNET | Oscar F. Bjornson | Lac du Bonnet, Man. |
| LAKESIDE | D. L. Campbell | 326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29 |
| LA VERENDRYE | Albert Vielfaure | La Broquerie, Man. |
| LOGAN | Lemuel Harris | 1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3 |
| MINNEDOSA | Hon. Walter Weir | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| MORRIS | Harry P. Shewman | Morris, Man. |
| OSBORNE | Hon. Obie Baizley | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| PEMBINA | Mrs. Carolyne Morrison | Manitou, Man. |
| PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE | Gordon E. Johnston | 7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie |
| RADISSON | Russell Paulley | 435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man. |
| RHINELAND | J. M. Froese | Winkler, Man. |
| RIVER HEIGHTS | Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q.C. | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| ROBLIN | Keith Alexander | Roblin, Man. |
| ROCK LAKE | Hon. Abram W. Harrison | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE | Hon. George Hutton | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| RUPERTSLAND | J. E. Jeannotte | Meadow Portage, Man. |
| ST. BONIFACE | Laurent Desjardins | 138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man. |
| ST. GEORGE | Elman Guttormson | Lundar, Man. |
| ST. JAMES | D. M. Stanes | 381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12 |
| ST. JOHN'S | Saul Cherniack, Q. C. | 333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4 |
| ST. MATTHEWS | W. G. Martin | 924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10 |
| ST. VITAL | Fred Groves | 3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8 |
| STE. ROSE | Gildas Molgat | Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| SELKIRK | T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C. | Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man. |
| SEVEN OAKS | Arthur E. Wright | 168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17 |
| SOURIS-LANSDOWNE | M. E. McKellar | Nesbitt, Man. |
| SPRINGFIELD | Fred T. Klym | Beausejour, Man. |
| SWAN RIVER | James H. Bilton | Swan River, Man. |
| THE PAS | Hon. J. B. Carroll | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| TURTLE MOUNTAIN | P. J. McDonald | Killarney, Man. |
| VIRDEN | Donald Morris McGregor | Kenton, Man. |
| WELLINGTON | Richard Seaborn | 594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10 |
| WINNIPEG CENTRE | James Cowan, Q. C. | 412 Paris Bidg., Winnipeg 2 |
| WOLSELEY | Hon. Duff Roblin | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 11th, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

The Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights)
introduced Bill No. 89, An Act to provide for Relief from Certain Unconscionable Transactions.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 25 Grade XI history class students from the Steinbach Bible School under the direction of their teacher Mr. Henry Friesen. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Carillon. There are 42 Grade VII, VIII and IX students from St. Eugene School under the direction of their teacher Sister Helen. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

There are some 54 Grade XI students from Lorette High School under the direction of their teacher Sister Farmer. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Springfield.

There are some 26 Grade VI students from Greenway School under the direction of their teacher Miss Lambert. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. Matthews.

Nous vous souhaitons la bien ici cette après-midi. Nous espérons que tout ce que vous avez vu et entendu à l'assemblée législative sera utile dans vos études. Puisse cette visite vous inspirer et stimuler votre intérêt dans les affaires de la province. Revenez encore nous visiter.

We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to address a question to the First Minister -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I'm sorry.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I would like to lay some orders on the table, and then I'll be happy to do what I can with the question.

I lay on the Order of the table, Madam Speaker -- (Interjection) -- Beg pardon? -- (Interjection) -- Good gracious. I lay on the table of the House, Madam Speaker, Order No. 7 in reply to a question asked by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead respecting clubs. I also lay on the table an Order of the House in reply to a question asked by the Honourable Member for St. John's on the question of insurance premiums.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report for the year ending December 31st, 1963, of the Public Utilities Board.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to lay on the table of the House the first Annual Report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board dated March, 1964. Copies for all members will be distributed.

I would lay on the table of the House also copies of what is referred to as the abbreviated report by Dixon-Spears in connection with Trans-Canada Air Lines. There are copies here for each caucus room as well as for the House.

May I take advantage of being on my feet at this time to remind the honourable members of the reception and dinner for MLA's being tendered by the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce this evening at 6:00 o'clock.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I should like to lay on the table of the House a Return to the Order of the House No. 31 on the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, dated March 6th, 1964.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. When may the House expect the legislation on the portability of pensions?

MR. ROBLIN: Soon, Madam Speaker.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Before the Orders of the Day, Madam Speaker, the other day on the Orders of the Day I rose to inform you that one of the visiting schools was in my constituency rather than as announced in the constituency of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface. Today I rise to correct you in reverse. St. Eugene School is in Radisson constituency and not in the constituency of St. Vital.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to receive the honour of the school being in my constituency. I think properly it is shared by the Honourable Member for St. Vital and myself. I respect his mentioning this in the House. I am pleased to share with him the responsibility of looking after the children of St. Emile School, or St. Eugene School.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): I'd just like to say that inasmuch as these young folks don't have the vote we can't blame them for either of these two folks being here.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question or two to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, or the First Minister. It's in respect of the TCA Report. I am pleased to receive the report this afternoon. May I ask my honourable friend what studies are being made in connection with the report by his department as question No. 1 -- and I apologize for not informing my honourable friend earlier of the question. And secondly, does my honourable friend now intend to call a meeting of the delegation which went to Ottawa on behalf of the retention of TCA in Manitoba?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, the situation is really no different than when my honourable friend asked the question last time. I received those copies on my desk only a few minutes ago. I know nothing more than I did the last time I answered the question. When there is anything new to announce, I'll announce it.

MR. PAULLEY: Then I take it, Madam Speaker, there's been no further consideration of the calling together of the delegation which went to Ottawa.

MR. EVANS: I have nothing further to add.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E.R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has asked me to have it stand again and I ask indulgence to do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the bills shown on the Order Paper.

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

Bills No. 2, 4, 11, 12, 13 and 14 were read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 24 The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, there isn't too much that I have to say now. I raise objection to this Bill No. 24, and I admit that I was a little bit late and at the time the members opposite tried to stop me from speaking. But as the present bill stands, I think it meets with approval from the parties concerned -- the agricultural parties. There is only one thing that I cannot reconcile and that is why when the bill was originally presented -- and I understand it was presented by the Honourable Minister of Health and probably he was only thinking of the ramification of this Act from the standpoint of health and as far as agriculture is concerned I don't think that he really -- it's not his department he didn't actually

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd)...study it. But I am definitely surprised that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture didn't detect what this Act meant to the farming industry of the Province of Manitoba. However, that is past and the oversight of the Minister has been rectified.

Now there is just one more point that I raised in committee and that was about Schedule B, Part 2 and I know that it is subject to the Pest Control Products Act of Canada and the Pesticide Control Act of Manitoba. I have the regulations 4263 before me and I notice that it doesn't mention any of these substances, these commonly used substances. My fears were that if any time -- maybe I am wrong and if I'm wrong I would like the Honourable Minister to correct me -- the Minister has the right to include any one of these preparations marked in part 2 in these regulations whereby it would necessitate the merchants out in the country who carry these products to procure a license. They are not in at the present time but am I not right when I say at the discretion of the Minister, he could place these under the regulation?

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): I just want to know one thing -- whether the sponsor of the Bill understands well all the pharmaceutical items appearing in this bill and whether the human being is fully protected either by the pharmaceutical association or by the doctors.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, really what the Honourable Member for Emerson is asking really has nothing to do with the Bill or Act under consideration here; but just to clarify the matter of control under the Manitoba Pesticide Control Act, it is true that any pesticide that is used by farmers on field crops and livestock is governed by that Manitoba Pesticide Control Act and if it is being used in commercial quantities in the production of field crops and livestock products it would be subject to the provisions of that Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN:passed.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon):.....in answer to the questions of the Honourable Minister for Inkster. I not being a pharmacist cannot answer to him what all of these items listed in here are, but I do have the assurance of the Food and Drug Act Regulations and I do have the assurance of the University of Manitoba that these particular articles should be in here under the various precautions that are listed here; and as a matter of fact, some of the new drugs that are listed in here, there are new labelling techniques required because of the new knowledge of the drugs and the new Act will actually provide more protection for the public than the old one.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, are we going to be supplied with the amendments now, or are we supposed to use the ones that we received in the Committee. I gave mine away, and I just wonder if we have copies of amendments available now -- none -- that's fine.

MR. ROBLIN:deal with the question of amendments but if they are not before the committee and members of the committee wish them to before the committee we will hold the Bill until they are produced, because I don't believe in the committee passing the amendments if there is any doubt about that matter, so I leave it to the committee to inform me.

MR. M.N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, the question here is that the amendments that were made in committee are many and very intricate. I don't know how you will Mr. Chairman, pass those amendments on this particular Bill unless we either have a Bill drafted with the amendments in it or have the amendments before us, unless we just go ahead and take it for granted that those amendments were passed. That's the only way we can do it.

MR. ROBLIN:I really don't approve of that myself. I think we should hold the Bill until the amendments are before the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there amendments to be distributed?

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, in reference to Schedule "B" part 2, I agree with the Member from Emerson

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, if we all agree to hold the Bill in committee perhaps we should postpone the debate until the amendments are before us and then we'll all be talking about the same thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Sections (1) to (4) of Bill No. 27 were read and passed.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Section 4 is amended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, this Bill comes into force following proclamation. .

Bill No. 28 was read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 31, Section 1 (a) passed, (b) passed, 4 passed -- (Interjection)
-- Yes, in the amendments where it says where a married woman, married woman is replaced by the word "person," and where it says she, he or her, him. Those are the amendments there.

MR. MOLGAT:in number Mr. Chairman, I believe that No. 7 was added, was it not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh yes, pardon me. Under Section 4, or 5 or 7 in subsection 4.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I think that this indicates one of the problems in dealing here in Committee with amendments on a verbal basis. I would suggest to the government that they should supply in any case where a bill has been amended copies of the amendments to the members, because you are reading now the sections and in fact, had we just proceeded we would have been passing the original bill, because insofar as the members here, they only have the original bill to deal with, they have no copies of the amendments. A number of members are not on Law Amendments Committee and haven't any means of knowing unless someone else informs them. So I think it would be better procedure if where a bill is amended that the amendments were simply given to the members in mimeograph form for whatever bill it is and then we can deal with the bill as such.

MR. CHAIRMAN:say "as amended;" perhaps I didn't say it on that occasion.

The remainder of Bill No. 31 was read and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 34, Section 1, 118 (a) passed; (b) passed; (c) passed; (d) passed; subsection

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to get the information on the section 3. Does it mean that the minister of a corporation can decide whether this bill is to come before the House or not. Probably I am mistaken but it seems to me that he is the judge in this bill before a bill of incorporation comes up before the House. If I am wrong, I'll apologize. If I am right, I want an explanation.

MR. STEINKOPF: The company will be incorporated under part 5 of The Companies Act in the usual way, but in this case there is the added requirement that it must receive the permission of the Minister of Industry and Commerce before the bill can be approved and made into a company.

Remainder of Bill No. 34 was read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 35 sections 1 to 3 (d) were read and passed.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I believe there is an amendment there, a typographical error. The word "his" should be "her."

MR. CHAIRMAN: In (d)?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: In (c) in 3 (c).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh yes, pardon me, in (c) -- in favour of "her" husband.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman are these notations of amendments not made on the copies of the Bill in the Law Amendments Committee? -- They are there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. It was so slightly made I didn't notice it. (d) passed....

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I believe there is an error too that was corrected. Instead of execute it should be executes, the "s" should be on the end of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The husband executes it for that purpose. Agreed?

MR. J.M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment on (e) (ii). I wonder if I can still make it. I didn't know we were on Bill No. 35. My amendment is that we delete the following words in the 14th line thereof of Section 2 (e) (ii) -- the following words: "in the same section or across a road or highway" and insert the following words, "within a radius of five miles." The amendment that I am proposing will make the farmers in southern Manitoba also eligible to come under this Section. The way it presently reads it will only apply to those farmers that have 320 acres adjoining or just across from their own so that it would be contiguous. Under this proposal here it would be within a radius of five miles so that a homestead could be a set of farm buildings within a farm community, farm village, and the farmland might be two, three or four miles distant and they could still be included within the definition or interpretation of a homestead.

MR. CHAIRMAN:by the Honourable Member for Rhineland to amend Section 2 (e)

(Mr. Chairman, cont'd)...(ii) by deleting the following words in the 14th line thereof: "in the same section or across a road or highway" and insert the following words, "within a radius of five miles."

MR. MCLEAN: Mr. Chairman, speaking to this amendment which has been proposed by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland, I must say that I would be unable to agree to the amendment which he has proposed. I think, Mr. Chairman, that this proceeds from perhaps a misunderstanding about this particular part of The Dower Act. The principal effect of these provisions in The Dower Act has to do with requiring the consent of the spouse when it comes to alienating or in any way dealing with the land of the owner in those circumstances where the property is the home of the person desiring to transact some business respecting it. It doesn't go beyond that and to extend it out would be to make it meaningless. This is to protect the home of the owner and his or her spouse and if one said "within a radius of five miles" why not within a radius of 50 miles or 100 miles; it would make the whole thing quite meaningless and I would not want to become involved in that kind of an arrangement. In addition, I would point out that the provisions in this particular section of the Act are the same as those in the previous Act and they have been in force in Manitoba for many years, are well understood by not only lawyers but by the general public and ought not in my opinion to be disturbed at the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm not a lawyer and in possibly no position to discuss the details of this thing, and wonder if, in view of the fact that I think it was agreed in Committee that the bill and some of the suggestions that have been made by the Member from Winnipeg Centre would be referred to, I think, the Law Society, for consideration, whether this item brought up by the Member for Rhineland shouldn't also be considered. Because he does have a point, Mr. Chairman, insofar as certain sections of the Province of Manitoba, and notably the area that he represents, where the normal system there is not for the farm home to be on the farm land that is cultivated but rather to be in a village, and a good number of the original Mennonite settlements in the Province of Manitoba are exactly on that basis, where they had an actual agricultural village with no business conducted there but all the farm homes in the same area along one piece of section road and then they farmed the adjoining lands in many cases as far as five miles away -- and this system of land tenure is common in these parts of Manitoba. It does not apply the same way as the remainder of the province where it is split up into the normal section and township with usually the farm home being on a quarter section. So I think that his point should be considered. I don't think I would be prepared to vote in favour of the amendment at this stage but would strongly recommend that it be referred, along with the bill, the suggestions of the Member for Winnipeg Centre to the Law Society for further consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that acceptable to the Honourable Member for Rhineland?

MR. FROESE: I think that if I got assurance that this would be taken into consideration it would be acceptable to me because I can see the difficulty in amending it in this way.

The reason for bringing it in is quite obvious because it cuts out so many of the people in my particular area. The reason it happens to be that way is the land was cut up into sections quite a number of years after the settlements had already been made and that is why we run into these difficulties. If I get the assurance I will withdraw the amendment.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, not wishing to confuse the issue at all, but from the silence of the Honourable the Attorney-General, it appears to me that he is willing to see that this is referred to the Committee of the Law Society. I would also like to remind him while he is at it, to remind the members of this committee, just in case they are all city folk, that more and more farmers are beginning to live in towns and villages, have their homes established there and they still farm, some of them as far as 10, 15 miles away from their homes, which would also have to be taken into consideration when this particular section is under discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we going to vote on the amendment? Those in favour of the amendment, say "aye."

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Honourable Member for Rhineland said he'd be satisfied if he was assured this would be referred to the committee, and he would withdraw his amendment. If I was not mistaken I believe that's what:....

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I thought I gave the assurance to the Law Amendments Committee yesterday that yes, the whole Act will be referred to the Law Reform Committee for consideration of this and any other matters arising under it either from our discussions yesterday or today.

Bill No. 35, Sections 2 to 10 (b) were read section by section and passed.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment here. I think this again points out the necessity of having these amendments before the members of the committee because one of the days we are going to get into trouble, amendments that have not been passed may be proclaimed law. According to my notes here made in the Law Amendments Committee there are amendments to 10 (b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: In 10 (b) "in case of a wife who is mentally incompetent," that is the change there, instead of "within the meaning of the expression as it is defined in The Lunacy Act, by The Administrator of Estates of the Mentally Incompetent.

MR. HRYHORCZUK:something else, some other words used there, I think it was the Counsel that suggested the amendment. I see that I have here the words "by his committee." I don't know whether -- I haven't heard it read -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, very complicated. Instead of The Administrator of Estates (b) passed, section 10 passed, Section 11 -----

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, just exactly what is it we are passing? Would you read the section, as amended, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the case of a wife this is the amendment: "who is a mentally incompetent by her committee."

MR. HRYHORCZUK: There must be another word there because that doesn't make sense reading that way. There must be an insertion between the word "is" and the word "mentally."

MR. McLEAN:would read "in the case of a wife who is a mentally incompetent, by her committee."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: It doesn't make sense that way at all, to me, anyhow. I may be wrong but I think there should be something -- who is either "declared" mentally incompetent by her....." -- that way, maybe if the word "declared" was there, or some similar word.

MR. CHAIRMAN: "in the case of a wife who is a mentally incompetent by her committee" -- (Interjection) -- That's correct.

A MEMBER: Is that the way it reads?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 10 (b) agreed? That's the amendment as passed by the committee.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, would you read the section as it will read, as amended, please.

MR. ROBLIN: We have now the Legislative Counsel with us; we have the benefit of his advice; perhaps, as he is the draftsman he might now read it in the amended form so the committee may understand it thoroughly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll read it in its original form -- "in the case of a wife who is mentally incompetent.....

MR. ROBLIN: No, Mr. Chairman, I think if we ask the Legislative Counsel to read the "amended" version, then members will understand what it is.

MR. TALLIN: "Where a consent or release is executed" -- Clause (a) there is no change. Clause (b) "In the case of a wife who is a mentally incompetent by her committee."

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Well then, you have the article "a" inserted in the original section.

MR. TALLIN: Yes, it's inserted here.

MR. MOLGAT: Then everything else within the meaning of that expression is defined in The Lunacy Act, by The Administrator of Estates, and mentally incompetent is removed.

MR. TALLIN: That is correct, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed? (b) passed.

MR. ROBLIN:Mr. Tallin, bring up a chair.

Bill No. 35, sections 10 to 13 (i) (a) were read and passed.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, may I draw your attention to the fact the marginal note is wrong, has to be changed. It reads "living apart two years" and the section reads "six

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd)...months."

Remainder of Bill No. 35 was read section by section to Schedule Form F and passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I believe there's an amendment in Form F. There's a misprint there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes,by wife to consent, "release." It was an error in spelling. Remainder of Bill 35 read and passed.

Bill No. 45 was read section by section and passed, with amendment "and" authority instead of "or" authority, in subsection 3.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before the committee rises I think the experience we've had today with the bills is an example of the way that we should not be dealing with bills going through this House. After all the events that go on in Law Amendments Committee are not on Hansard; they are unrecorded insofar as the actual proceedings of the House. They are recorded, presumably by the Clerk, but this is the time when all the members of the House have the opportunity to have their say on any of these bills, in detail. We have had the situation today where a number of sections of a number of bills could have been interpreted by any of the honourable members here as being originally in the bill, no indication given of an amendment, and I don't believe that this is the way that the committee should proceed. I would like to have the assurance from the government that henceforth when we proceed here in Committee of the Whole that we will have typewritten copies of any amendments to all the bills that are referred.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think my honourable friend is absolutely right. There is no disagreement between us on this point at all. I think that you, Sir, ought to call amendments when they appear in the bill so that it will be drawn to the attention of members of the House so that we may know; and if there are any bills in which the amendments are substantial and members feel there should be printed copies of the changes that have been made, and I agree this should be produced except for changes of a minor nature, then the committee should have them. As already pointed out, I've asked that one of these bills be held in the committee until such time as the amendments concerned can be produced for members. I think that is the right procedure and there is no disagreement between us on that point.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: That's not quite satisfactory as far as I'm concerned. Not that these small amendments cannot be very important. You can have one word changed and it is important insofar as it effects the sense of the section. I would suggest that it's so easy for the Chairman to miss a small amendment and I would suggest that a list of all the amendments, no matter how small they are or how insignificant they may look, are given to each member of this committee. And if we have a list of bills before us, like we have in the Orders of the Day today, that the amendments on all of those bills that are dealt with by the committee be handed to each member of this House, whether that amendment is small and looks innocent and insignificant, or whether it's a large one.

MR. CHAIRMAN:to the members of the committee, of course, nothing is insignificant and everything is important. The Chairman can take a little bit of blame I suppose for missing out some of the amendments, but if you looked at the bills sometimes you would see one little word that is so tiny that you've got to have glasses almost to see what it is. So I think with the Chairman at the Law Amendments Committee we can have a little understanding that they can be a little more clearly defined. Not that I want a separate thing put in front of me there but I think -- there's no reason why we cannot carry on as we are doing unless there is some major one -- that I'll undertake to be very careful that every little amendment, everything is presented to the committee. Now if you wish to do further than that, it's.....

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, you can't take responsibility for those amendments. I think it's the House -- the government takes responsibility for them, and if we pass any of them without the amendment being read out to the committee I doubt its validity. It's only a little extra work but that little extra work can save us a lot of grief in the future in some of these amendments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has considered certain bills and directed me to report as follows. Bills No. 2, 4, 11, 12, 13, 14, 27, 28, 31, 34, 35, 45 without amendment, and Bill No. 24 held in the committee, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W.J. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that the report of the committee be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. Bills No. 2, 4, 11, 12, 13, and 14 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Bill No. 24 is held, Madam Speaker.

Bills No. 27, 28, 31, 34, 35 and 45 were each read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, I adjourned this debate so that the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities could speak on the matter but also so that he wouldn't have to adjourn it in his name, thus closing the debate. If any other honourable member wishes to speak, he may take this opportunity; if not, I would turn it over to the Minister of Public Utilities.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does any other honourable member wish to speak? The Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, the debate on this bill has been most thorough, and covering the important matter that it does, I think the debate itself has been kept on a very high plane. It has been very stimulating for me because in bringing in this bill I realized the importance of a suggestion as is contained in the bill and I'm very happy that the general thought of the bill and the general feel of the House is that the bill is one that should be passed.

I would like to explain in detail, if I can, the explanation that went along with the bill at the time of introducing it. It seems that there is more disturbance and conflict of opinion on what I said, or what I meant rather, than the context of the bill itself, and in re-reading what I did say and also in Hansard I still am of the same opinion that there was little doubt as to what the intent was. In dealing with a matter as important as this, a matter that involves two major crown corporations who are, in effect, responsible for looking after assets of some \$560 million, a little bit more than the total debt of the Province of Manitoba, one doesn't deal with a matter like this very lightly.

I am very happy too that everyone has agreed that it is most unrealistic to expect a Minister, whether he is new or whether he is old, to be answerable on matters relating to the day to day operations of these two operational giants. Quite a bit was said about ministerial responsibility and suggesting that it would be a constitutional error for the Minister to avoid or to duck that responsibility. In theory and in a certain amount of fact, this is a true statement, but sometimes the facts and the practice gets mixed up. In this case we are dealing with two crown corporations and two crown corporations whose duties are pretty well defined and whose direction has been well laid out by the two Acts governing the operation of the two crown corporations. The amendment that I suggested and am suggesting in the passing of this bill and the sister bill that goes along with it is simply to bring into practice the procedure that the original act intended, and the practice that is being followed in Ottawa and elsewhere wherever you find crown corporations.

Quite a bit was said about the feeling of such honourable men as Messrs. Borden and Messrs. Meighen and reference was made to Dawson's procedure in the Canadian House of Commons, and in re-reading it and checking this, I find that most had to do with the operation of a department as opposed to the operation of a crown corporation. As a matter of fact, it was so ably stated by many of the debators that preceded me, that this very fine distinction must be kept in mind at all times and was kept in mind by Dawson. On Page 155, Dawson states, "The growth of public corporations in Canada has produced a few of the problems in question period which have become so important in the United Kingdom there is still no clear practice surrounding questions addressed to public corporations. In spite of the growth of crown companies which have now entered into many branches of industry, Members of Parliament have showed remarkable restraint in their quest for information. Any attempt to obtain detailed information relating to the operation of these companies has been met with a blank refusal on the part of the government. Questions which deal with the internal business of the corporations have often been held to be outside the scope of the government's knowledge and therefore not answerable.

"In addition, Ministers to whom questions are addressed on the subject of public

(Mr. Steinkopf cont'd) corporations take no responsibility for the answers presented. They are merely the agents through whom messages pass between the corporations and the House. When the Prime Minister refused to accept a question in 1932, he noted that in order to answer the question he would write the Canadian National Railway and they would merely reply that it was not in the public interest to give the information requested. Three years later, another Minister refused a similar question on the Canadian National Railways on the ground that he had no information on the matter. To emphasize this position of the Minister, answers are often prefaced with the remark that 'the corporation advises'."

There is a long paragraph there that goes into it in more detail and ends up with this statement. "Although the government has been unwilling to answer detailed questions in the House, it has been quite willing to allow the same questions to be asked directly of the officers of the corporations in committees."

We realize that the Minister cannot abrogate his responsibility nor can the Executive Council, and it is not our intention that they do so, but it does make sense to me to improve the procedure and the channel of communication between the members of this House and the crown corporation on matters to do with the running of the day to day operation of the corporation.

The important fact that we must remember is that the act now gives the utility the right to run its own affairs, with minor limitations, without the necessity of obtaining prior approval of the government. Why was this done? Possibly so that there would be no political color to the management of these utilities and to enable them to conduct their affairs in a normal commercial manner.

Now that we are paying attention to this facet of the basic legislation and bringing in these amendments, some have questioned and asked; Are we dodging our responsibility? I do not think so. The alternative, as the First Minister pointed out, in trying to make the Minister directly responsible for every act of the crown companies, would be to make a major amendment and to change the whole concept of these utilities by making them departments rather than crown corporations.

I do not think that the Minister should be asked to answer questions that do not lie within the realm of his knowledge. The government certainly would continue to accept humble addresses for return of papers. Furthermore, it would produce the board responsible and have the committee meet as often as is necessary so that the members will get first-hand answers and information instead of second-hand via the present method. Naturally the honourable members will be free to ask any questions of management they want to that relate to the question of the corporation, and so be put into the same position as the Minister is now in. One must remember too that the Minister is only the agent when he asks the questions of the board or someone else.

Ministerial responsibility in connection with this utility is to sack the board and get a new one if he feels that they are doing a poor job, but it is against the law for the Minister to run the board and it is not practical for a Minister to be apprised of the day to day operations of these very large corporations. The Executive Council will simply approve the policy and matters relating to the development of the utilities and, if called upon, will answer questions in this House on matters concerning such long term policy, capital requirements and the appointment of members of the board, and at all times will answer questions if we can, but the intent is that these questions be answered in the manner very very properly put up by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead who I think understands the concept of what we are trying to do. There is no intent on the part of anyone to abrogate the responsibility of the department or of the Minister or of the Executive Council.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the second reading on a proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities of Bill No. 37.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannette, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Paultey, Peters, Roblin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse,

(Nays cont'd)Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 38; Nays, 14.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

The adjourned debate on the second reading on the Proposed Motion of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I would beg leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I regret to say this, but I don't think that we should let the matter stand. I think we should proceed with this debate today. It has been on the Order Paper a long time. The Public Utilities Committee meets tomorrow and it seems to me that we should have an opportunity to express our views and principle if at all possible on this motion today. It has already stood in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface more than once and I would solicit his co-operation in proceeding with this matter now.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, the point is that the Minister today made a statement which I think the members of this side of the House would like to be able to read to see exactly what the Minister said on the companion bill. After all, the House was prepared to stand the matter yesterday for a Minister of the Crown. I'm surprised that today the government should take the position that they would refuse a standing for a private member.

MR. ROBLIN: I would ask the co-operation of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in proceeding if he possibly can.

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the Member for St. Boniface reconsider?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Madam Speaker, I don't mind co-operating, but as my leader said, there is a statement that was made today that I think is of vital importance -- something very important -- and if at all possible, I think that another day won't matter too much. We have had motions that have stood in the name of the same member for many times, not only this member. If the House rules I will speak today, but I think that co-operation doesn't necessarily mean speed. I think this is important enough that we should have a chance to reply to what we feel is an erroneous statement that was made today.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, Madam Speaker, if my honourable friend cannot see his way clear to it, I certainly am not going to press the issue to a vote, but I will say that the government expects to proceed with the Public Utilities Commission tomorrow and to have these reports placed before them. I trust there will be no objection to that procedure.

MR. MOLGAT: That's the very point of this whole affair, that the government is perfectly entitled to put these reports before the committee now without any such legislation. They are free to do it. It's been done before and they are perfectly entitled to do it. He doesn't need these bills to do this.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are the members agreed that the motion should stand?

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 58. The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

MR. ROBLIN: The Minister is absent at a conference in Ottawa, Madam Speaker, and perhaps it would be better to have him introduce the bill although one of my colleagues is prepared to do so if the House does not wish the matter to stand.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, we will be pleased to let the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 40. The Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 71, The Honourable the Minister of Welfare.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas) presented Bill No. 71, an Act to amend The Disabled Persons' Allowance Act , for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, there was an explanation given at the resolution stage. This is another one of those bills which provide for making retroactive regulations recommended by the committee on regulations.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I don't rise to oppose the bill. I regret I was not present in the House at the resolution stage unfortunately. I would have a few questions, however, on the bill if I may and the Minister can reply if he wishes today or I may get the explanation when we reach the committee, but it seems to me that there should be some date to which these retroactive payments can be made. As the bill stands now, it simply permits retroactive payments without saying until when. This seems to me could go back over many years. It should be stated how far back the government intends to go on this matter.

I would also like to know from the Minister how this fits in with the payments made under the Federal Old Age Security plan. Now if I remember correctly -- and if I'm wrong, I'd like to be corrected on this -- the Old Age Security Pension was increased from \$65.00 to \$75.00 effective the first of October. What I would like to know from the Minister then is whether this is simply to make it retroactive to that same date, the 1st of October, and if this is to bring the payment from \$65.00 to \$75.00 for the people in this category. Again I say I regret I was not at the committee stage when possibly the Minister gave those explanations then. If so, would you tell me where in Hansard and I'll be quite pleased to look it up myself.

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, if there are no other questions I will

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, just one question, a very specific one. I want to ask the Minister if this legislation is being brought in as a result of the recommendation of the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations which met awhile back and suggested that this is a matter that shouldn't be dealt with by regulations but by statute. Is that the reason?

MR. CARROLL: If there are no other questions, Madam Speaker -- this is the result of the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Regulations. I don't recall the exact circumstances that prompted the committee to bring in this report, but I am familiar with the circumstances that developed last fall at the time of the last change in Old Age Security Payments. The result of that change was that where there was a married couple where one had his income raised as a result of a change in pension and the other partner was under Old Age Assistance, his income would then be raised above the ceiling which was allowed under The Old Age Assistance Act. This would enable us to make a change retroactively to raise the income level as of the date of the federal change in pensions, October 1st in this particular case. We aren't intending to go back to raise the level of Old Age Assistance payments as of that date, or in this case the Disabled Persons pension. It merely enables us to raise the income ceilings to which they are entitled under this legislation.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: May I ask the Honourable Minister a question? In the event that the government decides to raise the pension from 65 to 75 for the Old Age Assistance and the other branches over which you have jurisdiction, will this amendment be used to make those payments retroactive?

MR. CARROLL: It could be used for that purpose, yes. It could be.

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

MR. CARROLL presented Bill No. 72, an Act to amend The Old Age Assistance Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, pursuing the questions that were asked by my colleague from Ethelbert Plains, I'd like to have from the Minister the details of the situation now on Old Age Assistance. What are the payments presently to people on Old Age Assistance? Is it \$65 a month or is it \$75.00? And if it is \$75 now, at what date did this become effective? If it is \$65 now, is it the government's intention to increase it to \$75, and, if so, will it be retroactive to the 1st of October under the provisions which he just has said could be done under this act? I think that the House should know what the intentions are. If this act is going to permit this action to take place, we would like to know whether it is the intention of the government to make this retroactive payment or not.

MR. CARROLL: If there are no further questions, Madam Chairman. I regret that I'm not sure just when the increase in Old Age Assistance payments became effective. It was either December 1st or January 1st. The Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons -- Disabled Persons'

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) pensions are now \$75 per month. It is not our intention to go back and increase this retroactively to October 1st, but merely to accommodate the change in income ceilings as of October 1st to prevent the requirement of deducting the increase in Old Age Security payments which would have resulted in an overpayment to a couple who might have been in this kind of a situation.

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

..... continued on next page

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I wonder if you would be kind enough to call the resolution on Dental Health Policy.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the Proposed Resolution of the Honourable the Minister of Health. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'll be happy to accommodate the Leader of the House and not ask for the matter to stand and co-operate and speak on this subject today.

To begin with, Madam Speaker, I must express extreme surprise at the government coming out with this wishy-washy weak-kneed resolution that they present to us. After the brave statements made in the Throne Speech just some very few weeks ago, at which time this government, pursuing its so-called and self-styled course of action, said then, "during the Session a proposal respecting the dental health field will be recommended for your consideration."

Now, Madam Speaker, anyone finding that sort of a statement in a Throne Speech prepared by the front bench opposite for reading here by the Lieutenant-Governor of the province, indicating the policy of this government for the year to follow, would have reason to expect that the government would present some policy, but lo and behold, what do we find, Madam Speaker? Not one iota of policy. Just a resolution to pass the subject off on to someone else for consideration to report at a later date. That, Madam Speaker, is the type of so-called action that we get consistently from this government whenever they reach an item that is controversial. Whenever there is an item on which honourable members opposite, the Member for St. Vital and the Minister of Health or who it be, can't reach a decision, well let's appoint a Royal Commission, and if we can't appoint a Royal Commission on this one, well then let's set up a committee. But whatever we do, let's not make a decision.

In spite of the statements made to the public of Manitoba over the years about a government of action and a government of decision and a government who do things -- no, let's appoint a commission. Let's put it off so that we don't have to make a decision, so that the government doesn't have to tell the people of Manitoba where they stand on the issue. Let's bring in everybody in the House and then we can go out to the Province of Manitoba and say, "Well, you know it is not the government who did this, it is the whole of the House. This is the policy decided upon by all of the members of the Legislature because we can't make up our minds ourselves." That is exactly what the government is presenting us with at this time.

Madam Speaker, I say that that's just not good enough for a government. If this government cannot make decisions, then I suggest to them that they shouldn't pretend to the people of Manitoba that they should be governing. Let them simply abdicate if that's their decision, but let's not continue this way of either shelving things or passing them on to someone else to make a decision for them.

Surely, Madam Speaker, after listening to the speech of the Minister of Health on this subject a couple of days ago, one could expect that the Minister of Health, with his experts, with the people on his staff, could make a decision on this matter. What has he got a department for? If he cannot make use of those people to make a decision, to present a resolution or a bill to the House on which the House can make a decision, then I suggest that the Minister had better look pretty carefully at the operation of his department, because this is certainly not the way to govern, Madam Speaker. This is sheer abdication of responsibility. Madam Speaker, I am not prepared to vote for the appointment of a committee as the Minister suggests.

Madam Speaker, some three years ago -- or maybe it is four now, I forget -- this House appointed a committee to investigate the livestock industry in the Province of Manitoba. It took us three or four years to get a report out of this committee. It cost the taxpayers of Manitoba, I don't know how much money, for members to be running off to Iowa and off to Alberta, and now the Minister proposes the same thing in this regard. He is going to send members of the House to Saskatchewan and to Alberta, and I'm not sure from his statement whether he wouldn't include New Zealand because he gave us quite a lecture on the situation in New Zealand and in Sweden and in Germany. Madam Speaker, surely the Minister can make a decision. Surely he can present something to the House and not a weak-kneed resolution setting up a committee. Madam Speaker, that just isn't good enough.

Well now, I would like to state my position on this subject, Madam Speaker. I have a position on this going back over some years, because back in 1955 when I was a new member in this House, I introduced a Bill at that time, Madam Speaker, to permit dental technicians

(Mr. Molgat, Cont'd.) . . . or denturists to deal directly with the public. At that same time, I might add, my colleague the Member for Selkirk was introducing -- I shouldn't say a companion bill, better I should say a competing bill taking the reverse position. Madam Speaker, my position has not changed. I still believe that dental technicians should be permitted to deal directly with the public. I believe that this should be done under some very definite safeguards for the public health of the province and I believe that this can be done.

The outcome of the resolutions or the bills that were introduced in 1955, Madam Speaker, was the building of the Dental School at the University, and I well remember then -- the Minister of Education is smiling at me now -- his predecessor was very much involved in the discussion at that time and we did obtain as a result of it, a Dental College. But I believe, Madam Speaker, still, that there is need in the Province of Manitoba for the work the dental technicians are doing. The present situation is entirely unsatisfactory. It is unsatisfactory to have illegal activities going on in the Province of Manitoba such as these where there is constant bootlegging but I don't believe, Madam Speaker, that it can be corrected by continuing to make this illegal.

My suggestion is legalize it but control it, and I would suggest that the dental technicians -- and here I am sorry I do not make the differentiation between dental technicians and denturists, I am speaking of those people who produce dentures -- should be controlled by the Department of Health. I think it is unfair to the dental profession in Manitoba that they should be asked to police the dental technicians. I think it puts them in an impossible position. I think it is unfair to them from a public relations standpoint. The events of the past few months have shown that clearly. It is not good for the dental profession and I'm sure they would be the first to agree.

So the control should go to the Department of Health. The Department of Health should licence these people; it should inspect them; it should make sure that they live up to proper health standards. They should not be allowed to produce dentures unless the patient has been to see either a doctor or a dentist to obtain a certificate of oral health. The government should set up a course of study and a course which would qualify these people specifically for the work that they are doing. This could be done, I suggest, Madam Speaker, through the Dental School or through our new institute that we visited some time ago, the Manitoba Technical School -- the new one. This would put these people, Madam Speaker, under a control that does not exist now, the control of the Department of Health. It would ensure that they would live up to proper standards; it would ensure that the present situation of bootlegging and illicit activities going on in the Province of Manitoba would cease; and, in my opinion, the public of Manitoba get service that they are entitled to and can only obtain now by being illegal.

MR. GROVES: I am not surprised at the attitude of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. He states that he is surprised that the government has approached this matter with what he calls a wishy-washy resolution. I think that there are very good reasons for what has been done and I hope in the course of my remarks to show that there is every good reason for dealing with this matter by way of this resolution.

He says that it is not good enough. Madam Chairman, I think that it is a very wise move to approach this matter in this way. I'm glad that the honourable member declared himself in favour of the denturists because that is my position as well, but if he is really sincere, and I believe that he is, in being in favour of the denturists, I can assure him that if he hopes to achieve this, that the only way at the moment that it can be done or that there is some assurance of it being done, is by setting up this committee to determine the facts.

It was my intention at the last session of the Legislature to present a bill to this House authorizing the incorporation of the denturists. It was also my intention at this session to do the same. The reason that it was not done at the last session was that their bill had not been completed and there was still some hope of the two technicians' associations getting together and bringing in some joint legislation.

Prior to the last session a brief was presented to the Premier of the province, and Dr. Johnson, the Minister of Health, and I'd like to quote a few paragraphs from that brief: "During the period that has expired since the last brief presented by the Public Denturists Association to the Manitoba Law Amendments Committee, bills have been passed in British Columbia in 1960 and in Alberta in 1961 incorporating the public denturists, or as they are known in Alberta, certified dental mechanics, as opposed to dental technicians who deal only with dentists.

(Mr. Groves, Cont'd.) . . .

"These bills were enacted only after a great deal of enquiry in British Columbia. A commission made an extensive study of the situation. A bitter fight ensued in the Legislature in Alberta when the bill was presented last year. Many dentists there, as in Saskatchewan, threatened that they would leave the province if the bill were passed and members of the College of Dentistry said they would resign. The Legislature informed the dentists that they would not be dictated to by the dental profession and the bill was passed. To date, not one dentist has resigned from the College of Dentistry and no dentist has left the Province of Alberta. In fact, dentists have left" -- oh I'm sorry, Saskatchewan -- "in fact, dentists have left Saskatchewan in the last year to locate in Edmonton where 37 public denturists are practising.

"The denturists at this crucial time have little alternative but to again petition the Government of Manitoba for legislation, convinced that those thousands who supported the denturists in the past will readily lend support again. The denturists very respectfully submit, in the light of the foregoing, that the Government of Manitoba set up an investigating body such as a House Committee."

So, Madam Speaker, what these denturists asked for a year ago we are giving to them in this resolution, an investigating body that will separate the wheat from the chaff and come up with some facts on which we can base a fair decision on what I am sure is, as the honourable member said earlier, a very controversial and very difficult question. I am sure that no one would object to a dental technician dealing directly with the public if his course of study which he received dealt with the same subjects and background that the dentists received in prosthetic dentistry.

The real problem to reach is an agreement as to what would be required to qualify in order to render service in this single field of dental prosthetics. Too little training would be unfair to the public and too much training in fields which in no way relate to prosthetic dentistry only would, I think, be unfair to the technician. The technicians are willing to accept training; they're willing to accept high standards; and they're willing to accept the strict government supervision which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition suggested.

In Alberta, the dentists have a course set up and they have some pretty stringent entrance requirements -- the denturists -- I'm sorry if I said dentists. They must have a university entrance for qualification to enter this course; they must have a good moral character and have two character references; they must have technical ability or aptitude as decided by an examining board; there is a six months' re-assessment period to determine whether the student should continue in the course; and there is a provision for qualified lecturers from the dental and the medical profession.

And I shall take the liberty, as the Minister did in connection with the course in dentistry, to read off the subjects that are taken in this two-year course on dental prosthetics for technicians. In the first year they take oral anatomy, dental materials, full dental prosthesis, history, ethics and orientation, elementary principles of bacteriology and hygiene. In the second year they take a further course in materials and a further course in prosthesis. They take a course in jurisprudence and practice management, in patient relationship and psychology and oral health in denture patients. These matters, Madam Speaker, are matters which should be examined into very carefully by our Legislative Committee.

Let's just briefly have a look at what's gone on in Manitoba since 1960. I have had compiled a report from nine dental laboratories which show that in this period there were total visitations from the general public of 59,142 persons, with a gross sale of \$678,091.00. The industry's service to the public, of course, is much more extensive than these figures show since these figures do not take into consideration the fact that technicians who make their main business the working in laboratories on prescription from dentists are doing considerable denture work at home after hours. Moreover, there are a number of technicians operating in Manitoba, particularly in Winnipeg, that are neither members of the Dental Technicians Association that work on prescriptions nor of the Denturists Association. So it's impossible because of these factors to estimate the industry's total output. But we have sufficient in these records, Madam Speaker, to indicate that it is very substantial. Last year in the House I gave some figures from 14 laboratories. During this period these laboratories worked on 9,416 full dentures, 2,407 relines and 8,587 cases of repairs.

(Mr. Groves, Cont'd.) . . .

Madam Speaker, in the course of this committee's work I think these figures that I have provided should be stacked up against the production, or the work that has been done by the Manitoba Denture Clinic. I was of the opinion at the time of our debates of last year and the previous time when this bill was presented that the Manitoba Denture Clinic was being set up by the dentists as merely a public relations gesture to hide their real intention of closing out and prohibiting the denturists from working directly with the public, and thus affording the public a fast and efficient service on dental plate work -- where there was no disease of the mouth, of course. More and more as I see what is going on in their clinic, I am convinced that I was right. I am convinced that once the denturists by the process of law are eliminated, that this denture clinic will be closed and people will be forced, even for minor work, to deal through the dental offices. Madam Speaker, I think this is another field on which our Legislative Committee have got to satisfy themselves.

The Minister when he was making his speech the other day seemed to get carried away with himself and he actually argued against setting up a committee and argued in favour of the dentists and their desire to see these technicians relegated to a subservient role in dental health. As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, I thought as the Minister started his talk that I had been done in and double-crossed, but I was glad to see that later on in his address he partially redeemed himself and did say a few words in favour of the commission and mentioned the fact that denturists and dental technicians particularly in the future, might have a very large and very real role to play in dental health in this province.

Now it's well known, Madam Speaker, that this resolution is a compromise. It was accepted by myself in good faith and the best means of gathering for the Legislature the facts about this serious problem upon which we as legislators may next year have to make a final decision. The Minister, I think in all fairness, might have dealt with this in his contribution to the debate rather than bring up some of the more controversial aspects. The Minister prior to the sitting of the Legislature had a bill to incorporate the dental technicians that are presently working for the dentists. This bill would, in effect, have frozen out the denturists except for some minor repairs. Now I'm not revealing any confidence because this bill was released to the solicitor for the other technicians' group some months ago, who in turn made it public at an address which he gave to the Annual Meeting of the Dental Society.

I was also going to present a bill at this session -- in fact, the same bill as I presented three years ago on behalf of the denturists. Both of these bills were submitted to our colleagues with their respective arguments -- the Minister's on behalf of the technicians and mine on behalf of the denturists -- and it was suggested in view of the apparent serious conflict in the facts which were gathered by the parties that were supporting each of these bills that it was essential that some fact-gathering body be set up to bring these loose ends together, and it was decided that a committee of this Legislature was the instrument which should be used to do them. And I would like to compliment the government in setting up a committee of the Legislature rather than a Royal Commission, as has been done in some other instances, because I must say that I for one have always been suspicious of the so-called experts that get onto these Royal Commissions. However, it was decided then that both of them should be dropped in favour of setting up a legislative committee to gather these facts -- and I abide by that decision, Madam Speaker, and I agree that this is what should be done -- and I wholeheartedly support this resolution as the proper thing to do.

The Minister also indirectly criticized the denturists, and they have been criticized in other quarters for conducting their publicity campaign. I think, too, and I say this a bit facetiously, that the Minister made it very obvious that the dentists have also been not idle in their public relations efforts and I have to admit, Madam Speaker, that both of these public relation programs have been a success.

One argument when he was dealing with the dentists, that the Minister didn't discuss naturally, and one which I think underlines this whole move by the dentists -- and I mentioned this before and disagreed, Madam Speaker -- the dentists see some of the gravy slopping off the train and this is why they have been so actively opposing the efforts on the part of these technicians. And I am afraid, Madam Speaker, that I'm not one that can feel sorry for the dentists. I have in front of me an issue of the Financial Post of November 16th, 1963, and it

(Mr. Groves, Cont'd.) . . . is entitled, "Your Handy Guide to Where the Money Is." More Canadians are making more money and a handy guide to where it is being made is Ottawa's Green Book. This is National Revenue's recently released annual volume on tax statistics. Open up the latest one, make some comparisons with earlier volumes, and a picture of Canada's changing market begins to emerge. It shows which occupation has the highest average incomes, and a little figuring reveals which are rising faster. And the first little box in this article says "The Prosperous Professions." These are the occupations that are making the biggest gains in income during the decade 1951 to 1961. Very first on the list, Madam Speaker, are the dentists with an increase in income in a 10-year period, of 96 percent. So I'm afraid, Madam Speaker, that I'm not prepared to shed any tears on behalf of the dental profession; and to listen to too many of their arguments when I am convinced that in my opinion many of them are based purely on economics. Because this is, Madam Speaker, in my opinion, purely a matter of economics. This is why the dentists are fighting it. We have heard many times that the dentists will threaten to leave the province; or that they threaten to leave the province if we allow technicians to practise directly to the public. We hear dire predictions about the future of our Dental College. I say, Madam Speaker, that we will not lose our dentists, and that we will not lose our Dental College. There are unlimited opportunities for dentists, particularly in rural Manitoba, and it is estimated in this same Financial Post article that over 50 percent of the people of this country never get to see a dentist and even if they were able to, the dentists as they are set up at the moment, would be unable to handle them. The dentists of this province have a big job to do and I say that they should hop to it and forget about vindictive wars against craftsmen who accept the leadership of the dentists in their field and are prepared to help them to do this job.

Madam Speaker, I have a son who within the next year or so may want some advice from me as to what he should do when he leaves school. What we all want when we leave school and we enter business or professional life are good income, good hours, and opportunity, and I would have no hesitation, denturists or no denturists, in suggesting to him that he can get these three requirements from the profession of dentistry.

Now, Madam Speaker, why do we need a committee? I am convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt that denturists, properly qualified, trained and experienced, should be allowed to work directly for the public. I base this on a mass of material which I have gathered from many sources both from within and without the boundaries of Manitoba, and I am convinced that these people can be a real help to the dental profession in giving to the public of Manitoba the dental service to which they are entitled. I admit, however, that my information has been acquired for the purpose of building up my case for the denturists. Many members of this House feel as I do, and we are supported by a large body of public opinion.

The Minister and his predecessor, on the other hand, have been convinced by the dentists and by a mass of material which they have accumulated over the years that to support the denturists would be to lower the standards of dentistry in Manitoba that would result in the loss of many of our province's dentists and would result in the closing of our Dental College. Many members of the House also support this point of view.

When this resolution is passed, Madam Speaker, I think that both sides, while the committee is studying these matters, especially those members on the committee, should forget all about the partisan material that has been gathered and stated in debates in this House, and concentrate on exacting, unbiased facts on which we in the Legislature can base an opinion perhaps one year hence.

We must also watch, I think, in the light of what the Minister said the other afternoon, that when this committee does visit the other provinces to the west of us they should be very careful to make sure that over-exuberant professional people in the departments in these provinces do not try to lead the committee around by the nose and only show them one side of the story.

There are many specific reasons, Madam Speaker, why we should have a committee, and I have a number of these and their contradiction that I think this committee should clear up. First of all, the Minister said in his speech the other day that Saskatchewan in 1960 rescinded their law. The reason that he gave for this was because they needed more dentists. In the same speech he admitted that some of the graduates from our own School of Dentistry in ..

(Mr. Groves, Cont'd.) . . . Manitoba went to Saskatchewan to practise, and in addition I know of denturists who have left this province and gone to Saskatchewan and are now practising their craft, to the best of my information, legally for the public in Saskatchewan. These are two points of view, Madam Speaker, that must be cleared up by this committee, that we're not going to clear it up if we debate it for the next ten years in this House.

The Minister also said in his speech that he wants denturists and technicians to aid in the field of dental health, and he wants more and better dentistry for the people of Manitoba. On the other hand, the dentists say that the denturists are no good, that they are bootleggers, and the dentists employ a private Gestapo to close them up. So who is right in this respect, Madam Speaker? Another point that should be cleared up by our committee.

In Alberta we have a situation where the Minister of Health of this province telephoned the Minister of Health in the Province of Alberta, and was told that the situation in Alberta where denturists are allowed to practise for the public, was chaotic. On the other hand, a telephone call to the Minister of Labour of the Province of Alberta, who actually administers the Denturists' Act in that province, and he advises that everything is fine. So I think the committee, Madam Speaker, has a job to do in straightening out and finding out who is right in this respect.

In British Columbia, a committee or commission was set up similar to what we are doing here, to study this whole matter before legislation is brought into the House. In a long distance telephone call three days ago I was advised that while this committee was sitting that the dentists in the Province of British Columbia endeavoured to close up the denturists who were operating at that time. In an effort to try and confirm this I am informed by the dentists of British Columbia that this is not so. So who is right, Madam Speaker? Another problem for this committee to solve.

The dentists claim that their denture clinic is doing great things. A year ago when I produced my figures on some 14,000 visitations to illegal denturists, I read in the report of the Denture Clinic, I am not sure of this figure but it seems to me it was around 3,000, to wit, those figures that I produced a year ago, those figures that I mentioned earlier in my address this afternoon, the denturists claim that the vast majority of the general public are not patronizing the Denture Clinic but are patronizing their establishments. So the committee should find out what the right facts are in these respects.

The dental technicians, who work for the denturists, seem to be solidly behind the dentists. The denturists, on the other hand, say that they have privately met with these technicians and that privately these technicians agree with the denturists that they should be allowed to practise their craft directly to the public, and they state further that they cannot come out into the open with this point of view for fear of losing their jobs or of some other form of reprisal from the dental profession. So here we have the third party in this eternal triangle making one statement to the dentists and making another statement to the denturists. Who is right, Madam Speaker? Here is another thing that our committee should have to dig into.

This committee should also find out, because there are conflicting stories in this respect as well, why is it that in Alberta this Act is administered by the Department of Labour rather than the Department of Health?

We are told, Madam Speaker, that there is a dentist shortage, and yet in the Financial Post articles to which I referred earlier we find that where denturists are practising directly for the public that the proportion of dentists per thousand of population is most favourable. Only Ontario has a better picture and I'm not sure at this moment what the law is in Ontario in connection with technicians, but in Alberta there is one dentist for every 2,977 population; British Columbia, one dentist for every 2,426. These are the two provinces with the best ratio of dentists to the population and yet these are the two provinces where denturists are allowed to practise their craft directly to the public. This doesn't stand up, Madam Speaker, in the light of some of the arguments that we received from the dental profession, and I think it is the job of this committee to determine which of these facts are right, or why this should be.

There are many others, Madam Speaker, and those of us who have sat through the debates in this House on this subject have listened time and again to arguments supporting both sides that conflict with each other. And as I said earlier I'm convinced that the only way that we're going to find out the actual facts and to reconcile these arguments or points of view is to set up

(Mr. Groves, Cont'd.) . . . a committee whose sole job would be to do just that.

There are, Madam Speaker, two things however which still bother me. One is that the dentists could, after this House rises, increase the staff of their private Gestapo and use the legislation which they have at the moment and which is not being changed by this resolution, to close up the technician establishments which they would like to see closed, and in the event of our committee coming back with a recommendation that it would be all right for denturists to practise their craft directly to the public, there would be in fact none to practise. It is also possible that the dental technicians in the meantime could in anticipation of a favourable report find that they could thumb their noses at the dentists and we might find a large number of new establishments opened up while this committee is meeting. I hope that both of these groups will exercise restraint during the period that this committee is meeting and that a gentleman's agreement between the two of them might be effected in order to maintain the present status quo, at least until our committee reports.

The government by this resolution, Madam Speaker, and this House, if the resolution passes, is recognizing the fact that there are three groups involved in this triangle and they're setting up a committee of the House to enquire into the situation and to recommend a course of action to this Legislature, and I want to go on record now, Madam Speaker, as saying this: for any of these groups to flout this while the committee is meeting would be in my opinion be contempt of this Legislature. And, Madam Speaker, this should be dealt with accordingly by you if it happens, and I serve notice that if this does happen I will demand this of Your Honour.

What do these three groups, the dentists, the technicians and the denturists really want? They're not really that much different than the rest of us. They want good, comfortable and healthy working conditions. They want a fair income. They want the assurance of security so that they can live respectably and happily and to have a home and good living conditions for their family. And this applies, as I said before, to all three of these groups. They want a continuous education program to keep them abreast of improved methods in their profession or their craft, and they want and they merit our respect. They all want to eliminate unfair competition; they want to eliminate unfair labour practices; and they want to eliminate bootleg dental establishments; and they want to eliminate poorly trained dental technicians -- all of them are interested in this. The public, on the other hand, wants available facilities, facilities that are available when they have need of them, and they want good service. They don't want to have to wait two months to get in to see a dentist. They want reasonable prices, not only for denture work but for dental work. They want prices, particularly those in the lower incomes, that bear some semblance to their ability to pay. And we, as members of the Legislature, Madam Speaker, want more dentists and we want improved dental health for more people in the Province of Manitoba. And I'm convinced, Madam Speaker, that the points of view of these three groups can be reconciled. I'm convinced that all of these things that I have mentioned can be accomplished, and I think, Madam Speaker, despite opinions that have been expressed to the contrary, it is the job of this committee to do this, to do this and to bring back their recommendations as to what legislation would be necessary, to the session of the Legislature next year.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, may I ask a question to the last speaker? Will he permit a question? The question is: after the two long biased speeches made by the Minister of Health and the honourable member who just took his seat, my question is: if the resolution is coming up right now to give the denturists full rights what they ask for, would you support it?

MR. GROVES: Yes.

MR. GRAY: Thank you. You are the only honest man around the House in the meantime.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, may we now have the . . . resolution on Ways and Means?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister, and the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I'm happy that I may be able to say a few words on the budget here this afternoon. I thought the previous speaker might bring about a debate that might last till 5:30.

However, at this time I'd like to make a few remarks in connection with the budget that was brought in by the First Minister who is also the Provincial Treasurer of this province. When I think of the expenditures that this House approves and the revenues that we intend to collect to make those disbursements, questions come to mind. And I wonder is this what the people of the province want us to do, to spend the money the way we are doing? Do they desire or want increased services? How much can we afford? Or how much further do we go in redistributing the wealth of the people? In fact, we are distributing the future income of our people when we borrow to meet our commitments, be it current or capital. We cannot continue in this manner indefinitely or we'll all be the poorer for it if we do so. At the same time I think we're setting a poor example of a government to the people of this province as managers of our public affairs by doing this.

When I first came into this House I got the feeling this government was very sure of itself and knew where they were going. They were displaying confidence in the future, but not so now. This has changed, and very much so. I would like to compare the government when it came in, some three or four or five years ago, to a newly wed couple starting a new home, and rather than trying to make ends meet, start off by fully equipping, modernizing their new home, or getting a new home and mortgaging it and then perhaps a family coming along in due course, and so in a short time the husband as the breadwinner has very tough sledding meeting his obligations, consisting of monthly payments most likely; mortgage payments, living expenses, doctor bills. As a result he ends up borrowing for living expenses, and this can happen repeatedly from past experiences that we know of. Trying to consolidate his debts but falling farther and farther behind and finally ending up in despair. This is typical of our province's operation of its finances. We are borrowing every year to make ends meet and continually consolidating until our credit will be exhausted.

I do not intend to go into the figures, as they were given by the Leader of the Official Opposition and also by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. I think they were given in great detail so that I need not go into this at all. But I think the figure that he mentioned was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$570 million. And here I might point out that this \$570 million does not include the commitments and guarantees, or future grants to hospitals, school divisions, school districts, that will have to be paid as time goes along. I feel that we have embarked on too many programs from which we cannot retract, programs, the cost of which are increasing from year to year and are beyond our control largely because of the centralization that this government has brought about.

We have also practically killed the volunteer effort in the fields of hospitalization, welfare, self-help organizations, and this is also making inroads now in the education field. The average citizen no longer has the feeling of belonging, or being a part of society that has influence as to what is being done, or what should be done, permitting him to be a part of it. Everything seems to be controlled from the top down as though we were in a dictatorship. I feel we should try and regain lost ground in this respect.

Madam Speaker, when I take a look at the details of estimated revenue I find that the person that has acquired -- should I say bad habits of smoking and drinking -- that he's made to put up one-sixth, roughly one-sixth of the budget over and above what the other taxpayers in this province are paying. We had some good discussions in committee on the attorney-general's department in connection with deterrents and this probably could be a deterrent but I don't know whether it works out that way.

Anyway, the revenues are increasing from year to year and we notice increases expected for the coming year. I also note that the large amounts that we expect to take in come from gasoline and motor fuel taxes. We also have the income of the individuals and the income taxes from corporations which amount to \$25 million and \$18 million respectively. Then we also have the equalization payments from the Dominion Government and the succession duties which are being collected under agreement by the Federal Government which make up \$21 million, which is another substantial sum. The treasury therefore collects some \$109 million of the estimated revenue.

(Mr. Froese, Cont'd.) . . .

We then go on to the Attorney-General's department and we have another big item here of \$16 million being collected by the Liquor Control Commission, and I also note that in the Attorney-General's Department the Land Titles fees provide a revenue of some \$600,000 in that department over and above the expenditures made. But when we come to the Natural Resources Department we find that we are spending more than we are taking in, and I feel that this should not be the case, especially here in Manitoba when we have so many natural resources at our disposal and that need development. We are spending some \$6,368,000 and we are expecting to get in some \$4,917,000, and in this connection I would briefly like to refer to the statement made by the Honourable Duff Roblin, Premier and Provincial Treasurer of Manitoba to the plenary session Federal Provincial Conference, Ottawa, November 25, 1963. I don't know whether members of this House have all read it. I feel the Minister should be complimented on the presentation. I think it is a very good report, although I don't agree with all of what was said.

On page 4 he mentioned that today the provincial share of our fiscal resources is inadequate as far as Manitoba is concerned, and he approved of the collection agreement as the proper step in correcting the undesirable tendency towards strongly centralized financial control which were a product of wartime emergencies. I fully support this statement that was made.

On page 6 he mentioned that we insist "that the crux of the situation lies with the need to establish a more effective and realistic partnership than we have had heretofore. Previous to that . . ." he explained and goes into the partnership matter and I also endorse that section. However, on the following page, page 7, we deal with another matter and this is the concept of distributing the income of natural resources that the different provinces collect or receive, and here I feel that I should differ from the First Minister. I feel that natural resources are and belong to the province that has them and develops them. I don't think that we should share the results and the benefits in other provinces from a province that takes initiative and develops its natural resources so that they get revenue from this. I feel -- and I think if the situation in Manitoba was one that we had developed our natural resources more fully and that we were deriving larger benefits, I doubt whether this statement would appear in this presentation and I, for one, would take exception to this and certainly do not approve of the statement made in this connection.

Perhaps I should read the two paragraphs: "Under the present scheme equalization is to the national per capita average a return from the standard tax field. Manitoba does not accept this retreat from the former high level of equalization as being consistent with the concept of national equality of standards. This concept demands in our view that equalization should be to the top province and that such equalization should be paid not as a grant or privilege but as a basic rise due to partners in this consideration. This has to do with the top province, where I think the situation has now changed where it has to do with the two top provinces and they are no longer getting the grants averaged out to the top province."

He goes further on: "We support the inclusion of a natural resource revenue factor and the concept of equalization, equalization limited to the standard taxes on personal, corporation income and succession duties was an historical accident of the tax rental agreement. Fiscal equity in Canada must reflect that the greatest disparities occur elsewhere such as in the return from the natural resources of the provinces. It would be unrealistic not to provide for the continued equalization of these widely varied natural resources revenues."

I feel, Madam Speaker, that we are just not doing a job. If we were doing a job we wouldn't have reason to complain on this matter. On the following page, where he puts forward Manitoba's proposal -- I should probably read the five items. He goes on to say: "I now propose to summarize briefly what Manitoba has proposed for immediate adjustment of the existing financial arrangements. 1. That the yields of the standard taxes at the rates established for each year under the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act 1961 be continued and that these yields be equalized to the top province as pledged by the party now forming the Government of Canada. 2. That natural resource revenues continue to be equalized to the national average and that equalization payments be given for this factor as computed under the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act 1961." This is the one I object to. "3. That consideration be given to extending the equalization principle to the whole provincial revenue base as far as may be

(Mr. Froese cont'd) practicable. 4. That guarantees established in the present arrangements be continued. 5. That the collection agreements be retained and enlarged to provide some freedom of tax policy decision to both partners consistent with the effective administration."

Those were the proposals made, and further on in the report these are discussed and he brings up some other matters as far as co-operative federalism and some approaches to continuing co-operation, contracting out, a proposal for a continuing secretariat.

Madam Speaker, in going through the report I make this one exception and I feel very strongly on it. However, I will proceed with what other arguments I wish to bring up in connection with the budget.

MR. ROBLIN: ask my honourable friend to expatiate on the one point he doesn't agree with. I'm not quite following him there.

MR. FROESE: Well, the matter I didn't agree with was the statement you made here: "We support the inclusion of a natural resource revenue factor and the concept of equalization." I don't go along with that.

MR. ROBLIN: I ask my honourable friend - why not? If gold is where providence placed it, and we can't control that kind of thing, what is the argument that he makes to justify his position?

MR. FROESE: Well I feel that the natural resources belong to the provinces and that they are not a matter for the Federal government to decide as to how the revenue should be distributed, and that they should receive the revenues in the first place.

MR. ROBLIN: exhausting my honourable friend's courtesy, for which I thank him, I ask him why he does not feel that this is not a proper matter for equalization whether or not they belong to the province. After all, we're seeking standard levels of services here through this system. --(Interjection) -- No, my friend has been kind enough to answer questions. I appreciate it.

MR. FROESE: I feel that there are other revenues that the Dominion Government can collect and distribute other than revenues from natural resources.

In going over, Madam Speaker, the estimates that are also before us at the present time, I noted the ones that have received a particular increase this present year, and the ones that stand out more particular, are the Agricultural estimates and the Welfare, as well as Education, but I think we can understand that education costs are rising from year to year, and also in some of the divisions that were left out on previous occasions have now come in, so that extra monies are needed because these people are now getting higher grants, but when we come to the matter of Welfare I feel that this is really a big problem and it is not peculiar to Manitoba. All the provinces in Canada today seem to have this problem of welfare costs and I think we should take a good look at it. We note also that the Federal Government when it recently came out with its spending program for 1964-65 that there, too, the federal spending on welfare is away up. Family allowances are up \$3,100,000, increased to \$546 million. I note also that the public debt charges are up \$156 million to \$1,037,000,000, so that we are seeing increases taking place in the federal government's program as well. The federal share of hospital insurance up \$35 million to \$420 million, so that here too the welfare program is taking on greater costs as we go along.

Now what is the answer to this whole question of welfare? I feel, particularly here in Manitoba, that we should have a basic structure of assistance that we provide, then go ahead and decentralize this whole area of welfare. I feel by centralizing it we are increasing the costs and there are tendencies for people to move into the urban centres where they receive more in welfare. Therefore, naturally I feel that decentralization would help in this respect, so the people in rural areas would also have a say in the matter because they know the conditions in the rural parts -- in the rural centres -- and therefore I think they could use their influence and help the government in this matter.

But I don't think this is the complete answer. I feel that the reason why we do have more and more people on welfare has to do with the unemployment. More people are unemployed and, as a result, more people will go on welfare. The same holds true for automation. As we have more automation, we will find that less people will have employment and this will also have a bearing on the cost of welfare.

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

I would like to read an editorial which was in "Canada," month of March, 1964. This has to do with the matter of automation and how it affects employment and what these people have to say as a solution to the matter, and I read. 'Said a union man last fall, 'when machines begin to have voices and begin to talk to each other, that isn't the mere technological change.' Said a sociologist, 'when you realize that machines displace muscles then later displace minds, and now in turn are displacing other machines.' Said a professor, 'changes once measured in epochs and centuries now occur within a single generation or even within a single decade.' The bogey they were all talking about was automation.

"The Canadian labour organizer sums up the feeling of many people. The aimless, unplanned, explosive and destructive introduction of automation is reaching a point where it is no longer tolerable. We can solve it as we will temporarily, but none of this can do more than allay the overwhelming burden that automation has put on the American worker. If you haven't thought seriously about automation, you should. These men are serious. They see on the horizon something that could turn the life we know into a nightmare. Automation is not, it is true, a mere technological change, but it is the extension of something familiar, mechanization. Its very familiarity has let it creep up on us almost unawares. Mechanization has reduced the work week by an average of three hours every decade since 1900. At that rate, work would vanish entirely in little more than a century. Both the rate is accelerating. IBM is installing machines that can read typewritten pages at 1800 words a minute and turn them into punched tapes that automatically operate your teleprinter. That is what is happening to office help.

"In the 10 years of the 1950's, Canadian automobile production climbed by more than a third. At the same time, the number of production people employed by auto manufacturers dropped six percent and their work week was reduced. That is what is happening to factory help. When computers are brought into an office, out of every 100 jobs relating to the work the computers do, 25 are immediately eliminated. That is what is happening to accountants, bookkeepers and clerks.

"The top man in a firm producing automation equipment says that every \$5000 invested in his products enables the buyer to dismiss one worker. The figure will soon be lowered. One Canadian union official thinks the figure will drop below 2,000. For a \$200,000 investment, management could dismiss 100 workers. All this is because automation is deliberately intended not to create new jobs. Even though the population grows, even though production grows, in many cases automation is deliberately designed to eliminate jobs. By one U.S. estimate, a million jobs a year are lost to automation. We may expect an annual figure of 100,000 in Canada soon. The work force is around six million, about 400,000 or six percent of whom are now unemployed. Automation could jump that unemployment figure to 7-1/2 percent in one year, nine percent the next, and 12 percent by the end of 1967 and so on.

"What is the solution? Already workers are offering the most radical, the most extraordinary answers, and perhaps because most laymen feel the whole subject is too complicated to be grasped, these men's ideas go largely unheeded, even unheard. Here is a British-born economist, Robert Theobold: 'A time will come when we will be paying people for not working. We need new principles guaranteeing income for everyone, specifically designed to break the link between jobs and income. This due income from government should be given as an absolute, constitutional right.' Are government handouts the answer?" And so the article goes on.

I think this is all important because if we want to remedy the matter of welfare, we have to recognize these facts. I have yet to see an offer to the solution coming forward by any of the old line parties. I feel that we in Social Credit have a partial answer and that we believe that production and consumption should be equalized, that we should have a national dividend paid to all people in Canada and this would in a partial way offset welfare costs. Welfare costs will have to be paid and they have to be paid by the taxpayer. This in turn means that we have to collect taxes which are in effect wealth, and that we have to redistribute it and I for one feel that we cannot continually go on increasing this amount that we are distributing -- and distributing other people's wealth.

We all know that there is a chronic shortage of purchasing power in Canada because the people in this Dominion can never buy back the foods that they produce in the first instance, so that this also contributes to a shortage which, if it wasn't there, I feel that welfare would also

(Mr. Froese, Cont'd.) . . . be helped. And with unemployment increasing and with automation increasing, as we have heard in this article, I think we should be real concerned in this connection and with this problem.

When I go through the estimates I feel one thing that is very important to me is the matter of agricultural research. I have mentioned this in committee and I feel that it bears repeating once more. I feel that we are spending too little on the matter of plant breeding and getting new varieties of cereals, of grains and of feeds that we need in the production of our crops. We note that the farmers' income in Manitoba in 1963 was down from \$174 million to \$120 million, and we can see further decreases if we do not have the proper varieties of grain to grow. We know that all the early varieties of flax were taken off the recommended list because of rust. We know that our Selkirk wheat which has stood up very well over a long period of years was also affected by rust last year. I feel that we should do more in this line in getting varieties ahead of time that will stand up because the farmers' income is completely dependent on the government in this respect, that they provide the proper and necessary varieties that he can grow a good crop. This will in turn also provide revenue for the government, because if the farmer has a poor crop, naturally the government will collect less in taxes.

Another matter that I feel I should bring up, and I have done this on previous occasions, has to do with the insurance companies. We know that the insurance companies have large amounts of moneys that they invest annually, and have invested at the present time, and that these companies are restricted under law to invest only so much in stocks and shares of companies that in turn indicate the growth in our communities. I feel that this restriction should be lifted, or at least they should be allowed to invest more. At the present time they are bound to invest in government bonds and government municipal school bonds and so on which is, in effect, the debt of this country. I feel that we should allow them to invest in the growth rather than in the debt of this country so that we will have greater production and have the resources to get more industries going.

Madam Speaker, I also feel very strongly on the point of getting industries established and seeing to it that risk capital is provided and in existence to start new industries. In this connection I would recommend that the province set floor prices for certain products in agriculture. I think the province can afford this because in very many instances this would cost them very little. I'm particularly thinking of potatoes at the present time. I think there is a movement afoot to have a potato marketing board, or a vegetable marketing board concerning potatoes, and if this comes about it would restrict young farmers entering in that market because it would be more or less a closed shop. If we had a floor price, the farmer could feel secure that he could go into this venture of producing potatoes; he could thence go about and set up a starch factory which would take care of all the surplus. In this way I feel that we could get an industry going in southern Manitoba and also elsewhere, because potatoes are not only grown in southern Manitoba, they're further north up in the Carberry -- or in that particular area a lot of potatoes are being grown.

So I think we should take a little imagination and venture into this field in setting floor prices as a province. If this is not done, I feel we'll have more bankruptcies -- we had one recently in my constituency where just such a grower's plant went bankrupt. The farmer shareholders lost every cent they invested although the Development Fund, which also provided some of the funds at an earlier date, they received every penny, so that here I feel this is a little unjust.

We had a similar occasion just very recently happen in Saskatchewan where also a potato plant went bankrupt, but there the government underwrote the cost and gave the producers something for the potatoes that they lost. I think we could apply that here in Manitoba as well.

We know that the risk capital has to come about, it has to come from somewhere, and it will have to come from the people that have the money. And in order to get those people to invest in such ventures as the potato industry, I think we should give them some support in the way of floor prices as I mentioned, so that we will get this necessary capital, risk capital made available to the people. Also, as I have previously mentioned, I think in many years this would cost us nothing because the farmers are resourceful and are trying to make ends meet. They would do their best to see to it -- if it was up to them they would do their utmost to see things going and not come to the government for help in a normal year.

(Mr. Froese, Cont'd.) . . .

A further matter that I wish to touch on has to do with the money that we continually see in the estimates or in the capital supply which should actually go in the estimates. This matter I think was also touched on by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. When we see monies capitalized which are going to be spent on research, I feel we're off base. We have a certain amount included in the estimates -- I think around \$550,000 -- but we also note from the report given to us by the Minister that a further \$425,000 is being capitalized and I feel this should not be done. This should come from current revenue.

Likewise, I feel that the highway program and related projects should not be capitalized but should come from current revenue and be included in the estimates. I feel that we will be continuing building roads -- we will have to continue building roads, and why capitalize this? Eventually we will have such a large debt that we will have a job just making our payments from year to year without adding any new burdens for our road program.

I think those more or less complete -- I had a few other items down, but I think I'll conclude my remarks at this point.

MR. R. SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question? -- (Interjection) -- I don't know whether you can, but I've always been fascinated with the proposal on balancing consumption and production, and knowing that the honourable member doesn't agree with socialistic ideas, I was wondering if he could explain how one does balance production consumption without state intervention.

MR. FROESE: Well, the only way this can be brought about is to use the Bank of Canada that we now have, put it to the disposal of the government so that they can pay out a national dividend to all the people and in this way equalize consumption and production.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, would the Member for Wellington permit a question? If he would, I would like to ask him if he believes in -- (Interjection) --

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, 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 2:30 Thursday afternoon.