

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:30 o'clock, Wednesday, May 22, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Orders of the Day

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could take a moment to discuss the order of business for today and also for tomorrow morning. It would be our suggestion that we remain in the House today and continue to deal with second readings of bills. There are approximately 17 government bills still to have second reading. There are approximately 15, as I recall, private bills of a public nature and then there are 3 private bills as well. So it would seem that that would be a sufficient amount of work to keep us occupied in the three sessions today. Then we could give notice - presuming that there will be enough work ready for Law Amendments - we could give notice that Law Amendments could sit tomorrow morning at 9:30. That would give a full 24 hour notice of the meeting of that committee. Move into Law Amendments tomorrow morning and then come back and clean up any other work that may be left, hopefully, not on second readings but in third readings and other matters tomorrow.

So I would suggest that course of action to the members of the House, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that we can, without unduly rushing the debate on these matters, keep steadily at second readings all day today and then move into Law Amendments tomorrow morning to do whatever business has moved on to that committee. And then from that time on we will have to judge our progress and make plans according to the progress that has been made in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it then we commence with Bill 53, where we left off yesterday?

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I thank you, thank the House for having laid this over until I was able to be back to continue with the presentation that I was making the day before yesterday.

This is the matter of individual's willing or giving their bodies or parts of their bodies for the use of the Department of Anatomy, Medical College, and I had reached the point of Section No. 4 on the concluding page of the bill where mention or suggestion is made in the bill that after removal of part of the body for purposes of the medical college the body be returned to the custody and the control of the person who would have had custody and control of the body if no direction had been made under the Act. I was inquiring about whether this procedure was preferable to the one that is followed out in cases where the Department of Anatomy has charge of the body for a year for purposes of dissection and examination and study and then at the conclusion of the year the body is buried under the auspices of the Department of Anatomy; whether there should be different treatment if only part of the body is used than if the whole body is used.

The Minister of Health may have some thoughts on this particular question. I am not pressing anything but it seems to me that it would be, well a little unsatisfactory for members of the family of the deceased if the body were taken and parts removed and the body perhaps kept for some little while and then returned to those who would have charge of the body, the next of kin or preferred claimants in this particular connection.

Now in addition to this, there are some questions that I have in my mind. It is indicated here in different parts of the Acts, proposed bill, that the person may give direction and authority for the use of either parts of the body or transfer of parts from a body and I wondered whether in this connection any prescribed forms would be used or whether it is proposed that a man should indicate in his Will just what his particular desires are: Is he willing the body or parts of the body for certain purposes to the Department of Anatomy or in what form does that direction take. It isn't indicated in the Act. I wondered whether the form could be prescribed in the Act or described, or whether it could take some such form as has been set out by the Faculty of Medicine at the local university as it is set out in the little booklet called "Service After Death" printed and published by the Department of Anatomy, the Faculty of Medicine, where it is shown what form the direction may take and what the man involved would have to set out. It's very

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) . . . simple as it is shown on these pages and could I think quite easily be included in an Act of this kind. I don't anticipate that this will be the last time that an Anatomy Act of this kind will be introduced to the House; with the great increase of transplants of one kind or another, there will be other Acts as we discover, as we learn what the actual involvements are and what some of the problems are.

But let me deal with these forms first. There is the statement of purpose, for instance, and it is simply there setting out the statement that the individual who is donating his body wishes it to be given to the Department of Anatomy and it is witnessed by another person. In an earlier form that the Department of Anatomy used it was a form in which indicated that it should be what was called a "preferred claimant". Now that description does not appear in the present Act and I don't know what it is necessary those terms be used when a person described as the one who is lawfully in possession of the body is referred to. This would be a preferred claimant or any other individual who fills the several categories, one or other of the several categories set out.

One of the things that is stressed in this pamphlet, this booklet, in addition to these forms, a "statement of desire" and then another one is "waiver of claim," in which the preferred claimant or the person lawfully in possession of the body waives any claim to the body; there's another form and then there's a burial arrangement request for these particular forms. Now it is stressed here, although it isn't indicated in the Act, that in the former Anatomy Act - I believe, I am not sure - it was pointed out that the wish of the individual should not be included in a Will because as it is said here, a Will is often not read until after burial and the direction of course then could not be carried out.

Another thing mentioned in this booklet published by the Faculty of Medicine, Department of Anatomy, another thing that is stressed and is not mentioned in the Act, proposed bill, is that there be no embalming. The body should not be embalmed and the body should not be autopsied prior to the handing of it over for whatever purpose to the Department of Anatomy or the Faculty of Medicine. This is emphasized in several places in the course of this little booklet. Now it is based, I think, on the present Anatomy Act, but I think applies equally well to the present one and says here among other things. The Department of Anatomy will not accept embalmed or autopsied bodies and it may refuse bodies unsuitable for other reasons.

These are certain conditions that must be set up and there should be controls. I feel that some reference somewhere in the Act could be made to these conditions. Then it is suggested, it goes into the procedure at the time of burial of the remains after the Department of Anatomy no longer has any need for them, and it is indicated that full and complete respect is shown the bodies of those who have decided to help the advancement of study in the Department of Anatomy, full and complete respect is shown to the bodies of those who have decided in this way to help to advance the studies in that field. When a body is taken and buried by the Department of Anatomy, all funeral expenses are paid by the University, but if it should happen that members of the family or relatives should wish to arrange for a private burial of their own, then that will be at their expense.

There are a number of things mentioned in this booklet which I think could be very useful, not in re-writing but in probably amending or adding to this Act in one or several different places, taking into consideration the need for an unembalmed body, unautopsied body, I think those are the only conditions, but it must be suitable in other ways for the purposes of the Department.

I don't know that I have anything more to say in this connection, Mr. Speaker. I would leave that and if there are any further comments they can wait until the time of the sitting of Law Amendments. Thank you very much.—(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, The Honourable Member for St. Boniface was asking me what was the title of this booklet. It is called "Service After Death". It is published by the University of Manitoba Faculty of Medicine, Department of Anatomy.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 28. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I see that the Honourable Member for Rhineland is not here. I would ask you to -- and he has the adjournment on the next four bills. Bill No. 87 would appear to be the next one, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 87. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned debate on this particular bill for one of my colleagues, who has indicated to me since that time that he has no comments.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. LYON: Bill No. 81 would be the next, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 81. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to add in connection with this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear the honourable member's comments but I believe I can put the question.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 100. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there's only a few comments that we have to make in respect to this Bill. In particular, there is the number of recommendations that were made by the Civil Service Superannuation Board and the actuaries. These have been omitted from the Bill and I would suggest that the Minister would seriously consider these being included. Now the first item is that the Civil Service Association would like to see that the retirement age be permitted to be at 60 with full pension rights at that time. Apparently I am led to understand there is a surplus in the Superannuation Fund in excess of \$4 million, Mr. Speaker, and this is the reason why they would like to have this.

The other item, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this, happens to be that they have many members who would like to be able to take their pension rights at the earlier retiring age, because many of them have had disabilities and so on and consequently they cannot carry on. And further to that, Mr. Speaker, there is the point about having the best five years utilized in figuring out the amount of their pensions. I think those are only the two items, Mr. Speaker, that have been left out of this bill. I will have further to comment in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N.D.P.) (Radisson): I'm sorry that the Honourable the Provincial Secretary isn't present because I think that this would be a proper time for me to make an appeal for a reassessment of pensions being paid at the present time. I realize that the bill that we're dealing with is the Superannuation Act changes for the future, but it is of course quite within order when the matter of superannuation is opened up to consider the payment of the pensions at the present time.

I've made an appeal over a number of years for increases in the pensions of some of our civil servants who have been on retirement for some considerable period of time and whose pensions have not been raised to care of increased costs of living; and while I appreciate the fact that in some respects it's just their -- some might consider it's just their tough luck to have been born too soon to be able to have the higher pensions, which of course many will agree they're not high enough yet -- but unfortunately, however, they have not been able in many cases to maintain a reasonable standard of living at the pensions being awarded as a result of their past service.

If I recall correctly, there are somewhere in the neighborhood of 50 or 60 or more whose pensions are less than \$50.00, and then varying degrees, and there's a fair number whose pension is less than \$100.00 a month. While it might be fair in some respects to say this is based on their service, I do think though as far as our civil service is concerned in particular, of course that's under our jurisdiction here, that we could well recognize the invaluable service they gave to the province, and indeed, of course, to the various boards and commissions under control of the government whose pensions are paid out of the Superannuation Fund.

At the present time the Honourable Minister in charge, the Provincial Secretary and also in his capacity of that of Minister of Public Utilities is well aware of a group of individuals whose pensions are paid out of the Superannuation Fund endeavouring to have their pensions increased -- and I'm referring to a number of pensioners who were members of the Winnipeg Electric Company which of course was taken over by the Manitoba Hydro -- the pensions being paid to them as the result of their take-over far less than that had they in effect been continuing employees of Manitoba Hydro.

So I want, Mr. Speaker, without belaboring the point, to make once again the appeal that I have made in the past, without too much success, on behalf of those people that we've honoured in this Assembly from time to time who rendered invaluable service to the province and to the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... community whose pension should be reviewed once again and should be increased.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 104. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RUSSELL I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this Bill because I hadn't had an opportunity of looking at it. I'm quite in accord to have it go to Law Amendments and leave it at that, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE Q. C. (Selkirk): Without dealing specifically with this Bill but dealing generally with the Municipal Act, I think the time has come, Mr. Speaker, for this House to take a very close look at adopting the principle of deferring local improvement levies insofar as they're applicable to the homes of individuals whose chief source of livelihood is derived from old age security and supplementary benefits. I have found in my experience as municipal solicitor that we can't stand in the way of progress, but at the same time sometimes as a result of developing a certain area we come across old homes occupied by old age pensioners who really cannot afford to pay the additional levy that is imposed against their land as a result of these improvements. and I feel that we should take a very serious look towards evolving a practice of permitting a municipality, subject to the approval of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, to defer local improvement levies insofar as they effect properties of these individuals.

Now dealing specifically with the bill, I find that it is quite acceptable, but I also feel that I should deal with some matters that have been raised during the course of this debate. One matter that was raised was why should there be reference to the City of Winnipeg and the City of St. Boniface. Well, I think the reason is quite apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the Municipal Act does not apply to the City of Winnipeg nor to the City of St. Boniface unless it is specifically made to apply.

Now the other thing that was raised was the question of the government now permitting a municipality and a school division to enter into an agreement. I'm very pleased that this has been enacted as law, but I do regret the fact that we spent so much time during this session debating a resolution, and I'm beginning to wonder whether or no we were allowed to debate that resolution for the purpose of giving to a member of the government side of the House any accolade for a change in this legislation. I think that legislation was considered long before that resolution came into the House and I certainly don't like that type of practice to prevail here. Let's be honest with each other. Why didn't the Minister get up on his seat and say, we are introducing this resolution, or we are amending the Municipal Act? Nevertheless we wasted several afternoons in this House debating something which the government knew was going to be enacted into legislation. I think it was a waste of time.

Now it has been suggested that we should give similar power to municipalities and to the Metro Corporation. Well, I think they already possess that power, Mr. Speaker. Municipalities were given the power in 1964 to make these agreements, and Metro was given the power to make similar agreements with municipalities in 1966.

As to the euphemism that we are now practicing in changing the expression, "an indigent person" to a "person in need", I do hope that that results in a reduction of the cost of welfare to the municipalities; otherwise I don't think it's worthy of any further comment.

Regarding the air space deal, I have no objection to a municipality being held liable under the Municipal Act where they permit someone to use air space for a passageway or something else. I think that's only just and equitable.

Now there was another point raised, and that was in connection with derelict cars. I can appreciate the fact that it may seem unjust to hold an owner of property liable for a derelict car being found on his property, but I know that that is the policy under the Public Health Act, that an owner is liable for anything that occurs on his land just the same as it is under the Weed Control Act, and I think that what we should do is let this section go the way it is for a year trial to see whether or no it is going to work any hardship on any owner before we start changing it, because I can visualize cases where it'd be an easy way for an individual to escape liability simply by saying, well I didn't know anything about it.

Well, there's another question raised and that was in connection with changing the date that taxes would be due from October 31st to December 31st. Now I don't think that that change

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.)... in the Municipal Act is going to affect municipalities at all, by reason of the fact that a municipality now has the power under the Municipal Act to change the date that taxes will be due in that municipality and it is not bound by the December 31st deadline. It can move its date up to the 1st of August or any other time that it wishes and taxes are payable at par in that municipality up until 30 days after the date fixed in that by-law, so the mere fact that we change the date in the Municipal Act for taxes being due on December 31st instead of October 31st, that will only affect those municipalities who have not enacted a by-law under the provisions of Section 1090 of the Municipal Act. So in all respects I feel this is a good Bill and I'm going to support it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK Q.C. (St. John's.); I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might take a moment and direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery. I don't know the name of the school that these young people have come from, but I would like to extend to them the good wishes and the welcome of the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly today, and congratulate them for making the effort to be here.

Bill No. 52. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, this is a new Bill in regards to local authority elections and a revision of the whole Election Act as far as salaries are concerned, and in my opinion it's a very useful Bill. It's been brought up-to-date in regards to recent court actions and so on, and I think it's a trend that's quite acceptable to the electors and municipal authorities.

There are one of two clauses in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, that I have some reservations on. The Bill itself does away entirely with the ratepayer as we knew it under the old Act as far as ratepayer elections is concerned, but there is one clause that says that a person can go on the electors' roll if they have \$100.00 worth of assessment as a non-resident. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is very insignificant and I think it's a useless sort of a clause inasmuch under the present-day assessments \$100.00 wouldn't be too much land and not too much of a building - I suggest maybe one of the Chick Sale type might involve \$100.00 but not any more - and it would be a nuisance factor in my opinion to have \$100.00 of assessment to put an individual as a non-resident on the roll. I would suggest that this particular clause should read that any non-resident that is on the assessment roll should be entitled to be put on the electors' roll regardless of assessment. This would do away with the nuisance value and I think set it up a little more in current line of thinking.

The fact that this particular Bill now when it's passed does away entirely with any reference to ratepayers in regards to money by-laws - this is to resident electors that are on the roll - that in making up the roll, it's made up at a specified time in the year which does the full year for various types of elections, be it school boards, school divisions and what not. I think this is a very useful thing, but I suggest that in the one portion of the Act where they claim that a person must make a declaration as to what ward they would want to be on the list on, could set up some kind of confusion at a time when elections were held in the off-season. For instance, if a person was qualified under say two or three wards and he elects to vote in Ward 1, an election of some type comes on in Ward 3, which he could be qualified, he's disqualified himself and might have to go through a certain procedure to get back on again. This could set up some type of confusion.

And the other one I'll come back to, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that again in this Bill they are showing references to ballot papers as to the markings on them, and I wish to protest this type of paper to be hung in a ballot booth with a suggestion as to where you shall mark your ballot, whether it be by an X or by the proportional representation for it part of it. They have in the Act a ballot that is for a money by-law which has no markings. It just suggests that you will mark your preference for or against with an X, and I'm going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, and in Law Amendments I'm going to be prepared to move an amendment to the effect that I think that these markings on ballot papers to be hung in ballot booths, the markings should be taken off and instructions hung above it as to how you shall mark a ballot. I think this is very suggestive and it certainly does give some benefits to the person that happens - the name happens to be in the marking of which that particular mark advertises to.

(MR. DOW cont'd.)....

So with these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite thankful that the Election Act has been brought up-to-date and that it is current, and we will look forward to some of the discussions in Law Amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding from when the Minister spoke that this Bill 52 would be dealt with by the committee which is to be set up under the resolution standing in the Minister's name, a Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs to meet during the session - between now and the next session - dealing with the revisions of the Municipal Act, and it's my understanding that this would be referred to that committee. In view of the fact that debate has taken place, however, am I to assume that we're to give it second reading and then it will be referred to the committee for further study? The Attorney-General nods his head, in which case I have very little to say on it. If I'm on that committee, or members of our group of course, we will have a number of points to bring up.

There's one I would like to bring to the attention of the House and it's the one which calls for a deposit by candidates who stand for local election. This is something new really in the municipal level. I can't really see the benefit of it; I can't see what we hope to achieve; and I can't see the need for it. I question the value or the need of a deposit on the provincial or federal levels, and I certainly wouldn't go along with a deposit being required for people running for local office, whether it be school board or council. In a local municipality, an attempt is made to get everyone interested and there shouldn't be the problem, or the hurdle of requiring a deposit to be placed and a forfeiture of the deposit if less than a certain percentage of votes is achieved at the polls. I think it will inhibit elections; it will discourage people from running, and particularly at the municipal level we should try to, as I say, get people interested in running. The fact that the odd time you end up with people who run just for the sake of getting something said on the hustings isn't really all that bad. I think that even people who know they can't make it in a municipal election sometimes feel that they have something to say to the electorate, and if they have a certain thing they want to espouse, I don't think we should inhibit that; I think we should encourage it.

Now this is an all-encompassing sort of Bill; it's both a revision and there are new ideas being introduced. It's a Bill that I think is long overdue and it will take its place with the revisions in the Municipal Act itself, and once it's studied and dealt with, I think we'll have a far better Elections Act than we had in the past and it will be something that the municipal authorities will be able to live with much easier than they can with the one that they're dealing now. So with that, I'm agreeable that it goes to second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to speak at length on this Bill; I understand that we'll receive full review in the committee at a later date. I think, though, that we should look again at the question of who is qualified as an elector, and my colleague the Member for Turtle Mountain has made one suggestion for an improvement in the Bill. It seems to me that the time has come to go further than that, in that an elector should simply be a resident, that this business of having non-resident electors should be changed and that it would completely simplify the operation. The difficulty which was mentioned of having different wards and deciding in which ward you're going to vote, and possibly eliminating yourself from a vote at a later date, if we simply went to the basic rule, which is the rule that we follow in provincial elections, the rule that we follow in federal elections, and simply say that a qualified elector is a resident, then you'd simplify the whole procedure.

I think it recognizes, as well, the facts of life at this time. More and more people are tenants, particularly in our cities with large apartment blocks, and I think it is a fact that these people are in fact paying municipal taxes like anyone else because the rents are based -- the tax is one of the factors in establishing the rent. If the taxes go up the rents go up, so anyone who's living in rented premises is participating in the same way in providing municipal taxes. Having the one rule of a resident elector puts everyone on the same basis and I think would be the right thing to do, and I would propose that this amendment should be considered in this Act.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 102. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could call Bill No. 96 - it's an important

(MR. LYON cont'd) . . . . Bill, the Agricultural Credit and Development Act, - and enquire if any other members of the House wish to speak on it, because even though the Member for Rhineland holds it in his name, I think we should give other members of the House an opportunity to participate in the debate and then he can make his contribution as and when he arrives.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 96. Any member wish to speak? -- Are you prepared to go to 102? Bill No. 102. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): I adjourned debate for the Honourable Member from Radisson.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for taking the adjournment. I was out of the House the other night when this matter - the other morning rather - when this Bill was considered, and I realize and appreciate very much the fact that by and large we've had a pretty full discussion on the question of Medicare and medical services during the present session. However, the matter is of such vital importance that we cannot allow this Bill to go to committee without further vigorous protests.

I think that I would be correct in my assessment of the Bill and a review through the media of the press - I must confess - of the debates that have taken place thus far on this Bill, to think that I can be equally critical of the Liberals as well as the government, because it seems to me that the Liberals have acquiesced with the government in changing the basic concepts of Bill 68 which we passed last year. For what have we here? A complete change of the approach to Medicare here in the Province of Manitoba.

As a matter of fact, I think it would be fair to say that the proposition we're dealing with now in the House is no better really than we have at the present time by the contributions - if you can call them that - of the Department of Welfare, augmenting the MMS for our people who are in unfortunate circumstances insofar as revenue is concerned, because this Bill, if approved, while it's used a terminology of voluntary scheme as against the universal and comprehensive scheme, gives to that government, Mr. Speaker, the same rights as they've got now under the Social Allowances Act; namely, to pass regulations to make available to certain classes of people Medicare, medical services.

As a matter of fact, it's even worse in some respects than the provisions under the Social Allowances Act, because under the present Social Allowances Act people who are awarded Medicare cards also are provided for dental services, optical services and drugs. I wouldn't be a bit surprised, knowing the record of this government and its attitude to our less fortunate citizens, that they'll withdraw the type of Medicare card they're now awarding under Social Allowances and utilize this Act, and thereby deprive them of the additional services that it is possible for them to receive under our present Social Allowances Act. Because frankly - and I want to repeat this to try and hammer it home into the noggins of my honourable friends opposite - at the present time under our Social Allowances Act we have the meanest means test right across Canada, and that same group will be the group that will apply the regulations and the terms and the regulations in respect of Medicare, and I don't trust them. I'm certainly going to vote against the Bill itself because it violates the principles enunciated by the Hall Commission on medical services.

I don't know, Mr. Speaker, how many members of this House have taken the time out to read the Royal Commission on health services report. And just so that there's no misunderstanding, I want to read a few of the paragraphs from the Royal Commission report into the record and those that are present - and all too few may I suggest - in the House at the present time, may at least have some of the benefits of the study made by Mr. Justice Hall and his commission. On Page 740 of the Hall Commission report they deal with the question of compulsion in the provision of medicare services and they recognize, starting on Page 740, that there can be and there are various differences of opinion in respect of as to whether or not there should be a comprehensive and universal plan or a compulsory plan, or a voluntary plan that the Minister of Health is now introducing as against the plan we approved of last year.

What the Hall Commission states is that the question of compulsion is an important issue, and now, Mr. Speaker, I quote directly from Page 740: "This is an important issue since it lies at the roots of our democratic system. The essential point to be made is that society in its collective judgment has found it necessary to use the force of law to achieve a number of socially desirable objectives - attendance at school, payments of taxes to support schools, licensing of physicians to prevent unqualified persons from practising, regulation of insurance companies - to mention only a few. There can be few who would oppose the element of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . compulsion present in any of these examples.

"The most relevant example is of course compulsory education, but it should be noted that there is a great and fundamental difference between a government-sponsored health service and compulsory education. Compulsory education requires compulsory financing through taxes and compulsory attendance at school. In contrast, a health program requires only payment of taxes; there is no compulsion on anyone to accept or obtain services.

"Moreover, as long as the providers of service remain as independent self-governing professional practitioners with whom the insurance agency on which the professions are represented makes the contract, they are not employees of the state. As a matter of fact, in a situation such as that obtaining in those provinces financing their hospital insurance programs from indirect revenues, it is almost impossible to discover any element of compulsion with the hospital services in any form whatever. In fact the greatest result has been an extension of freedom, freer access to facilities and freedom from fear of financial consequences."

This, Mr. Speaker, is what Hall and his Commission had to say on the question of compulsion, and this is the basic concept we adopted here in this House. Now the Minister wants to go away from that concept, and I want to repeat that it's not compulsion in the normal sense of compulsion any more than education. And I want to read the last sentence again because I think that it is vital and important. "In fact", Hall says, "the greatest result has been an extension of freedom, freer access to facilities and freedom from fear of financial consequences."

And what does my honourable friend the Minister of Health say in respect of this in answer to the learned people who formed this commission? We want to invoke a system, so-called voluntary, that will impose upon many people fears of financial consequences and take away from them the freedom of access to the services. Because in essence this is what a so-called voluntary plan, as suggested by the Minister of Health in this legislation, will be bringing about.

But there's another aspect too, Mr. Speaker, in respect of Medicare. This is a cost-conscious government, so we are told. The Honourable Minister of Public Utilities nodded his head as though it wasn't. I don't think you are really. On one side the government does give lip service to being a government that is concerned with the tax dollar in Manitoba. The First Minister has suggested that this is one of the reasons why they will not proceed with the legislation as passed here and as approved at Ottawa, but Hall says in his report that the kind of system that the Minister of Health is now proposing is the most costly type of a system and Hall rejected it completely as being too costly. We have to set up another bureaucracy, another group of civil servants to diagnose the financial assets of individuals, because under the legislation proposed by the Minister there are going to be classes of individuals, designated persons, some of those who will have their premiums paid for entirely, others who will have part of their premiums paid on a means test basis, of which this government of course is famous for, but we will have to have an ever-increasing number of civil service in order to apply the means test.

And Hall on Page 743 says, "having decided that the best solution for Canada is the establishment of a comprehensive universal health services program as outlined, and having considered the three points at issue involved in determining the best method of implementing such a program, we have concluded that Canada requires the establishment of health insurance funds provincially administered, contributed to by the Federal Government from general revenue and by provincial government as they determine, structured along lines similar to that of the hospital insurance program." I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister, if he hasn't read this document, should.

And their reasoning, Hall says further, is as follows: "That the method of subsidy should be one that subsidizes the insurance fund rather than one that subsidizes the individual." Rejection completely of the proposition of the Minister of subsidizing the individual through premiums, and "the reliance on the method of voluntary insurance would be unnecessarily slow and inevitably incomplete." -- Hall speaking insofar as the proposition of the Minister is concerned.

And thirdly, "The number of individuals who would require subsidy to meet the total health services cost is so large that no government could impose the means test procedure on so many citizens or would be justified in establishing a system requiring so much unnecessary administration. The health services will make enough demand on our resources; we must not



(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . waste them."

And this is what the Minister, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is doing in the proposition that we have before us. It sounds beautiful in this free society, as we call it, with all our free enterprise sites to consider the use of the word voluntary, but I respectfully suggest to the members of this House that the plan that the Minister is invoking is not a voluntary plan in the normal sense of voluntary and that a compulsory plan is the only plan which will provide the necessary medical services to the people of Manitoba and people of Canada.

I suggest that this House would be well advised to reject the Bill that we have before us at the present time, on the basis at least - two bases - it will be ineffective and it will be more costly in the long run for the taxpayer of Manitoba than the provision of a medicare system envisioned under Bill 68.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the main objection to the Bill that is presently before us has already been enunciated by the Leader of my Party, and that is that it is a waste of the time of the Legislature and an insult to our intelligence. This legislation is completely unnecessary. The government can go ahead and do exactly what they are suggesting that they want to do in this legislation without reading any bills, without the first reading, second reading or third reading. If they are concerned with subsidizing people to pay premiums to any medical plan, they can do that under their welfare regulations. They are doing it now, and all they have to do, as indicated by my Honourable Leader, is change the regulations or amend them so that they can take care of people that possibly they are not now taking care of.

So what is the purpose of presenting this Bill to the Legislature? Well, Mr. Speaker, the purpose is to try to use the Legislature and the enactment of a Bill to somehow create a political advantage for the government. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we have ever seen before just how blatant this kind of thing is as we are now demonstrated by this legislation, because, Mr. Speaker, I can't recall - and perhaps the Minister of Health will correct me if I'm wrong - I can't recall last year's legislation, Bill 68, as referring to a compulsory plan. I don't remember the word compulsory in that plan. I don't remember any head notes or marginal notes referring to compulsory plan. Perhaps the Minister can demonstrate that this was in the Act, and if he does, then I stand corrected. But in this particular legislation we have a marginal note referring to a voluntary scheme. We have the legislation itself referring to residents on a voluntary basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is this voluntary basis that the Minister of Health is talking about? What are they trying to sell when they talk about a voluntary plan? Well, Mr. Speaker, they tell us that the compulsory feature of the legislation that they object to and which they voted for unanimously - that is their group in any event - last year, is that it has to be paid for by everybody, that nobody can opt out of the payment. They agree that the doctor needn't work under the plan; they agree that the patient needn't accept the services of the plan; they agree that there is complete freedom as between doctor and patient, as between doctor and plan and as between patient and plan. The only feature which is not completely voluntary is the feature of payment. Under last year's plan everybody was obliged to contribute to the cost.

Mr. Speaker, is this year's plan any different? And indeed is any plan, any plan for the provision of medical service provide that payment will be voluntary? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is an illusion. It's not true and doesn't exist under any proposed scheme for payment of medical services. And let's examine them all. Let us take the system where it would be completely uninsured. Is payment voluntary? Of course not. Payment is a matter of law as between the physician and the patient, and no patient can say that he wants to voluntarily get the service and not pay for it.

So if there were no plan and we use the criteria of payments - and that's the only criteria the Minister is using to describe 68 as compulsory - let us examine to see whether under any scheme imaginable payment is voluntary. I say that if there were no scheme, if we didn't have a health insurance scheme, payment would not be voluntary; payment would be compulsory.

Let's go to the MMS scheme, the present scheme that we have in existence now. Is payment voluntary? No. If you belong to the scheme you have to pay for it and if you don't belong to the scheme you have to pay for it, so in both cases payment is compulsory.

Let's look at the scheme that is before us now - and I'm surprised that the Honourable Member for Rhineland doesn't jump up and some of my Liberal friends don't jump up and say that we are pushing Manitoba into a compulsory scheme - because how is this welfare going to

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . be paid? Is it going to be voluntary? Are we going to say that those people who don't wish to contribute to the cost of paying for the people who can't afford it can opt out? Is that what the Minister is suggesting? No. So payments for this scheme is compulsory and payment for every single scheme that has been devised or suggested by my honourable friends on the right and by the members of the government is compulsory. There is no such thing as a voluntary payment in terms of payment for medical expenses whether you have a scheme or whether you don't have a scheme, or whether you have a beggar's scheme or whether you have a universal scheme or whether you have a comprehensive scheme, every single scheme calls for payment as an obligatory matter, either as between the doctor and the patient or the doctor and the taxing authority, or the doctor and the MMS.

So there is no such thing as what my honourable friend is trying to produce, and to use the expression in the Act "voluntary scheme" is an outright misrepresentation. Are you going to tell people who don't wish -- let us assume that the Government of Manitoba under this scheme has to finance people to the extent of 2, 3, 4, or 5 million dollars, is payment of that amount going to be voluntary as far as the citizens of Manitoba are concerned? No sir, if it's collected out of sales tax it will be a compulsory sales tax; if it's collected out of income tax it will be a compulsory income tax; if it's collected out of some sort of premium that you'll add to everybody else's premium, it will be a compulsory premium. So let's not mislead anybody. When you are talking about Bill 68 as being compulsory, you are only referring to the premium, that's the only thing that is compulsory - payment - and there is no distinction between that principle and the principle that you are now suggesting.

If you want to have a difference, then I suggested to you last year - and this Party suggested it to you - if you want complete voluntariness, then eliminate the premium and pay for the whole thing out of taxation. Oh, you'll scream that you'll have to raise the taxes an enormous amount of money. Let us assume, let us assume, Mr. Speaker, that you are going to do this - and I certainly would propose it - let's assume what it would mean in terms of the tax, the type of tax that this government passed last year. It would mean a 5 percent increase in the sales tax, wouldn't it? Fifty million dollars to pay for the whole scheme without one cent of Federal funds - \$50 million - but you'll double the sales tax. Well what does that mean to a person who is now paying \$175 in premiums to the MMS and is going to be asked to pay \$200 plus 25 percent extra billing? What does it mean to double the sales tax? It doesn't mean a thing.

I have indicated that a person earning \$3,700 a year is now paying \$50 sales tax, so if you double his sales tax you add \$50 to that sales tax as against over \$200 in premiums which he now has to pay and which he is going to be asked to pay by the medical profession, and that if we have to go it alone, which only one province in this country had the courage to do. The Province of Saskatchewan paid for it out of their own funds and they didn't do any worse and the health costs in Saskatchewan didn't rise over the past five years like they have risen in this province, which the Minister is well aware of.

So let's not bring in legislation which refers to a voluntary scheme. I ask my friend from Rhineland, in British Columbia where they finance, where they give charity to the poor and the needy, where they have a beggar's plan, I'm asking my friend from Rhineland where they have a beggar's plan in Alberta, do the public have to pay for the cost of that plan or can they opt out? Can they say I don't want to pay my share of the taxes that goes to this -- (Interjection)-- They don't tax people in Alberta? No taxes in Alberta at all?

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): They don't need to contribute if they don't want to.

MR. GREEN: You say to me that a person in Alberta can opt out of paying for the revenue that is used to finance the needy? Is that right? Can you produce legislation from the Province of Alberta which says that people can opt out of paying those taxes which are used to finance the needy to join the medical scheme? That's ridiculous, not even a Social Credit government would make that kind of a statement and they don't. This plan is no less compulsory than any other plan that has ever been devised, and for the Minister to put it in the marginal note is an insult to the intelligence of the people of Manitoba and an insult to the members of this House who have engaged in an argument continuously as to whether their provision is less compulsory than our provision, and for the Minister to force this argument by legislation is similar to what they are doing with the Information Services Branch. They are spending money to publicize their own position and now they are enacting legislation which says that their own definition of voluntary is the only true definition.

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated - and I challenge the Minister to correct me if I'm wrong - the entire medical care program in Manitoba, based on costs as they were before the profession was aided and abetted in increasing their costs by that government, could have been financed by a 5 percent sales tax - \$50 million - more than financed, because that was more than the amount, without one cent of federal funds. It could still be done and the increase in taxes, it's true, would be a problem, but it would be less of a problem than the over \$200 in premiums that are going to have to be paid by most Manitobans plus the 25 percent extra billing which we are now told about.

Mr. Speaker, the government has indicated that the reason they won't go into this plan is that the costs are running wild. What if the costs were going up to \$200 million? Wouldn't that be a reason for the government for getting into it? What if it went up four times? What if they went up five times? Wouldn't that be exactly the time when the people would have to get together and say we have to do something about this, we have to do something towards seeing to it that people will be able to obtain this very essential service in the Province of Manitoba? The reverse has taken place. And why, Mr. Speaker? Does the government not know - and I suggest to you that they do know - that according to the best advice, the medical costs in Manitoba according to the presentations that have been made by the medical profession will go up from roughly \$33 million a year to \$51 million a year?

Do they not also know, and I suggest that they have it on the best advice, that a plan which subsidizes 75 percent of the medical costs will be unsaleable, that MMS is dead that it will not be able to sell a program which subsidizes 75 percent of the costs? Does the government know any program in Canada which has succeeded on the basis of selling insurance to pay for 75 percent of the medical costs based on the doctor being able to make those costs whatever he wants? Does he know of any insurance company that will suggest to him that such a plan is saleable, because if that plan is not saleable - and I suggest to you that it's not - then more and more people are going to opt out of the plan, because if my \$200.00 in premiums - whatever the figure is going to be - does not even insure my medical costs but still requires me to pay an additional 25 percent, then more and more people are going to say that it's not worth buying the insurance.

And isn't that what you know? Haven't you already been told that by people who are experts in the insurance field? And if you know that, then how can you come to this Legislature and ask us to adopt a plan which is going to allow you to subsidize people who are on MMS when that insurance won't even be in existence. And are you willing to buy insurance for people, needy people, on the basis of them having to pay 25 percent additional after the monies have been paid by the government to the doctor? Are you willing to buy insurance of that kind? I suggest to you that, if you do, you're going into a very very bad insurance program, and I, Mr. Speaker, don't think that that program will exist because I don't think that the people of Manitoba will buy it, because after buying it they are still uninsured. And I think that the government knows this. I think that this is what they've been told, and if they've been told this, why are they insisting on embarking on this program and writing into the marginal notes that this is a voluntary scheme? It's not a voluntary scheme; it's a scheme which every Manitoban will have to finance.

Mr. Speaker, the situation before the people of Manitoba is as was described last week; there's been no essential change. We are told that without increasing their services the medical profession will increase the amount of gross medical fees from roughly \$33 million a year to \$51 million a year, that they are going to bill everybody, except I guess those who are in the welfare groups, who have no taxable income, an additional 25 percent after the amounts that they receive from the medical care program. And if, as I would hope, more people were able to have their health care looked after, the gross fees are going to go up even more, and all of this is happening without any steps being taken by the government to indicate that there is at least a way in which this situation can be controlled.

All we get from the government is a piece of completely irrelevant, unnecessary and redundant legislation which says that they can do what they are now doing. You could have saved this debate. You could have at least utilized that efficiency, because this debate is not necessary for the purpose of you doing what you say you want to do in this Bill. Can you not - can you not say that your requirements for people who wish to be put on your present Medicare plan are being altered to take care of what you want to do in this Bill? And if so, is this Bill

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . merely being passed in order for you to try to demonstrate the undemonstrable, that is that this scheme is voluntary whereas every other scheme suggested is compulsory.

Mr. Speaker, I said before, and I repeat, that there is no scheme which has been suggested from any source, from the Member for Rhineland or from anybody else, where payment is voluntary, and under Bill 68 payment on behalf of the ditizens is obligatory. But if you want to make it completely voluntary, then finance it all by taxation. Don't have a premium, then there would be no obligation to pay a premium; there would be no obligation upon a doctor to give the service; there would be no obligation on the part of a patient to receive the service; and we would have what Mr. Justice Hall spoke about, we would have the greatest freedom and voluntariness in the acceptance of medical care. The most inhibiting feature of medical care is the point at which a person says that in order to get it I would have to pay a great deal of money. That makes it involuntary. I'm asking this government to make it completely voluntary and to do so at a smaller expense, on a completely pragmatic basis, at a smaller expense than is now being expended through the various plans that are now in existence.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I've exhausted my right to speak, but on a point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Inkster, the Saskatchewan government certainly has increased their contributions to their medical services scheme from the general fund over the years. There's no doubt on this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I presume we go back to the top of the page again. Now, the Honourable Member for Rhineland . . .

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, if you'd be good enough now to call the second reading of Bill 39.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 39. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, Bill 39 is one of the bills that was brought in the other day in connection with capital spending and borrowing, and Bill 39 in particular deals with the matter of extending \$200 million of borrowing power to the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board. As we know, it can be done either of two ways, either the province can borrow the money or the utility can do it on its own. To me, this is a rather large expenditure and also I would like to discuss the principle involved in borrowing by the government as a whole.

It has been said, and certainly throughout the session, that the present government is trying to live within its means and that they're holding the line since we have a balanced budget so to speak. However, to me a balanced budget is meaningless when you go ahead and borrow large amounts in addition to the money that you spend under current estimates, for which you might have a balanced budget, because this certainly indicates that we're not living within our means, that we are going out and making large borrowings and going into debt at a fast rate here in Manitoba. Most anyone could run a government on that basis. If you intend to go out and borrow every time you need additional monies, just go ahead and borrow, well it's quite simple, but when you have to live within your means and live within a certain amount of money to spend for the services provided by the government, I think that's a different matter altogether.

While they probably have been trying to do this as far as the estimates are concerned, but here again I don't think they tried so hard because we still had an increase of 24 million roughly in round figures of increase in estimates, so that in my opinion we're not holding the line. Certainly if we did not go into borrowing this certainly would have put on a much larger squeeze or a much tighter squeeze on the government, something that the farmers feel in this province. To me, it seems when we go on capital borrowing for a government, well the taxpayer will pay, he will come across and pay later on.

In farming or any other business, even though you might need capital for capital expenditure purposes, you would like to buy a new tractor, a new implement combine or whatever it is, or so on, certainly farmers like to get new machinery, but because of the squeeze they find they have to let the old machinery do and get it repaired and get it fixed and they have to do with what they have and not borrow money for purchases of further capital requirements in order to

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . buy new machinery, and I think we as the government here should try and make do with what we have and not go outside and borrow large amounts of money.

The logical answer probably will come back that this is a venture that they've embarked on, a big project up in the north and that Hydro is a utility, the energy of which is being used and has to be expanded, but I think there's certain restraints that should be exercised even in this matter. I know the Honourable Member for Churchill the other day came back at me and said, well B. C. is doing the same thing, but I would like to point out that in British Columbia they went ahead and sold energy in advance and got the monies so that they wouldn't have to pay interest on these large amounts of money that they otherwise would have to borrow and pay interest on for many years.

This is the other point that I would like to get at, and that is the high cost of borrowing today. We were told in committee by the Chairman of the Hydro, the late Don Stephens at that time, that the cost of money would be around seven or seven and a half percent and that their policy was to borrow on the long-term basis. I feel that this policy should be changed especially during times when we have such high cost of money, that we should probably borrow on a short-term basis so that when the rate goes down that we at that time can borrow on a long-term basis and save the taxpayers a lot of money in my opinion. We don't know just when the rates will come down but certainly we don't expect it to continue for the next 25 years for which this money will be borrowed.

Then too, the bonds or debentures, whatever it is, are they callable? Can they be called in and paid off so that these monies could be repaid and re-borrowed at a later date? This is a question that I would like to see answered, because under the policy that they're now borrowing money, this means that we will be paying high rates of interest for the next 24 or 25 years on the money that is being for this utility. And it does not only apply to this utility, it applies to the other monies that are being asked for in total of 295 million.

Mr. Chairman, to point out more clearly just what the increased costs of a few percentages does to such long-term borrowings, I would like to read a few excerpts that I have before me. This is taken from the Vancouver Province, March 4, 1968. It's titled: "They pay the piper but don't call the tune." I would like to read what it contains and then later on project some figures, and I'm reading:

"Conjecture that the maximum interest rate on National Housing Act mortgages may go as high as nine percent this year is a reminder to home buyers or builders of the rapid rise in their costs." This was on March 4th and this has gone up since. "Last year the NHA rates stayed at seven percent until the end of June, but under a new government formula the rate is pegged at 2 1/4 percent above the average yield on government long-term bonds. The next adjustment date is April 1st.

"A two percent difference in mortgage interest may not sound much by the month, but an amortization table shows that a seven percent \$15,000 mortgage repaid over 20 years cost \$27,696, while the same mortgage at nine percent costs \$32,011, a difference of \$4,315.00. In other words, before the year is out some buyers or builders could find that the total cost of financing a new home had risen between four and five thousand dollars within 12 months. The difference in monthly rate of course would be only \$18.00 on a \$15,000 mortgage, but added to other cost items it creates a financial burden before which some prospective homeowners may quail. Ironically enough, these may be the same families that have postponed home ownership in the hope that costs might go down. Now they must decide whether to take the plunge or wait a while longer in the hope that prices will subside to a lower level.

"One thing seems clear. Until governments reduce their demands on the country's capital resources there will be an increasing premium on money. Medicare and other spending programs at all levels of government are increasing the pressure on industry. Home buyers and builders, among others, are paying the piper but they don't call the tune."

Now, Mr. Chairman, we had here on a \$15,000 home that the difference of two percent of an increase in interest rates would cost an additional \$4,135.00. This is over a 20-year period. Now the capital money that we're borrowing is over a 25-year period, and if we apply those same figures, this two percent additional cost in money, on the amount that we will be borrowing, it amounts to \$86,300,000, so that at the two percent difference it's an enormous amount of money. If we can save this money by delaying or changing the policy and borrowing for the time being on a short-term basis so that we can capitalize on lower interest rates later

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . on, certainly this would be to the advantage of the people of this province and something that should be considered.

Now we all know that the value of the dollar has gone down considerably, and if it goes down any further, the less value we get for our dollar. And on this point I would like to read another few paragraphs from The Vancouver Sun dated Friday, October 20, 1967. This was last fall. The title of the article is "Everybody Swindles", and I would like to quote a few paragraphs from this article as well, and it reads this way.

"In 1958 Canadians trusted governments to manage their economy so that money would retain its worth. They bought government bonds paying 4.5 percent interest to mature in 25 years. How foolish they were. A man who bought one of those \$1,000 bonds nine years ago could sell it this week for no more than \$790. Why? Because the price of money has been inflated along with the price of everything else, and the \$790 would buy today as much as \$600 would have done when the bond was issued, so the man who trusted the government with his life's savings has taken about a 40 percent loss.

"This situation illustrates one aspect of the massive swindle described Tuesday by Neil J. McKinnon, Chairman of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce. 'Furthermore,' Mr. McKinnon told a conference of financial executives at Montreal, 'the swindle was perpetrated on the great majority of the populace who are least able to protect themselves against the consequences.' This theme has been recurring, perhaps tiresomely so, in these editorial columns for the past two years and with growing emphasis. The reason is that the rate of inflation has been doubling and tripling in the limits of safety laid down by the country's best economists. 'For a time,' said Mr. McKinnon, 'a 2 percent overall price increase per year was considered the upper limit. Is it now between 3 and 4 or 5 percent - will it become still higher?'"

And then a little later on, I would like to read two more paragraphs. "Mr. McKinnon ascribes most of the blame to continuous government deficits partially financed by deliberate increases in the supply of money. He is not overstating the case. Deficits of the Federal Government are now so enormous that Finance Minister Mitchell Sharp is having trouble in selling the necessary bonds even at interest yields almost 50 percent higher than paid in 1958. Spending plans for the next year were so high that the Cabinet was recently forced to admit that there was no hope of financing them all. This state of affairs does not merely invite inflation, it positively impels it ever higher.

"Mr. McKinnon will be criticized by politicians with the squandermania complex for the violence of his language. Words such as swindle and cheat derive amplification from his prestige. They are not too severe, however, if they had to marshal public opinion behind a demand for a return to sanity in Canada's fiscal affairs. That's the end of the quotation.

Mr. Chairman, I think both these statements are valuable in that they point out the situation that we have not only here in Manitoba but in Canada as far as fiscal matters are concerned and the high cost of money. While one would say that moneys have to be provided now wince a project has been started, it certainly doesn't hold true for some of the other items for which capital is being brought about through the several Bills that were introduced the other day. Since I do not subscribe to long-term borrowing and the policy that is presently being followed by this government, I do intend to support the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Provincial Treasurer.

MR. EVANS: Perhaps I should make a short comment that my Honourable friend from Rhineland has treated us to his annual speech on Social Credit theory, a theory which has never been tried anywhere, and if it were tried, would prove disastrous. I think I'll not engage in a debate on Social Credit theory at this time.

He asks why we can't borrow money in the short money market. Well, you borrow money where it is, where you can borrow it from. There isn't money to be had in anything like the quantity required for a hydro development of this kind. And then there is the opposite side of that medal, and that is the requirement of any kind of a utility, relative security or stability of their funds, or they can't make forward commitments in fairness to the contractors that are building the dam and expect to be paid - or building the power plant. Are the bonds to be callable and what will the interest rate be and what will the term be? We don't know. When it comes time to float each issue - this is a capital authority - nowhere in this Bill is there described the issue which will be made, either by Hydro or possibly by the government direct although that is unlikely. So I simply make those short comments with regard to my honourable friend's speech.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 114, an Act to amend The Attorney-General's Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, there's really not too much to explain because the Bill is totally self-explanatory and has arisen by virtue of a recommendation of the Statutory Orders Committee which was concurred in earlier in this session.

In brief, the two segments of the Bill provide, first of all, an enabling section to permit the Attorney-General to enter into an arrangement with the Law Society of Manitoba, or for that matter potentially any other group, in order to make provision for legal aid for persons charged with indictable offences and all of the further requirements that would result from entering into such an agreement. This, in essence, will result in a formalization of the present relatively long standing arrangements that have been arrived at on an ad hoc basis between the department and the Law Society of Manitoba whereby public moneys have been expended over the last six years at least for the provision of legal aid to indigent persons in the province.

It is not - and I underline this - it is not a fully comprehensive legal aid scheme with respect to civil matters. This is an enabling section only for criminal offences, indictable offences - those are the serious offences under the Criminal Code. Moneys have been voted in the estimates of the Department of the Attorney-General to enable this scheme to get under way in a more intensive way than has been the case up to the present. It is our anticipation that the negotiations with the Law Society of Manitoba will in all probability result in their appointment of a full-time administrator for legal aid in the province, and then moving forward from that field of progress, we expect to see the system develop as years go by. But we think that this is a more prudent way in which to formalize the present arrangement than to provide legal aid on an ever-widening basis across the province to indigents in Manitoba who are charged with serious indictable offences.

The second portion of the Bill is new and relates to the establishment of machinery by which persons who are injured, or their estates if those persons are killed, will have access to the Court of Queen's Bench in order to obtain an award for the person injured, or for the estate of such person if he is killed, up to a maximum of \$10,000.00, persons who are injured or who are killed while assisting a police officer in the course of his duties in enforcing the law.

There is very little else that I can say on the section except that it does carry forward the general theme of this type of legislation which is becoming more common in the common law provinces of the country. It does not - and I repeat, and I think this is clear to everyone - it does not deal with the question of persons who have received injuries as a result of a crime but deals only with the first aspect of persons who are injured or who are killed with respect to their services while assisting a police officer. Again we think it is prudent and we certainly agree that this type of aid should be available to persons. We also know and we also feel that it will not be frequently used but we think it should be available for those public-spirited citizens who are motivated to assist the law officers from time to time in carrying out their public functions.

The Statutory Orders Committee will be looking at the further aspects of compensation for persons who are victims of crime, but I would have to enter the expected caveat that this is a potentially very expensive field to get into and that at the present time we feel, in the light of the financial requirements for both of these plans, that this is as far as we can provide public moneys for these two worthwhile projects.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I realize that there are people who will feel that the government has not gone quite far enough in this Bill, but I feel that to a certain extent we're breaking new territory and I think we should proceed cautiously. I would be prepared to support this on a trial basis just to see what it is going to cost us over the next year or so. It may be that we may have to raise our sights, or we may have to lower our sights, I don't know, but I think this is a matter which we should try to evolve a system rather than enter into a grandiose scheme which is going to cost us more money than we anticipate at the present time. I feel that caution should be our slogan in entering into something which is new ground for us in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the Honourable Member for Selkirk must have been talking about the aspect of this Bill relating to compensation to victims of persons who were assisting police, because nothing what he said could be related to the question of legal aid. The legal aid portion of it will be barely costly at all, because as the Honourable Minister said, it carries forward and confirms the present policy which is practically voluntary on the part of the legal profession. There are payments that are made by the government in respect of certain attendances by the legal profession on the more serious trials relating to indictable offences, but there's a great deal that is being done by the legal profession voluntarily, and that's good and that's fine, but we all know it doesn't go far enough.

I think it was about three years ago that a special committee - and it may have been the Statutory Regulations Committee at that time - spent considerable time dealing with the entire question of legal aid, where there were briefs presented, studies made, and there is extensive documentation on the files of the members of those committees making recommendations and pointing out hardships that are suffered by people who can not pay for the services of lawyers. These are people who suffer, those in the aspects of criminal charges and the criminal courts and in the civil courts as well.

There are many occasions, and it was extensively spelled out in committee, as I say at least three years ago, that these are matters which should be taken up by the government so that people will be able to be represented in court and have equal justice in court. I think it was the Honourable Member for Inkster who said just recently that just as the government is obliged to spend money in the prosecution of people, to the same extent should the government be obliged to make sure that people have the ability to defend themselves in the actions which the government is prosecuting, to the extent, if necessary, of paying for their legal assistance.

What the Bill is doing here is not really clear to me, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister started by saying "There's not much to say on this Bill", and he is oh so right, because all he did say in respect to legal aid was that we are now formalizing what we've been doing all along. I can only assume that the Attorney-General has been doing all along that which he has a right to do all along and therefore that this is not a corrective measure to make legal that which he was doing that was not legal, and therefore he says that he is only carrying forward something which has been the practice up to now.

Now the suggestion that there is a possibility of extension of the program as a result of this Bill is one which I don't buy, because the Bill for one thing limits the nature of the assistance offered and limits it to indictable offences under the Criminal Code, and of course that means not only to indictable offences but limits it to criminal matters only and appeals arising therefrom, and only for the purpose of administering such a scheme is the Attorney-General authorized to enter into agreements with the Law Society or other persons to carry it out.

He says there is money provided in the budget and he said that about the estimates. He said that before he spoke about the other matter, that is the aid to those persons who suffered damages as a result of participating in the arrest of a criminal or prevention of crime. So he says there's money in his budget, and as I recall it, it is not in the estimates at all, it is part of his general estimates, and if the general estimates were increased to any extent because of this, I would request the Minister when he closes debate to give us details of it just to indicate the extent to which firstly this was in the estimates of last year; and secondly, the extent to which they have been increased this year. And I am forecasting now that he either will not reply to this direct question or he will not have precise information, because I don't believe that there is an item in his estimates to which this is directly referable and which does increase the amount as has been suggested by him. I'll be happy to be corrected and learn more about his estimates when he answers when he closes debate.

So in spite of the fact that we have had in committee substantial information as to the great need of many people for aid, and not only in criminal matters but also in civil matters; in spite of the fact that the Committee on Statutory Regulations has had the responsibility of reviewing this problem and has not been able to do so because of this government's reluctance to have meetings of that committee and to deal with the matters which were assigned to it - and I say that with specific recollection of the fact that the committee was called very late in the year; the fact that we had to wait for no excusable reason until very late in the year to start the meetings; the fact that it was known well in advance that the committee had a large agenda, much greater than its usual agenda; and the fact that it could spend little time on this particular



(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . matter is an indication of the neglect of its duty on the part of this government in not making it possible to deal with these matters and thus force the Attorney-General into the position of saying - and he said this on Page 399 or so of Hansard of this year - to the effect that legal assistance to indigents was not debated at any length although briefs were seen.

He says there are further matters with respect to legal aid to indigents, particularly dealing with civil aid aspects, that honourable members have indicated that they wish to discuss further, and quite properly so. And again the committee, if re-established, can go into that question. So it's an admission that he, the person charged with the responsibility in this particular regard must go back to the committee for more discussions because the committee was not able to discuss them.

So he has the - well, he had the duty. I was going to say he has the effrontery, which he has also, but he is carrying out the duty imposed - self-imposed - through the committee of bringing in this Bill, which in regard to legal aid is meaningless insofar as I can read into it, which is merely a recognition, as he says, of what has been going on up to now.

Now moving on to the question of the second aspect which deals with the provision of compensation for persons who suffer injury due to the assistance of a police officer in enforcing the law, the Honourable Member for Selkirk adopted this prudence approach and felt that it was right to be careful in order to see just what this would cost. Well, I can forecast for him that it will cost nothing, or so close to nothing as not to make any impact on the Provincial Treasurer's concern about the budget, because I had occasion to read into the record a letter from the Chief of Police of Winnipeg endorsing legislation of this type and saying that neither he nor other senior officers of his department are aware of occasions when people did indeed suffer damage as a result of injuries which were suffered in assisting a police officer. Yet the principle is right and the principle was adopted by this House several years ago when I brought it in by way of a resolution, and once the principle is right, then of course we must approve of the Bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, it just doesn't mean much. It means to the extent that it will help a person it is good, to the extent that it will make someone be more fearless in helping a police officer it is good; but in terms of real progress in this policy it is really practically meaningless. You might note that it doesn't even help a person who may be attempting to prevent a crime on his own accord in the absence of a police officer. A person who sees a crime being committed is not protected if he enters into the offence area in an attempt to prevent that crime from being committed, and if one person is assaulting another with intent to rob him and a civilian steps in to assist the person who is being attacked, there is no help for him in this Bill, and that therefore a person who attempts to prevent a crime from being committed or attempts to help a person who is being injured as a result of a crime, is not protected.

The victim of course is not protected and that is the fear that the Minister must have, and I presume the government and the Member for Selkirk, in saying that we must be careful, this could be costly. But we had the opportunity of examining information of various schemes in many jurisdictions. Whereas it was raised in this House at a time when there was very little experience except I believe in England, there is considerable experience now. I had an opportunity when I was in New York some few months ago of meeting the officers of the commission that was established for this purpose. They have an office, they have investigations, they carry on tremendous help to large numbers of people who are sufferers and have been because of damages that they suffered as a result of crime inflicted on them, and New York of course is a different milieu and there is a vastly different crime rate and there is much more crime than there is here. But we had the benefit of a committee established by the Bar Association under the chairmanship of a very responsible person, the retired Court of Appeal Mr. Justice Schultz who travelled extensively at his own expense in order to explore this entire problem and gave a report, which was both voluminous and detailed, making strong recommendations that we proceed, and now we have this in other provinces of Canada, in other states of the United States, and in other jurisdictions - common law jurisdictions, as mentioned by the Honourable Minister.

You may recall that I read into the record a letter from a wife of a person who was injured some time ago here in Winnipeg and who indicated how seriously hampered they were in carrying on with their day-to-day lives with a person, with a father at the head of a household who had been injured and who was unable to contribute to the family's welfare. These are the things

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . that should have been handled and these are the things that were ignored.

Now since this matter came before us at the end of February or early in March - when I say before us I mean the committee - there was a report made of a committee established, I believe in Toronto, dealing on the Federal issue with this entire problem. This committee made strong recommendations in endorsement of the principle involved in the entire question of compensation for crime, and a statement was made by Dr. Allan M. Linden of Osgoode Hall Law School in Ontario to the House of Commons Committee on January 30, 1968, where he briefly reviews the entire problem. But I want only to cite his statement on the question of cost, and I wonder if the Honourable the Member for Selkirk would care to hear this in the light of what his fear of how very costly it was.

"A comparison was made with the British scheme which had certain safeguards, certain protections, certain maximums that are payable. A comparison was made on a straight per capita basis" - which I think weighs it in favour of appearing to be more costly than it really would be in Manitoba because of the heavy industrialization and the heavy density of population that exists in England as compared with here. And under the estimates made by this committee, "the cost of a Canadian scheme similar to the British, but excluding administrative costs and assuming all other factors are the same, could be estimated at approximately \$1 million annually or a contribution of five cents for each Canadian." And I point out again that Manitoba is not as heavily populated or as densely populated as would be the areas of British Columbia, Quebec and Ontario, and Manitoba I think would be less than average in costs than would the Canadian average, but if it were the Canadian average of \$1 million each or five cents per Canadian, it would be \$50,000 for Manitoba, and I say that's heavily weighted in favour of an indication of high cost. It would be substantially less and people would be compensated for losses suffered for something which is no fault of their own.

We now have a compulsory scheme for motor vehicle accidents and it is a large amount that is involved there, that is for people who suffer as a result of an automobile accident. What is suggested is that there should be proper compensation paid to people who are the innocent victims of criminal acts, a void in our system which is being filled elsewhere and which this government is prudently sitting back and just sitting on, as it is with other aspects of this program. — (Interjection) — The Honourable the Attorney-General is as usual attempting to make a speech while seated, and he is now pontificating about the cost of taxes on hospital premiums. I'm quite prepared to enter into the debate on hospital premium increases if, Mr. Speaker, you are prepared to permit me to do so, but you are shaking your head and you are quite right and I fully agree with your silent ruling, and I will not go into the field and I will not therefore rise to the bait of the Honourable the Attorney-General but invite him to debate these issues at the right time and not from his seat but from the place where his seat is located.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Attorney-General is fearful of the cost involved. He has had a committee study it; he has had a committee of some outside of the House study it; he has all the information available to him. Possibly he hasn't read it, or possibly he just feels that it is not a matter that is deserving of treatment, but we have hope because he has indicated that this question is not a closed book. The Committee on Statutory Regulations is going to be re-established with powers to investigate further matters, including compensation to victims of crime and including legal assistance to indigents, so we'll just go on with the same ride that we are going on with this government, slowly prodding it, slowly pushing it, slowly making suggestions, and much more slowly, getting some action out of this government in those fields which are really important and which are really vital for the people of Manitoba, and bit by bit this government is being prodded into doing things that are right and for which they want to take full credit.

Well, they are welcome to the credit if only they would do the work, but until they really do something and stop just giving lip service as they do in this Bill, they certainly do not deserve the respect which a government normally ought to be entitled to have for bringing in legislation which is needy and progressive.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I will be brief in my remarks. The Honourable Member for St. John's I think has covered most of the points. — (Interjection) — not necessarily, but I think he has made some very valid assumptions or conclusions here.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . I would like to know from the Minister when he closes debate whether there is any intention of entering into agreement with private individuals other than the Law Society for performing legal aid — (Interjection) — denturists are mentioned by the Honourable Member for St. John's. But hasn't the program up to now been channelled through the Law Society? I think that this was the way it was handled, and if there is any change intended I would like to hear from the Minister what change they do envision in this respect.

I certainly would have appreciated having the regulations with the Bill on second reading because the regulations will be prescribing a tariff of fees payable to barristers and also will establish standards for determining persons eligible. I think this would have been valuable to the members of the committee here to see just on what basis applicants are accepted and what requirements have to be met.

It seems to me that, as the Member for St. John's has pointed out, the matter of giving assistance to people suffering loss or suffering injury because of assisting the law officers that the assistance will mainly apply to dependents of people who were killed as a result of assisting the law officers and that very little might come to any other one that assisted but was not killed. If I am wrong here, I certainly would like the Minister to correct me because I think the subsections dealing with assistance deal mainly with the cases where a person was killed in trying to assist.

Mr. Chairman, I think both these programs are valuable, and while one has been carried out more or less unofficially probably for the past number of years, and certainly is valuable in my opinion and is giving good service, we are now embarking on the second one. I do hope that it will be beneficial and I see no reason why it shouldn't. I hope that as the legislation goes into effect and we get experience that it probably can be widened, or once we have the experience, that we can probably correct any efficiencies or deficiencies as the case may be.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: . . . be closing debate.

MR. HARRIS: I move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I may pause for a moment. We have some young people with us that I'm sure the honourable members would want to recognize.

MR. LYON: . . . the question on that motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: I apologize for that oversight. Again I don't know from what schools these young people are, but I would like to welcome them to the Assembly today. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome all you young people.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 109, The Statute Law Revision and Statute Law Amendment Act, 1968, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, this is the traditional Bill that comes in usually at the close of the session of each session to clean up a lot of basically typographical errors and other adjustments generally of a minor nature that are to be made in our Statutes. This year the Bill contains a number of other items that relate to our anticipation of the new revision of Statutes, the work on which will start this summer with the Statute Revision Committee.

There are several Acts being repealed. This is in anticipation of the revision of Statutes because their operation has been spent. For example, The Greater Winnipeg Diking Board Act, The Destruction of Papers Act, and an Act to amend The Department of Agriculture and Conservation Act. The Sunday Excursions Act, which is an old piece of legislation, is being repealed and the provisions of it are being added to The Lord's Day Act in order that all of the Lord's Day legislation on a provincial scope will be in the one Act.

There is also a further amendment to The Lord's Day Act, a section of the Lord's Day Act, which makes it clear that the provisions of that Act respecting amendments to by-laws apply to by-laws passed by the City of Winnipeg under the provisions of the Provincial Lord's Day Act. This relates to the use of billiard halls on Sundays. This is a clearing up of a section. There was an oversight when the Act was passed and there was a resolution from the City of Winnipeg asking that this be done, and this curative action is being taken in the present Bill.

There are amendments to several private Acts contained in the Bill which is somewhat unusual. There is a restriction on the right of the Bethany Regular Baptist Church to hold

(MR. LYON cont'd.) . . . . property; this restriction is being removed. It's an old restriction which used to be fairly common which is no longer used. Victoria Hospital has requested that the restriction on the location on which it can operate as a hospital be removed. It will now be able to operate a hospital anywhere in Manitoba.

The Manitoba Law School Foundation Act is being amended to make it clear that it will now refer to the Law Faculty of the University rather than to the Manitoba Law School, and any bequests given to the Law School will now go to the Law Faculty.

All amendments to private Acts are being enacted after requests from the bodies concerned, and rather than have all of these minor amendments required to be advertised and the expense that is concerned with that, we thought it advisable to bring these before the Legislature for consideration in this form in order that these technical amendments could be completed.

There are two amendments to the Act which stem from the report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders - the addition of brussels sprouts to the schedule of Fruit and Vegetable Sales. These are these substantive matters that -- and the Hospital Services Insurance Act, there's a corrective section being put in as a result of recommendations by that committee.

I say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that I am not in any way attempting to be exhaustive in my commentaries but merely to point out some of the highlights to the honourable members if this will be helpful in their reading of the statute.

There is legislation dealing with the expansion of the application of the Religious Societies Lands' Act. This will mean that religious societies of any religion may take advantage of the provisions of the Act, which deal largely with the holding of land. At the present time the Act applies only to congregations of Christians and Jews.

There's power given to the Co-op Promotion Board to invest co-op promotion trust accounts and trustee investments. At the present time they can only keep any income from the fund in their bank account. There's also a restriction in their capital investment provision which implies that they can only invest in bonds and debentures of the same nature as those in which the fund is presently invested.

There are some amendments, technical amendments to the Liquor Control Act dealing with a new group of definitions, none of which make any substantive change in the Act. There's repeal of the provision respecting Daylight Saving Time and Standard Time. This matter is now covered by the Official Time Act, but again no substantive change.

There's a minor amendment to the Companies Act, amendment to the Highway Department Act, and amendments to the Department of Tourism and Recreation Act, all of which are self-explanatory. Again, Mr. Speaker, without attempting to be exhaustive, I think this covers the main points that are before us in this traditional bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have no objections to this bill going into committee where we can get further information. I thank the Minister for his brief explanation. I would just like to ask a couple of questions in respect to this bill. One is in regards to the deletion of the item on mining, the Mines Act, which takes out from the regulations the penalties, whether this is replaced in the statute so that it isn't left without any enforcement. The other one, if the Minister would be kind enough to explain - I believe there's quite a bit of extensive power given to the Lieutenant-Governor in respect to the Highway Department Act in regard to the erection of signs along roads or land adjacent, contiguous or near to, which may create some difficulties in regards to people having notice of what their property is, etc., or even in regards to elections and the erection of advertising.

I think there's one other item, Mr. Speaker, and that is the Public Information Services is deleted from the Department of Tourism and Recreation. I would imagine this is now under the Industry and Commerce Department. I think that is all, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: I just have one question I'd like to direct to my honourable friend when he's closing the debate. I wonder if he would explain for my edification, or have his colleague the Minister of Agriculture explain the difference between a hothouse and a greenhouse when used for the purpose of producing cucumbers and tomatoes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in order to give me a few minutes' time to check out some sections, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Do we go back up to Bill 95 at the head of the page, or...

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if we could now go back to Bill No. 28 at the middle of Page 3.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 28. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I wish to tell the members I couldn't be here this morning in time, so that we have to come back. However, I have checked the bill in connection with certain matters that I wanted to check from the original legislation, and I'm quite prepared to support the bill. I know there are changes made from executors and administrators to personal representatives. I just wonder why the change is being made. Otherwise I am in accord with what the bill and the legislation intends to do.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 49. The Honourable the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, in attempting to reply to some of the questions that were asked by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks and the Honourable Member for Inkster, I'm sorry they're not in their seat at the time, but however, they mentioned here, or asked here rather, what our intentions were in removing the word "public". Our Act makes specific reference only to public housing and the deletion of the word "public" broadens the scope of the Act but it does not in any way eliminate the provision for public housing. It merely gives the Corporation authority to negotiate for public housing and for any other housing so we can take advantage of all provisions in the National Housing Act.

The Honourable Member also asked me that if Metro was giving the authority to prepare urban renewal schemes, would the cost be a Metro cost. If this authority was given, the cost would be a Metro cost.

Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the honourable members are in agreement to give approval in principle to Bill 49 with reservations to certain controversial provisions of this bill. Section 78 of the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act makes it abundantly clear that the Metropolitan Corporation of Winnipeg is the sole planning authority in the Metropolitan area and the additional zones. I'd like to read from a portion of that Metropolitan Act, which says: "On coming into force of this part, "(that's Part 4 of the Act) "the Corporation has, within the Metropolitan area and the additional zones, sole and full responsibility for and authority and jurisdiction over the planning and developing of the Metropolitan area and the additional zones, and save as expressly otherwise provided herein, the jurisdiction and power of every municipal council and every other person, board or authority within the Metropolitan area and the additional zones, in respect to matters to which reference is made in this subsection, is terminated on the coming into force of this part."

Now, the preparation of urban renewal schemes is essentially, Mr. Speaker, a planning function. Under renewal schemes, the planning function has been and is being carried out by the municipalities of the Metropolitan area, notwithstanding the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act. Renewal, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion can not be carried out in isolation from the planning of the total community. Planning for the total Metropolitan Winnipeg community is the responsibility of the Metropolitan Corporation, and we are concerned because there appears to be a conflict in the planning process between the planning carried out in the preparation of the urban renewal schemes and the planning function of the Metropolitan Winnipeg. The situation has given rise, Mr. Speaker, to a duplication of planning staff, to a duplication of data gathering, to a duplication of effort, and all of this makes for a duplication of cost in the preparation of urban renewal schemes where schemes are being prepared in the Metropolitan area. And for an example, I would like to give the honourable members the benefit of some of the things which have come to my attention.

For example, the consultants employed by Winnipeg asked for the preparation of a downtown market demand study in order to complete the urban renewal scheme for Area No. 3, and the estimated cost there was \$40,000. Now at that time our Housing and Renewal Committee, as it was called then, interceded and they demonstrated very clearly that the Metropolitan Corporation had the basic data available and that the study could be done by Metro, and as a result Metro did the study at a cost of some \$12,000. Now this was shared, 50 percent by

(MRS. FORBES cont'd.) . . . . Metro and 50 percent by the partnership - CMHC paying 50 percent of that share, the province 25 and the City of Winnipeg 25. In my opinion, here was a case which clearly demonstrated that cooperation was sadly lacking, and in addition, I think we should recognize here that that which benefits Downtown Winnipeg benefits the whole community of Greater Winnipeg.

Another example, Mr. Speaker, was in the preparation of costs for Area No. 3. The estimated cost here was \$100,000. Later, we received an application to increase this by \$75,000, making the total cost \$175,000. In looking into it, it became abundantly clear that these additional costs were at least in part due to a modification necessary to the scheme prepared by the consultants so that the scheme would conform with Metro's traffic and flood levels. In addition, we recognized our part as a province and the part of the Manitoba Centennial Commission in requesting a special scheme for the cultural centre area. Even after the preparation of this scheme, Mr. Speaker, Metro came out with a traffic interchange scheme in the very same cultural area, again demonstrating an absolute lack of liaison and cooperation between Metro and Winnipeg or vice versa.

As I said, the revised estimated cost was \$175,000, which we approved after speaking to Central Mortgage and Housing asking them to review the requests they were making. There were still some ten outstanding requirements by Central Mortgage and Housing which they wanted the consultants to report on. After consulting with them, they reduced these requirements from ten to four, so everybody thought that with the fading here we would be off to a chance where we could have this scheme prepared at \$175,000. But since, Mr. Speaker, I have been presented with a request for an additional \$15,000, and when I asked for the reasons for this I have been given the following. There was an error by the City of Winnipeg in estimating the consultants' expenditures to June 30th of 1967, amounting to some \$5,000. There was an increase in estimated cost of preparing the cultural centre scheme of some \$3,000. There was an increase in estimated costs of preparing the balance of the scheme for Area No. 3; the increased allowance for costs being incurred by the City of Winnipeg of some \$4,000; and there were increased costs by the consultants in preparing the work programs in the estimates. So even when we expected reductions due to the reductions by CMHC requirements, they were offset by the redesigning and the planning required as the result of changes in the concept for Metro roads in the area.

Mr. Speaker, when we came to Area No. 2, the estimated cost for the preparation of an urban renewal scheme here again was \$100,000. I have now been presented with a request for an additional \$25,000. Our Housing Corporation has pointed out to me that Winnipeg, in addition to the staff which it has, has employed three sets of consultants, and in checking with the Chairman of the Winnipeg Renewal Committee, Alderman Lillian Hallonquist, she informed me that the cost will likely exceed \$25,000, and in asking for a reason here I understand that the consultants farm part of the work out to other consultants and that the bills from the other consultants are just coming in so that there is a possibility that the resultant figure will be in excess of \$25,000. Alderman Lillian Hallonquist could not provide me with any firm figure as to the final cost of that scheme.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments in Bill 49 here, which are controversial ones, were proposed by us to make our Housing Renewal Corporation Act conform with the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act. Now I know that the honourable members of this Assembly are well aware that the Mayor and the Council of the City of Winnipeg are opposed to the amendments which we have proposed in this bill. Because of this, negotiations were conducted at the administrative level between the representatives of the City of Winnipeg and of our Department, and these negotiations have failed to resolve the difficulties envisioned by the Winnipeg Council respecting these proposed amendments. The City of Winnipeg is expressly concerned respecting the provisions in the bill, Sections 6 and 7, and I would like to point out, however, that these sections are not retroactive, as the honourable members here know full well. The bill does not state that they are retroactive. Therefore, they will not affect any urban renewal schemes now in preparation in the City of Winnipeg or in any other municipality under existing agreements. These sections apply to renewal schemes which will become the subject of future agreements between the responsible authority, the province and CMHC.

The Mayor and the Council of the City of Winnipeg have expressed concern that if these sections of the bill are approved the entire renewal function will be rendered impotent. Mr. Speaker, this is just not so. I'm aware of all the concerns expressed, but this doesn't

(MRS. FORBES cont'd.) . . . . necessarily mean that I agree or concur with many of the points that have been raised. I, too, am concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the entire renewal function as it applies to the Metropolitan Winnipeg area. Urban renewal is a very important, and will have a very important impact on this total community if it is effectively utilized as one of the planning tools for this purpose. I'm concerned too, Mr. Speaker, that the provisions of our Housing and Renewal Act do not conform with the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act, and I'm concerned too about the applications for approval for substantial additional funds over and above the original estimates when they seek approval for the preparation of urban renewal schemes. And Mr. Speaker, I am really concerned about the entire phasing and functioning of renewal process in the Metropolitan Winnipeg area. It's extremely important that this process be effectively utilized for the maximum benefit of the total Metropolitan Winnipeg community.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks pointed out to us last night that in the conflict of personalities from the City of Winnipeg in conflict with the personalities from the Metropolitan Corporation, that the people in the Metropolitan area of Greater Winnipeg, and particularly the people of Winnipeg itself, are the ones who are most seriously affected - and with that I certainly agree. We, Mr. Speaker, believe that the initiation and the implementation of urban renewal should be the responsibility of the municipality. We believe that planning should be the responsibility of the Metropolitan Corporation. We recognize that there is a thin line where planning ends and implementation begins, and therefore it requires co-operation. Co-operation apparently fails to exist. The whole purpose in the exercise we are going through here is to try to bring about more liaison and co-operation between these two bodies so that urban renewal may be carried out efficiently and at the lowest cost possible.

Mr. Speaker, because of my concern that any amendments proposed which would have the effect of changing the functional responsibility for the urban renewal process, that these be correct and right in principle and capable of effective application by the local authorities who are charged with the responsibility for each phase, I propose to move, while Bill 49 is under consideration in Law Amendments, that Sections 6 and 7 of Bill 49 be struck out, and also I propose to move that the matters which are dealt with in 6 and 7 of Bill 49 be referred to the proposed standing committee on Municipal Affairs for its consideration. And I would like it to be clearly understood that in the preparation of all urban renewal schemes in the Metropolitan area of Winnipeg and the additional zone, that our Housing Corporation will insist that the scheme be presented to the Metropolitan Corporation and receive the assurance of that Corporation that the scheme is not in conflict with, or in contradiction of the Metropolitan Development Plan and its land use control bylaws. We will insist on the elimination of duplication of use of staff, of collection of data and its analysis thereof in the preparation of any urban renewal scheme so that the cost will stay within reason, Mr. Speaker. We are not prepared to give any municipality in the Metropolitan area and the additional zone - and this includes the City of Winnipeg - approval for costs that could be eliminated or reduced by liaison and co-operation with the Metropolitan Corporation. Mr. Speaker, I recommend that Bill 49 be presented to Law Amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Just one matter that the Minister said - could she tell me again which section she is going to move be deleted?

MRS. FORBES: Six and seven.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Honourable Leader of the Opposition content?

MR. MOLGAT: Six and seven - to be deleted completely from the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 61. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, this is the Act to amend The Election Act, and while the other parties have already stated their position in connection with the Bill, I do not oppose the Bill in general. I think the Bill contains a number of good sections but I think there are certain omissions and certain changes that the Bill could stand.

I think the omission of not amending Section 37 (d), which has to do with the \$200.00 deposit, is something that the Bill should contain. We should delete that particular section. This is placing a penalty on the individual who would want to run, be it as an Independent or as a Party representative. I see no reason for having and retaining that section in the Bill. It should be omitted from the legislation and I intend to move an amendment to that effect in committee if no one else does, so that at least we'll vote on it and that we can discuss it properly

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . before committee.

Then I note that we're still retaining the age of 21 for electors being able to vote. Since over the years we've now, time and again, had a resolution before the House that the voting age be lowered, I thought that by the time another amendment to the Act was brought in, that a change would come about, but we're still with the age of 21. Here, too, an amendment would probably be in order. I don't know whether we should go quite as low as 18 - as some have been suggesting and resolutions have been calling for in past years - but I think a slight lowering could be entertained.

However, the third qualifications for anyone to vote has to do with the waiting period in being a resident for 12 months. I think this is unnecessary and I think this is unfair when people have to be Canadians or British subjects and then still have to wait for 12 months for them to vote. I think this time should be shortened. Certainly we do not have such a large immigration from one province to another that we should deprive these people from voting. Under Section 17 (c), qualifications to go on list of voters: "(c) Subject to subsection (2) of Section 16, every person whether male or female shall be entitled to have his or her name placed on the list of voters if he or she has resided in Manitoba for at least 12 months prior to the date of issue of the writ of election." So, why can't we lower this?

MR. LYON: . . . tremendous turnover of urban population.

MR. FROESE: So, I think this could stand revision, in my opinion.

Then they're reducing the 48 hours for a candidate to withdraw, to 24 hours. What is the purpose behind this? Certainly this could be retained. I don't see the reason for this change and probably the Minister who brings in the Bill should give an explanation on this point; what the reasons are behind this.

Then also, on Section 45 - although maybe I should not refer to sections, but the matter of having the party label printed on the ballot. I think this would be quite in order and I would certainly support having the party affiliation or the party label on the ballot. I know the New Democratic Party are requesting this and I'm supporting them on this matter because I think voters would want to see the party label on the ballot.

I notice that we're changing the Bill or the Act in connection with scrutineers, providing for scrutineers-at-large, and I take it that these two scrutineers-at-large are, or will be able to go into any poll and not be restricted to one particular poll. I welcome this change so that it's not completely dependent on the candidate who has that particular right, but he will now have two other people who can assist him in whatever way they so desire and so that they can go to the various polls.

I also welcome the change from having two vouchers to one for a person requiring a voucher, who is not on the voters' list. I think this is an improvement because in some cases I think it created difficulties when vouchers were required, especially when you had poor enumerators and that a number of the names were left off the voters' list so that there were not sufficient people around the voting, around the poll that would vouch or could vouch. And so, some of these changes definitely are an improvement; however, I also see that there are some deficiencies and some changes are needed as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to add a word about a principle that was not included in this Bill that the New Democratic Party intends to propose, and that is lowering the voting age. Last year, we, I think, were under the distinct impression that the government was finally going to do something about lowering the voting age and there was a suggestion that they were going to refer the matter to Youth and Manpower, or make some study, or wait until the Federal Government had taken action.

I wanted to point out that if you look at the federal scene in Canada today, you find out that the majority of provinces now have an under-21 voting age. Quebec and Saskatchewan, for example, are at 18; and Newfoundland, Alberta, B. C. and Prince Edward Island are at 19, so that a majority of 6 of 10 provinces actually do have an under-21 voting age, and I think that if you combine this, if you simply don't examine the question in isolation but if you combine it with an educational program, I think the case - and a very strong case - can indeed be made. I don't think there's any doubt that young people in this particular election that is going on are taking an active role. We even see in some constituencies where they are actually voting delegates and are turning the tide in favour of one or another candidate. In fact, there's even suggestions of people as young as 11 voting in constituencies. Well I'm not talking about that



(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . so much as the fact that I think that people at 18 who are high school graduates either are prepared or are potentially prepared to vote. I think that the educational system can provide the basic essential, the basic preparation for the franchise with their courses on civics and government.

There are public affairs and current affairs clubs in some of our high schools at present, and I think it would be more meaningful for the students; if they were going to vote at 18, it would make their studies more meaningful. One of the problems today is they study things about parliament and elections and then there is a three-year gap after school. But it would seem to me that if the student knew in Grade 12 that he was going to be casting a ballot that year, or the following year, that this would indeed make his studies more meaningful and would to some extent exert pressure and also create a motivation for him to take a greater interest in learning about the political process. I'm not concerned, as some people are, that young people might be susceptible to politicians, because I think the key fact is that there are politicians and I don't think that young people are going to necessarily be converted by the first-in-the-flesh politician that they meet, because they'll undoubtedly meet more than one. They also have of course a strong parental influence and they also are influenced by the mass media and by the press. Actually, lowering it to 18 in most cases really means voting in one more election, because since elections are only every - let's say two to four years on the average although they can be as much as five years apart at the provincial and the federal level, looking at the provincial scene it would seem that this would probably mean only one more election for the voter. And I might point out that even if you are 21 in the present circumstances and an election is called, it doesn't necessarily mean you will vote when you're 21. You might be 21 the month after a provincial election and consequently you might be 25 before you cast your first ballot in a provincial election.

So I would think that, on the question of judgment, young people are exercising a great deal of judgment and making very important decisions today, and I think you can see by looking at the Canadian scene, by looking at this convention in Winnipeg at this time, by the student riots that are going on throughout the world, the young people are involved and actually are demanding and desiring a bigger say in political affairs. I think if you couple their maturity, and perhaps their greater maturity than some of the generations who have gone beyond, with the necessary information, then they would and could be well prepared to exercise the franchise. So I regret that the government didn't see fit to include a provision to lower the voting age to 18, and I hope that the government will consider, or some of the members will consider, supporting the New Democratic Party's amendment to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I was one of the members who sat on the committee working on the rules for elections, and in general support what there is here in the Bill. We didn't obtain everything that we sought to have passed by that committee at the time, and I really think that we should keep our rules under constant revision.

The manner in which we approached the whole question of elections was that we should do everything that we could to facilitate voting, that we should take every possible step to ensure that an individual who is interested and who wants to vote, can find it easy and convenient to do so, and that any artificial barriers to voting, such as getting on the voters' list in very involved ways and so on, should be eliminated to the greatest extent possible. And I think that in many ways the Bill does represent forward action in this regard; the question, for example, of advance polls and ensuring that they are on days where they will suit most people; the facility insofar as less scrutineers, or vouchers rather. These are the sort of things which should facilitate voting for many people.

The Member who has just spoken has referred to voting at age 18. Well, this is an issue on which, on this side of the House at least, there appears to be no disagreement. Resolutions have been brought into the House on many occasions by my own party, on occasions by the NDP calling for this. The government has resisted it. I would urge again on the government that they review this situation. When we speak about the involvement of young people, we have to really mean involvement, and the method, in my opinion, of getting them involved politically is to give them the right to vote.

The fears that they are not going to do the right thing, that they are not sufficiently knowledgeable and so on, I think are not realistic fears. The advantage of having them involved at an early age, I think far outweigh any possible disadvantages that might exist. When we

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . consider that by age 21 most of our young people today are either starting a family or getting busy in a career, they may not have the time or the interest then to be involved in politics, but if we can get them involved at the high school level, get them involved at the time when they do have more time and the interest, then the chances are that they will remain involved in politics thereafter, and surely this is the whole purpose of our system of government - the involvement of people. The more involvement we have, the better job government can do. So I certainly intend to give every support to a resolution proposing lowering the voting age to 18.

I might point out insofar as my own party, and I think it applies to most other parties, young people today participate fully in party activity. For example, at all the nominating conventions which my party is holding and has held through the province of Manitoba during the course of this Federal election, young people from age 16 up are entitled to be there and vote for the candidate of their choice, so in many cases the people who are determining who the candidates are going to be, are the young people. They are deciding who the candidates are going to be and yet we tell them, on the other hand, "but you're not entitled to vote," when the election comes along. I don't think that this is the way, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to get our young people actively involved in the business of our country, so I urge on the government to throw off your conservative shackles. Look ahead. Think ahead. Don't hang on to your old theories; just because it's always been satisfactory that you should refuse to take some new looks at things; and I recommend to you strongly that a new look is far overdue in this field. Get involved, and I think that you should be prepared to move along this line. — (Interjection) — There are a few other items — well Mr. Trudeau is certainly interesting a lot of young people, if that's the question that is addressed to me.

There are other items in the Bill itself, Mr. Speaker, which I think would require further consideration when we reach the committee stage. One of the things I would like to see us do, and it's not really part of the bill but it's part of our procedure, is if possible produce a simplified version of the Act. Now I know there are some dangers in this but we cannot expect, when we hand out to poll captains and to returning officers and workers throughout a constituency an Act as thick as our Elections Act, we cannot expect that they will read through that Act chapter and verse, and if we could supply them with a fairly simple "does and don'ts", for example, the things that they are allowed to do and the things that they are not allowed to do in simple form, possibly with a reference to the correct section of the Act, I think we would simplify the situation. I look, for example, at some of the amendments - I'm not going to discuss the Bill section by section Mr. Speaker. I'll just refer to this one as an example because it came up in the debate; The Member for St. John's mentioned it; where . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wondered if the honourable gentleman intended to speak for some little time, because it is now 12:30 and probably the matter could be left in abeyance.

MR. MOLGAT: It's immaterial to me, Mr. Speaker, whichever. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: We have no objection if the honourable member would like to finish what he's saying.

MR. MOLGAT: I'll be very brief.

MR. SPEAKER: If the House wishes to go beyond 12:30 that's your privilege.

MR. MOLGAT: I'll keep my comments brief, Mr. Speaker, and I'll continue when we reach the committee stage. But I just want to point out this one case where the Member for St. John's mentioned the question of how you vote actually, where, according to the amendment here, it must be with an "X" with a black lead pencil provided therein, within the space that the ballot paper contains.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if the honourable member would permit — Mr. Speaker, I was looking for an opportunity to correct myself. There is a section in the Act itself which gives discretionary power.

MR. MOLGAT: Yes; well, I wasn't being critical of the Member for bringing it up because I think the point is right in any case, because this section says you must vote with an "X" and with a black lead pencil. Now another section in the Bill gives a saving provision. It says but you don't really have to do that, because as long as you have made it clear that that is how you intended to vote, that will be acceptable. But, being in two different sections of the Act, Mr. Speaker, what happens frequently is the Returning Officer will say, well, that's what the section said, and the individual who may be objecting to it may not realize that there's

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . a saving section elsewhere in the Bill because he hasn't proceeded to read it, and so I think we should get these things together and make sure, to simplify the whole thing. So those are the things I would like to bring forward, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that we do everything we can to simplify the voting process and get more people voting; secondly, make sure that the rules for voting are clear to everyone so that the Returning Officers, the Scrutineers for the various parties, can easily know the Act, and so that there are no infractions of the Act, or at least that that they be minimized to the greatest extent possible. For that reason, I would recommend a further review of what we are doing in this case to see if we can make sure that all our sections that have an effect are together, and that there be a simplified version produced for the use of people involved in election machinery.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Wednesday afternoon.