

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 24, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: The Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their Fifth Report.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 15 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

No. 59 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2).

No. 60 - An Act for the Relief of The Town of Tuxedo.

No. 67 - An Act to validate By-laws Nos. 19/66 and 4/67 of The Town of Swan River.

No. 70 - An Act to amend The Electoral Divisions Act.

No. 71 - An Act to amend The Psychologists Registration Act.

No. 72 - An Act respecting The Rural Municipality of Morris, The Town of Morris, and The Rural Municipality of Montcalm.

No. 73 - An Act to amend The Attorney-General's Act.

No. 77 - An Act to validate By-law No. 214 of The Village of Treherne.

No. 84 - An Act to amend The Department of Welfare Act.

No. 85 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.

No. 86 - An Act to amend The Legislative Library Act.

No. 87 - An Act to amend The Affiliated Colleges Grants Act.

No. 96 - The Public Schools Finance Board Act.

No. 103 - An Act to amend The Horse Racing Regulations Act.

No. 111 - An Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act.

No. 113 - An Act to amend The Social Allowances Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

No. 64 - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956 (2).

No. 65 - An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act.

No. 76 - An Act to amend The Flin Flon Charter.

No. 79 - An Act to amend The Companies Act (2).

No. 89 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (4).

No. 99 - An Act validating By-law No. 3916 of The City of Portage la Prairie and other matters.

No. 116 - An Act respecting The City of Winnipeg and The Young Women's Christian Association of Winnipeg.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library begs leave to present the following as their second report. Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 36 - An Act for the Relief of Dorothy J. Ungar.

No. 39 - An Act respecting The Agricultural and Community District of Newdale.

No. 41 - An Act to incorporate St. Paul's Home.

No. 90 - An Act to incorporate the Diocese of Rupert's Land Development Foundation.

No. 101 - An Act to incorporate Atkinson Centre.

No. 108 - An Act to amend an Act to amend and consolidate the Acts incorporating "The Fidelity Trust Company."

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

(MR. CLERK cont'd.)

Your Committee recommends that the Fees paid with respect to the following Bills be refunded, less the costs of printing:

No. 41 - An Act to incorporate St. Paul's Home.

No. 90 - An Act to incorporate the Diocese of Rupert's Land Development Foundation.

No. 101 - An Act to incorporate Atkinson Centre.

Your Committee also recommends that the fees paid at the Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature with respect to the proposed incorporation of The Certified General Accountants Association of Manitoba, be refunded.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, arising out of the report of the Committee, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the fees paid with respect to the following bills be refunded, less the cost of printing:

No. 41 - An Act to incorporate St. Paul's Home.

No. 90 - An Act to incorporate the Diocese of Rupert's Land Development Foundation.

No. 101 - An Act to incorporate Atkinson Centre.

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

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, arising out of the report of the Committee, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that by leave, the fees paid at the Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature with respect to the proposed incorporation of The Certified General Accountants Association of Manitoba, be refunded.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery, where we have 52 students of Grades 7 and 8 standing, from the Warren Elementary School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kotelko and Mrs. Wilson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 52 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I'd like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer. Over the weekend, I guess everyone in Manitoba received the general information guide in respect to the new sales tax, and I wonder if my honourable friend would undertake to supply me with at least one copy of each of the cards that are enumerated on the green sheet - 44 in number I believe. I think it would be helpful to all members of the House because, let's face it, we are going to be asked a lot of questions on the tax.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, just as in the case of that booklet, I propose to send to all members of the Legislature copies of the information that goes out to either vendor or consumer, as the case may be.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): A supplementary question: Would that include the regulations?

MR. EVANS: Yes, when they're ready.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, a further supplemental question: The Honourable the Provincial Treasurer says: "When they're ready." They've been published, I understand, in both the Winnipeg papers. It happened to, by inadvertence or otherwise, see a document purporting to be the regulations. They were not contained within Saturday's Gazette. I'm wondering why and when we are going to receive them ourselves.

MR. EVANS: As soon as I can get them printed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I intended to ask a supplementary question. We received an application in the mail. The question that I would like to ask is this: Does every

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) businessman in the Province of Manitoba have to make an application, even though he knows that he does not sell a taxable item? Is it still necessary to make an application?

MR. EVANS: The short answer is no. I would think it would be wise for anyone who thinks he might possibly be in that class to make an application. He'll be told if it's unnecessary for him to be licensed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. On Page 8 it says, under the heading: "Who must apply", it says "All vendors."

MR. EVANS: That is all vendors. My honourable friend said "businessman". He's one form of businessman. There are other kinds of businessmen.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question on the sales tax just for verification. I presume it is correct that the Federal Government will not be paying the provincial sales tax. Is that so?

MR. EVANS: I'm not aware whether we have power to levy the tax on the Federal Government or not. I'm not able to answer the question just now.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. When might I expect the Order for Return that was put in in December, regarding the Executive Assistants at various levels of government?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I believe that question belongs to my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary, and he gave the answer to it on Friday or Thursday.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the answer was "soon", though.

MR. ROBLIN: We're working on it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information regarding Bill No. 56 and the preparation and implementation of the proposed Sales Tax for Manitoba:

1. Whether any persons or firms outside the Manitoba Government service were consulted or employed in the planning and preparation of the bill or of the machinery and structure for implementing the Sales Tax.
2. If so, the names and addresses of such persons or firms.
3. The date on which they were first approached by the Manitoba Government or any of its employees.
4. The date on which they were employed.
5. The basis on which they were employed, and the basis on which they are paid, i. e., by contract, per diem, or what.
6. The amount expected to be spent on such consultation or assistance.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a brief word. I had previously put in an Order for Return on the question of advertising. This part does not refer to that particular work. I'm interested here to know what outside consultants were employed, and when, and everything about the operation. It's my understanding, for example, that the firm of Clarkson Gordon have done some work for the government and that during our debates here on the sales tax one of their representatives was in the gallery upstairs, and I am curious to know exactly what the cost was on the subject and when the planning was started.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would not call on Page 2 of the Order Paper, the Second Readings of Bills No. 112, 114 and 117; 115 may be delayed just briefly.

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings. Bill No. 112. The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. JOHNSON presented Bill No. 112, The Universities Grants Commission Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the principle of The Universities Grants Commission Bill, members are aware that two years ago a Council on Higher Learning was formed to examine the area of post secondary education in the province under fairly broad

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) terms of reference. The Council directed its immediate attention to the administrative structure of the university and the affiliates - affiliated colleges - with a view to rationalizing their relationships to one another and determining the future role of the affiliates.

The Council is composed of a broad representation from the boards of the affiliated colleges, the University and the academic fraternity. Identification of the central problems and recommendations for their solutions in the Arts and Science areas were given first priority in the council's business. Through 17 council meetings and numerous Arts and Science sessions - committee sessions, the Council reached conclusions and submitted recommendations to the Minister of Education to whom the Council must report according to its terms of reference on the following items:

First of all, they recommended university status for Brandon College, and as members know, this will be established as a university on the 1st of July of 1967. They have recommended now university status for United College. Members may wonder why I haven't made an announcement of the government's general acceptance of this recommendation at this particular time, but as the terms of reference of the Council indicate, these matters - once the recommendation reaches the end of the terms of reference, it must be circulated to all the colleges, constituents and partners in the Council of Higher Learning. This has been done and I'm still waiting for two replies which have been held up in coming to me. That is, their comments have been received and all to date have been favourable from the various governing bodies, as I say as required by the terms of reference. So they've made these two recommendations and I see no difficulty with the second.

Thirdly, they have worked on a development of a new framework involving the University of Manitoba, particularly the University's Faculty of Arts and Science, and St. John's College and St. Paul's College, and I can report to the House that this recommendation was made just before last weekend - about Thursday I received this first recommendation of a new framework; and thirdly, the Council has assigned, they advised me, to a special committee to report and study on the role of St. Boniface College in the field of higher education in Manitoba. I think we're all most grateful that representatives of the affiliates and the University, under the chairmanship of Mr. Searle Leach, have resolved in large measure the organizational problems that are facing the affiliated colleges, and I believe there is unanimity on all sides that the present course of action - namely establishing Brandon College and United College as separate universities and giving consideration to St. John's and St. Paul's as member colleges within the University - is a very great step forward in this province, and I'm particularly hopeful, as the universities are formed and as the position of St. John's and St. Paul's are rationalized on campus, that all parties will recognize the need in this province to prevent duplication of effort in the academic fields, and the expressions I have received of co-operation and desire to do what is needed for Manitoba in the field of university education are most welcome.

It has also become obvious, as proposals are considered for new universities to be established and affiliates on campus to be integrated with the university, that further public support will be required. In the last several months discussions with the University and the affiliates have emphasized that there is a need for either a continuing Council of Higher Learning with statutory powers, or a University Grants Commission to receive budgets and study programs of the several institutions. Such a pattern has already developed elsewhere in Canada and other countries, and the Act before you is the mechanism chosen to bring about what we consider to be a desirable step at this time, and this Act in large measure incorporates the best parts I believe of similar legislation in other provinces. The bill, in short, provides that a Grants Commission consisting of five members appointed by Order-in-Council will be charged with responsibility of receiving budgets from the universities and distributing the monies which come to it from the Consolidated Fund for the support of these universities. It still allows for institutions to receive private monies and allows the universities to maintain their traditional academic freedom. It gives the commission the power to consider the individual desires of institutions for expansion and will have the necessary authority to prevent unnecessary duplication of services.

The institutions will have complete control of denominational theology and collegiate divisions, neither of which will be supported under the proposed Grants Commission. The Grants Commission can inquire into any financial aspects of the University's operations and can distribute money voted by this Legislature amongst the applicants. Without such a Grants Commission or central body funnelling the funds to universities, and with such universities

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) looking to us for major financial support, there could well develop conflicting policies unless the university and college level of education is considered as a whole and related in that way to the total public funds available for this support.

This is therefore, Mr. Speaker, in summary an attempt to set up a body which will carry out these general functions as outlined in the Act. I would report to the committee simultaneously that while we're bringing in this legislation and see the need for this general Grants Commission, the Council of Higher Learning will have to complete its work, I believe, within the framework that they have recommended to me, or to the government, which I'm in the process of passing on to the several bodies for comment, that in general my impression is that the general idea is well received by all concerned. I hear this informally, and hopefully that will be the case, and I feel all participants see the need for such a commission to be established and I recommend it to the House. I will be pleased to try and answer any questions which may come about as a result of this second reading.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I think this is a desirable bill. It sets up a body to distribute grants to universities, affiliated colleges and so on, and at the same time, from the Minister's explanation, I feel that it is the right step forward because it's going to eliminate this duplication - probably duplication of financial help and so on. The Minister had said that there are five members who will be appointed to the board in this case, and they are all appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. In a previous bill the school finance board, there were some qualifications - or disqualifications - where they said certain persons were not allowed to be members. I notice that in this bill there's nothing stated; it just simply makes a flat statement that there are five appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Now one wonders what qualifications these people will have or what -- the Minister is smiling. "Don't say it," he says. No, I'm not going to say it; he knows what I mean. But I mean, what qualifications would they have? Would these people be appointed from the teaching profession, from the Department of Education, or say from the Department of - the Treasury Department, people who know something about it. I think we should know a little more about what the Minister has in mind, who are the people he thinks would qualify. I thought that he may even borrow some of the members from the Council of Higher Learning to become members of this - I might have misunderstood him. It might be a good idea to do that too, on this.

There are other questions probably that will come up when the Minister explains, but at this time I'm very happy that several colleges have been further recognized. He mentions St. Paul's College, St. Boniface College and St. John's College, and I understand that some of these colleges will qualify for grants under the University grants. I think it's the right step forward because they're performing a function in our educational field so they should be considered at all times. It makes me most happy now that these additional colleges and also the colleges that teach - university status, that they are being considered by this bill.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Emerson questioned casually what the qualifications of the Commission are or will be, and I would like to stress the question -- and not casually. I think that's very important. We've had the Council of Higher Learning sitting and studying the various problems of higher education, and unfortunately we have not had the benefit of the knowledge that they have acquired or of their thinking processes. All we have had to my recollection is a copy of the correspondence and the recommendation relating to Brandon College, and those of you who have seen it, have seen that it's a very brief statement: "The Council of Higher Learning recommends that Brandon College shall be a university." No reasons given, no establishment of any of the prerequisites for the creation of the university, no description of what new powers are acquired by an affiliated college that becomes a university, and indeed no justification other than the brief statement, and I deplore that because I for one was looking forward to learning what are the requirements, what are the powers of the university. How does one make that decision? How does one make the very important decision as to whether or not an affiliated college should be a university.

I recall that we discussed this briefly at the last session and that at that time the most cogent reason that was advanced was the geographic one. A distance of over a hundred miles from the superior body in itself seemed a very strong justification, as did the fact that it would service all of western Manitoba and was thus justified in being accepted, and I of course understand that reasoning. I do not understand the reasoning that applies to the United College being created a university. The Honourable Minister has now indicated that this is a recommendation. It is not accompanied with any reasons or justification, and I think it's important that people of

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) this province do learn. I'm not for a moment suggesting United College should not be a university, but I don't think it should be enough to just leave it to the mere statement that the Council of Higher Learning has recommended this step and as result we're going ahead with it. Of course, it is the Minister's responsibility to make the decision.

As I recall it that responsibility was taken by him last year by the passing of an Act, and we talked then about the dangers of pressures that might not be related to the best interests of higher education as being a factor in the decision. And now we don't really know what the pressures are, what the reasons are, and I would strongly urge the Minister that before he actually takes the step which he does - which I don't suggest he should not take because I don't pretend to know - that he find out just what are the requirements, what are the justifications for the creation of a university, and what are the additional responsibilities and authorities which are received and held by a university. My impression is that a university has great powers in degree-giving to the extent where it can take on graduate studies working towards Masters and Doctorates, and that of course means, I believe, a demand for additional libraries, additional lab facilities, additional professors who can deal with a small pupil ratio, and that the costs would grow tremendously. The danger of course is that the University of Manitoba itself, which I think doesn't have sufficient of these facilities in the graduate courses, and I'm thinking of libraries and the like, that there may be competition between the two, and I would think that the Minister recognizes that because this Act gives to the Commission the power to control and to prevent growth. It can stunt the growth of a university or an affiliated college by not only deciding whether or not there might be duplication and not only preventing expansion, but it can actually cut back on present programs. It can go to any affiliated college or university and say, "In our opinion, this or the other course that you are offering is not really -- there is no demand for it. There is no substantial demand in the opinion of the Commission," and as far as I see it there is no appeal from the opinion of the Commission and therefore it can even cut back on present programming.

So I come now to the fact that we are going to lose the services of the Council of Higher Learning and, without disrespect to the Council, I must say that we the people of Manitoba have only had the services of the Council through the fact that it can speak to the Minister, but we have not personally learned from the deliberations of the Council so the loss to that extent is the Minister's loss, not that of the members of the Legislature or indeed of the people of Manitoba, and with the demise of the Council of Higher Learning we will now have a Commission established under this Act and the Commission will consist of five persons who have tremendous powers. They have the powers I've already mentioned, both to agree to the expansion of programming or to keep it at a standstill, or indeed to cut it back, and these are tremendous powers which I'm not sure that the Minister himself had in the past. I'm not sure that anyone other than the bodies themselves had this power, and now it's being turned over to a commission of five people. This Commission, which incidentally makes its own rules as to procedure, not even having to submit its rules of procedure to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council but making its own rules as to procedure, which of course involves publication and in camera sessions and whether or not there would be any sessions at all and what powers are given to the individual members or officers, also has the responsibility of studying the requirements of the province for post secondary education, and this I think is a tremendous responsibility, one which I think the Department of Education and the Minister must recognize has been a function of government and now it's been turned over to a five-man commission which I think would have to be a full-time commission, and I'm not sure that five men could do all the work that is required to study the requirements of the province as to kind, quality and quantity of the post secondary education, as to the capacity of the universities and colleges to provide this education, and other related matters referred to by the Minister. It's going to, I think, be a full-time commission if it functions at all, and if it is, then of course the question of qualifications is very important because being given all these powers, I think that the people of Manitoba have the right to be assured that the persons selected are persons who have certain qualifications, and the point made by the Honourable Member for Emerson is valid; is vital. I think it's important that we know the class or group or type or background of the people that would be involved, because certainly it would be most dangerous if this were turned over to a group of businessmen as such. It would be equally dangerous, I presume, to turn it over to a group of educators only, as such, but I think that there has to be a real balance, and because the Minister - and the government - is turning over to a five-man commission these tremendous

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) powers and responsibilities, then frankly I think that there has to be some indication to the government and to the Cabinet as to what type of background it is expected that these five men, commissioners, will hold.

The term of office of these commissioners is not spelled out. Apparently it's an appointment - unless there's revocation or for such term as may be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and again we're coming into the field of regulations which I think is deplorable. But I think that it's important that there be a certain amount of continuity in such a commission and yet a change-over; in other words, a type of board or commission which does not retire all at once but where there's a gradual changing of personnel, and how you do that with five I don't know, and I even wonder whether five are a sufficient number to carry out all of these responsibilities and adjudicate as between affiliated colleges because no doubt there will be complaints made, certain demands made of opposition, one to the other, for the decisions that are made by the Commission, and I would think it's very important that there are sufficient of them with a broad enough point of view whose interest in the general educational needs in the post secondary field will be first and foremost. And therefore, I think it's up to the Minister to clarify for us what is planned as to qualifications, as to whether or not it's a full-time function, as to how the appointments will be made, as to the terms of reference which will come out of it.

Now, the Commission is going to make studies, going to make decisions, and it's going to make reports to the Minister which will come four months after the fiscal year, as I recall it, within four months after the end of the fiscal year, and thereafter the Minister shall lay a copy of the report before the Legislative Assembly. Now the fiscal year is planned for the first of April so we are now certain, and as certain as can be, that we will be getting the reports a year late and discussing them a year late. I think that would be unfortunate and I'm wondering if the Minister could clarify the reason for the fiscal year being the first of April and not, let us say, early enough so that the report would be made within the winter session, and I'm wondering why it has to be a four month lag between the fiscal year and the report, because surely it can be done much more quickly. Of course the report will be valueless unless the report does deal with the considerations that have taken place and gives reasons for decisions. Otherwise we will discover that the entire field of post secondary education will end up as the exclusive prerogative of a five-man board whose appointment is that of the Cabinet whose term to us is now not known, whose remuneration is not revealed to us, which makes its own rules and which can become a powerful and dictatorial body.

Having said all that, I do not disagree with the creation of a body whose responsibilities are such as are set out in the Act, but I do say that the terms of reference should be clearly expressed, the qualifications should be, the manner of appointment and the reporting function should be clearly before us, and I think that the Minister ought to make sure to explain it to us so that on second reading - and I'm sure this bill will get second reading - that when it goes into Committee we will have answers to these questions and will be able to deal with the specific sections so as to make sure that we do get this kind of full disclosure as to the nature of the Commission and how it will function.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, my comments will be very brief because I think the points that I had in mind to raise have already been covered. It seems to me that through this bill we'll be putting the University of Manitoba at arm's length from this House and from the government as such, and I'm not just sure whether this is the right thing to have it this way. I know that there are, and I see through the provisions in the bill that there are wide powers given to this Commission, that not only will it be dealing with the grants and the way for operational purposes but also with capital grants, and I think it will be a matter of this House to look very closely at these reports that we will be getting, and also at the money that will be spent for capital purposes.

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. LYON presented Bill No. 114, an Act to amend The Magistrates Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, just a brief word in addition to what was said at the committee stage - resolution stage - when this bill was introduced. The main principle involved in it is

(MR. LYON cont'd.) the appointment of a Chief Magistrate for the Province of Manitoba who will head, in an administrative way, the magisterial courts of our province and would also be the chief liaison man for the work of the magistrates throughout Manitoba and its relationship to the Department of the Attorney-General.

This is a position from which we hope great things will come because we feel that once the position is established we can then ask the Chief Magistrate of Manitoba, when appointed, to assist the Department, after consulting with the magistrates of the province, assist the Department in even further changes in the whole magisterial system in our province, further changes on such matters as more full-time appointments, regularizing of sittings, of even such things as consideration of adoption of a court dress for magistrates, matters in relation to the Inspector of Legal Offices' responsibilities as to where courts are held and so on. The system, as I mentioned at second reading, or at the resolution stage, has been utilized in the Province of Ontario now for a few years and the Departmental contacts with Ontario indicate that this position has been most helpful indeed to the administration of justice in that province, and we are anticipating it will do the same for improvements in the administration of justice in Manitoba.

The second point in the bill is to confer upon magistrates the same jurisdiction to deal with matters of contempt in provincial statutes that they presently have dealing with summary conviction matters under the Criminal Code, and this arose out of a decision from a case in Ontario that was recommended to the Department after consideration by the magistrates of the province. I would recommend support of this bill.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, we're extremely glad to hear the Honourable Minister introduce this bill, and while listening to the Honourable Minister this afternoon, when he mentioned that the Chief Magistrate is to act or will act as chief liaison man between the magistrates in Manitoba and the Attorney-General's Department and that he will assist in directing the work of all the magistrates in Manitoba in an administrative way, and then the Honourable Minister went on to mention that he hopes that great things will come from the creation of this new office, that he will advise the Department of necessary changes, more full-time appointments, regularizing sittings and dress and so on, I had hoped that the Honourable Minister would go to some greater length than that; and then for some reason or another he stopped short just of mentioning the fact that a similar office was created in the Province of Ontario and that it did work to the benefit and advantage of the Department, the Magistrate's Court, and no doubt the public in general.

I would just like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that I have made some comments in connection with this bill when it was introduced at resolution stage, and at that time I had indicated some of the things, or I had briefly outlined the role that I would hope to see the Chief Magistrate play, and I'm not quite certain, Mr. Speaker, whether this in fact will come about from reading the bill and even after listening to the explanatory comments offered by the Honourable the Attorney General this afternoon.

In the Province of Ontario, I note, referring to an Ontario text by Bigelow, a manual for Ontario magistrates, it makes reference to a voluntary organization of magistrates known as The Ontario Magistrates Association. Now in Manitoba I do not know whether we have such an organization or not, but anyway, the purposes of this organization are as follows: To discuss and study the administration of criminal justice; to create uniformity as well as may be done in the procedure in the Magistrate's Courts; to create uniformity as well as may be done in sentencing offenders; to discuss and study existing criminal and quasi-criminal law and recommend to the appropriate authorities such amendments thereof as may be considered to be meet and proper; to discuss and study all matters pertaining to the duties and welfare of the Ontario magistrates.

Now I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that in introducing this amendment or in bringing about this amendment to The Magistrates Act, that some of the things that the Ontario Magistrates Association does on a voluntary basis, as it were, through its own association, will be done here by virtue of the creation of the office of the Chief Magistrate, that the Chief Magistrate will take it upon himself to initiate discussion amongst the magistrates in the province on matters of sentencing and matters of bail, on uniformity of sentencing, bail and so forth.

Now, referring to bail and uniformity of sentences, and sentences in general, this, Mr. Speaker, again is a matter that we of the New Democratic Party had drawn to the attention of this House on many previous occasions. We have dealt with the matter of the inconsistency in the standards governing the granting of bail; we've dealt with the question of the importance of

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) seeing to it that bail is not denied a person who should be granted bail in order to allow him to prepare his own defence in keeping with the basic principle of justice in this land, and that is that a man is not guilty until proven guilty. And I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable the Attorney-General will agree with me that the standards followed by the courts in granting of bail have swung like the pendulum of a clock, perhaps not from one extreme to another, but there has been consistent variation, and the Honourable Minister is no doubt more acquainted with this than I am in reading some of the reported cases on matters related to applications for bail. I'm sure that he has observed that over the years there's been a swing from the position that the major factor to be taken into consideration is one to guarantee assurance or some form of assurance of the accused's appearance in court. And then there has been a swing to the other position, that other factors such as the nature of the offence and the character of the individual and so forth should be taken into consideration.

Now these, Mr. Speaker, are matters that I would suggest the magistrates in this province do take under careful consideration and do set down some guidelines for themselves, some standards whereby they'd be able to bring about some uniformity in the Province of Manitoba from one magistrate's court to another as to the basis on which the bail ought to be granted or denied. And the same, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest is true of a sentence that's granted in our courts. Here again we find a wide discrepancy. I will not deal with this at this particular time. I had briefly mentioned last time that there seems to be a wide discrepancy between the sentences; and this, by the way, the reference that I made at that time, dealt only with one category of offences; it dealt with offences arising out of the Manitoba Liquor Act, and even there we found that there's a wide discrepancy between the average fine imposed by the Winnipeg Magistrate's Court as opposed to the fine imposed by other Magistrate's Courts in the Province of Manitoba.

Now these are some of the matters, Mr. Speaker, that I would hope that the Chief Magistrate would take under consideration and would give the magistrates in the Province of Manitoba some guidance and direction to bring about some uniformity to the administration of justice in our province.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I don't rise to oppose the bill; I intend to support it. I would like the Minister, however, to explain one of the sections of the bill, if he might - I don't think there'll be any objections to doing it on a section basis as the principle has to be dealt with on each one - and that's the reason for Section 3, which I don't think that he covered. If he did, I missed it. I understood him to cover the other matters giving additional powers to the Chief Magistrate but it would appear to me that Section 3 may indicate that there had been some particular difficulties of which I'm not aware, but if there are then I'd like to know about them.

I'd also like to know if the Minister has made any decision - not as to the individual; I realize that he would not be making that announcement now - but whether it would be the intention to select from the present magistrates in the province, or whether it is the intention of the government to select someone who is not presently a magistrate, to assume this position. I would think it would be very important if the position is to be successful - and I'm sure it can be - that the individual chosen of course has the support of the present magistrates. I recognize that it's very difficult to get any individual in any capacity who has the total support of everyone, but certainly in the initial stages, in order to make the system work, it's a new plan in the Province of Manitoba; it will require someone who has the diplomatic approach with many of the individuals who are presently in the bench, and I'm sure that at the outset it will require a number of adjustments to be made, and the Minister may have decided on that basis whether to move from within the present structure or from outside. I would like to know what he can tell the House about this.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if there are no other questions, I will be closing the debate by speaking now.

I thank the Honourable Member from Burrows for his comments and I can assure him that a number of the matters that he has mentioned as falling within possible duties of a Chief Magistrate will, in fact, become the responsibility of the Chief Magistrate. I can also tell him, however, that there has been the practice over the past seven years, eight years that I'm aware of, that the magistrates do have at least an annual conference to discuss the very matters about which he has spoken and I believe a few years ago they did formalize their relationship into a Manitoba Magistrates Association, and that we do receive resolutions from them from time to time. As a matter of fact I believe one of the resolutions on one occasion, not too long ago,

(MR. LYON cont'd.) was that there be a Chief Magistrate for Manitoba. So we do have the advantage of their advice on these matters at the present time.

I agree with him that greater uniformity of sentence is desirable always, but as a person trained in the law himself he will realize of course that absolute uniformity of sentence is totally impossible because of the magistrate having to deal with the case on the facts as they appear before him, and while it is interesting to find out what other magistrates are doing - and I've found this from other courts as well - while other courts benefit from what their fellow judges are doing in similar fields, each judge, if you questioned him, or each magistrate, will say that, "I must be the final arbiter in my own cases as to what the penalty will be," and of course I think no one would argue with that proposition.

The Leader of the Opposition raised the point about the portion of the bill that deals with contempt proceedings. I did mention just briefly in passing that this section of the Act is being inserted in order to give jurisdiction to magistrates over provincial summary conviction statutes, the same jurisdiction for contempt as they presently have for federal summary conviction statutes under the Criminal Code. A case arose, I believe it was in the Province of Ontario, where a magistrate attempted to commit for contempt under a provincial statute, thinking that he had the same powers provincially as he has federally, and the court advised that these powers were only extended by the Criminal Code and did not apply to provincial statutes, and it was felt by the law officers of the Crown that this deficiency should be remedied so that the magistrates would have the uniform jurisdiction for contempt whether they are dealing with a federal summary conviction statute or a provincial summary conviction statute.

As to his question about the incumbent, the person who will be appointed, I can only tell him that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council has not considered the matter as yet. A good case can be made, I am well aware, for appointing a magistrate, a Chief Justice or a Chief Magistrate as the case may be, from among the existing bench. On the other hand, it's like all rules that in general, while it's a good one, in particular cases I can think of men who have been appointed from the profession directly to the Chief Justice of our superior courts, who have been among the most successful and most intelligent of the Chief Justices that this province indeed has ever had. So, much can be made for either case. I think what it boils down to is this, and this is what we shall do: to try to get the best possible man that we can for the position, whether he's presently on the bench or off the bench, but we'll try to get the best man that we can.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: . . . question, simply, on Section 3; there have been no problems in Manitoba then. We're inserting this because of something that arose in Ontario, not a difficulty that arose here?

MR. LYON: Not that I'm aware of in the province. I believe this was the recommendation that came through from the Magistrates Association that we spoke of earlier.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I understood the Leader of the House a moment ago, that we skip 115, to 117 now?

MR. LYON: I believe the Minister is now ready with Bill 115, Sir, if you would call it.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill 115. The Honourable the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress) presented Bill No. 115, an Act to amend The Municipal Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, there are several principles in an Act such as this, which is an amendment to The Municipal Act, and I'll try to deal with them separately without referring to sections, as much as I possibly can. The first portion of the Act repeals a provision which prohibits any person in arrears of taxes on unpatented land from voting. There is no other provision of the Act that provides -- where any person is indebted for arrears in taxes, from voting, and this provision regarding those living on unpatented land is being repealed.

In another portion of the bill here there is provision being made for substituting a statement of revenue and expenditure in place of an itemized statement of receipts and disbursements in monthly and annual reports required to be prepared by municipal secretaries. By the end of the year these itemized statements contain so many items that few secretary-treasurers

(MRS. FORBES cont'd.) have really complied with this part of the Act and so therefore we have considered that an amendment here to provide for the preparation of a statement containing adequate information for the purposes of financial control would be considered a much better way of looking after this portion.

In another spot, when the Act was amended in 1966 to provide for the integration of all municipal pension schemes with the Canada Pension Plan, it was believed that any contract other than those provided for in our Act under Section 381 (1) were with the Manitoba Urban Association, but it became apparent that some of the larger urban municipalities had independent contracts with licenced insured or with other trust companies, and so this amendment is proposed here so that these contracts will be placed in the same category as contracts with the Manitoba Urban Association.

There are sections of the bill which deal with housekeeping only. For instance, there is reference made here to the Department of Agriculture and Conservation and we are making these housekeeping corrections so as to bring it into conformity with the Water Control and Conservation Branch Act.

One portion, or one principle here deals with drainage and maintenance districts which have been disestablished. As you know, we have provincial drains and municipal drains now only. With the disestablishment of maintenance districts we need this amendment in here, and there is a clause here which states that a municipality is not liable for damages caused to any person by neglect or failure on its part to maintain or keep in repair any drain or drainage work, unless the person complaining of the damage serves on the clerk of the municipality, by registered mail, a notice in writing setting forth in detail a clear description of and the damage alleged. And there's a time limit in here. The municipality shall within three months of the receipt of this notice, notify that person by registered mail whether or not it proposes to undertake the work of maintenance required to make good the alleged failure, and if so, the time when it will commence the work on that project.

Another portion of the bill here is a housekeeping portion again, where there is reference made to the former Town Planning Act, and we are correcting this by inserting the proper terms as the Act is known today, the Planning Act. We also have a housekeeping portion where sections refer to the Public Works Act, and now it's been brought up properly under the Highways Act. These are housekeeping amendments only to the Act.

Now, one portion of the Act deals with giving the right to a municipal corporation to pass a by-law for controlling, regulating or prohibiting the removal of top soil from land within the corporation, and for prescribing the measures to be taken with respect to any land from which top soil has been removed. We've found that several municipalities adjacent to Metro Winnipeg have attempted to control the removal of top soil from areas in their municipalities under planning schemes, and it has been proven that in recent court cases it was determined that the planning provisions were not adequate for the purposes of prosecution and therefore these municipalities have asked that this power be granted to municipalities as an amendment to the Municipal Act.

One portion of the bill also attempts to clarify the definition of gas distribution and personal property. Under the previous Act no definition provided for gas distribution system or gas transmission systems. Both types were adequately handled under the term "gas transmission lines." This was because they were operated by separate companies, but recently the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company has taken over the North and Central Gas Company and therefore it owns both the distribution lines, and while the two systems were separated, the distribution system was assessed and taxed as personal property and the transmission line was taxed as pipe line. But the change in ownership had the effect of making the transmission line taxable as personal property because it was under the same ownership as the distribution system, and therefore these proposed amendments provide that a gas distribution system be assessed and taxed as personal property, and gas transmission lines or pipe lines be assessed and taxed as pipe lines.

We have a further portion of the bill which deals with exemptions, and this portion of the bill makes it clear that St. Boniface and Winnipeg, who levied by provisions in their Charter, will now -- this bill makes it clear that this exemption will come under Section 984 of the Municipal Act. And because of recent court cases here, too, it became necessary to spell out very clearly what some of these exemptions were and in one section it spelled out very clearly an exemption that churches -- be read clearly that churches, retreat houses and Sunday School buildings are exempt from taxation if they are used primarily for these purposes, and that land

(MRS. FORBES cont'd.) to the extent of four acres and the buildings thereon, owned and used by a college or a seminary of learning, are exempt whether vested in a trustee or otherwise; and that land to the extent of two acres and the buildings thereon, owned and used by a charitable institution exclusively for charitable purposes, are exempt from taxation whether vested in a trustee or otherwise. Also, out of court cases there arose difficulty as to what was meant by the word "contiguous", and so this Act sets out very definitely a definition of what it means by contiguous.

There is a section in the Act also that says that the application of this definition of contiguous applies to all municipalities in the province including the City of Winnipeg and the City of St. Boniface, and there is one other portion of the Act which clarifies the definition of a pipe line company.

One portion of the Act also takes care -- it's a housekeeping portion which takes care of an omission that was made in the 1966 amendment. It was observed that the words "or with the omission, neglect or refusal of the court to hear or determine an appeal" had been omitted in the revision of the Act, and therefore these words have been added to clarify Section 1038 (1) of the Act.

In here, too, we have provided for the charge that a municipality may make of \$1.00 for the issuance of a tax certificate in place of the former charge of 50 cents. Now members will recognize that the Act to amend the St. Boniface Charter and also a bill to amend the Winnipeg Charter have been brought up-to-date and so all these Acts conform in this respect.

Then we have a portion of the Act, or a section of the Act here, which is placed here because of the education finance charges, and this portion extends the budget deadline from April 15th to June 15th for this year of 1967 only.

We have one portion of the bill which makes it clear that the amendments made to Sections 983 and 1007 affecting gas distribution systems and pipe lines, are not to become effective until the 1968 taxation year. It's believed that the change in ownership has been recorded in the rolls for 1967, but if the assessed values have not been finalized for 1967 the change in value would occur in 1968, if the change in legislation did not affect the assessments for that year.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that when we come to committee stage we will be able to discuss the sections in more detail, and I recommend these amendments to the Municipal Act and to the members of the Assembly.

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

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): If the honourable member doesn't mind, I would just as soon speak on it now. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as the Minister pointed out, there are quite a few aspects of this bill. Some of them are straight housekeeping and I won't go into too much detail on that. I do want to question this matter of the exemptions, the fact that the City of Winnipeg and the City of St. Boniface will now lose the powers that they have under their Charters and will be brought under the Municipal Board. Now this, of course, is a step in the right direction. The next step of course is to have the City's Act that would apply to the city themselves and then we'd all know where we're going. Nonetheless, this is, I say, a step in the right direction. I'm wondering this, however. Since this will affect the assessments within the area, the taxation raised in the area, will these exempted lands and buildings and schools and so on - they deal with churches, synagogues, Sunday Schools, I think cemeteries as well - will they be included in the assessment rolls and the equalized assessment figures on which the Public School Finance Board will be determining the foundation levy that has to be paid by each municipality, or will these lands and buildings also be stricken from those rolls? Because if the municipalities cannot levy and will not be levying taxes against these buildings, then obviously they shouldn't appear on the assessment rolls of the municipality as a charge which has to be paid by the municipality. I'm just wondering if the Minister could clarify that for me.

The other item in regard to the pension, the cleaning up of the wording on the pension matter, I gather that this refers now to the Manitoba Urban Association scheme, but also to include any other schemes that any other municipalities might have privately, and of course, as the Minister pointed out, there are quite a number who don't belong to the MUA scheme. Now is this simply a matter of bringing them all into line with regard to stacking as compared

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) to integrating the pension schemes? I wonder if that's the only intent of this particular section of the Act, of these amendments, or whether it goes beyond that.

The third item is what's not in the bill, and this I was hoping to see in this Session. Earlier during the debate on the estimates I asked the Minister what the chances were to finally give the municipalities and their councils the power to pass by-laws by a vote of council to circumvent and make unnecessary the ratepayer by-laws. The matter has become very crucial within the Greater Winnipeg area, and I imagine will spread, where by-laws for such matters as police stations, fire halls, public works buildings, all very essential and necessary buildings for the operating of any municipality, are meeting with very reluctant support, if I may use that word, on the part of the ratepayers, and of course I can see their reluctance because people don't like to vote themselves into debt and this is what a debenture issue means.

Now I gathered from the remarks the Minister made in reply to this query I had during her estimates, that this Session we might have a bill introduced dealing with this matter, and I think it's essential that The Municipal Act be brought more in line with the realities of the situation, because every year that goes by we're going to have more and more difficulties unless the councils can, after studying the matter, pass an internal by-law. Certainly they should be subject to municipal board control so that their deficit or their debt, their dead weight debt, should be in line with their assessment. But I think the councils can be given the authority; I'm convinced that they are responsible enough to be given the authority to determine what is required for their various municipalities, and particularly now when we're going into a new Housing and Urban Renewal Act where, if I read it right, municipal by-laws will be required in order to enter into agreements and in order to take on a debt or issue debentures or even make loans. If the by-laws will have to go to the electors for ratepayer approval, Mr. Speaker, I very much question whether there'll be much Public Housing acts or Urban Renewal schemes going on in Metropolitan Winnipeg or perhaps elsewhere, unless the councils are given the right to do the things that are necessary without having to run to the public for every little bit of expenditure, and unless we do that we're not going to move forward in Manitoba. So I'm wondering whether the Minister could bring me up-to-date on this particular matter because I had hoped by now to have a bill which would clarify this and would make the necessary changes in The Municipal Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Moved by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville) presented Bill No. 117, an Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendments contained in this bill is to make it absolutely clear that the Act applies only to transactions within the province in connection with natural products grown, raised, harvested or caught within the province by producers who carry on their production in the province. The amendments are stated to be retroactive to April 16, 1964, the date The Natural Products Marketing Act came into force. But Section 3 of the amending bill preserves the status quo in respect to any court proceedings pending in court on the day the bill receives Royal Assent. It is important that amendments be retroactive in order to protect the transactions carried out in good faith under the Act in the past three years. Although the law officers of the Crown are satisfied that the proposed amendments remove any doubt as to the constitutional validity of the Act, the government proposes, in order to resolve any further doubt in this regard, to refer the validity of the Act as amended to the Court of Appeal under Chapter 44 of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, which allows the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to refer constitutional questions to that Court.

Now with respect to the case that that is about, the Queen versus Albert Sumka, the proposed amendments and references render the validity of Magistrate Gyles' decision academic and the decision will not therefore be appealed. The course of action will have the advantage of freeing Mr. Sumka from any further legal expenses which could have arisen if it had been decided to resolve the matter by appealing his case. As I said before, it's most important to us that we have solid marketing legislation here in the Province of Manitoba. There are very many involved relationships between provincial legislation governing within-province marketing and federal legislation and jurisdiction governing inter-provincial and international trade. It is

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) also very apparent that farmers are becoming more and more conscious of the need for greater attention being directed to effective marketing of our farm products. Effective marketing is essential to the farmer as a farmer-producer. It is equally important of course to the purchaser and the ultimate consumer. With the increasing investments in farm production, with increasing production costs, farmers need dependable markets if such can be achieved via marketing boards.

Vegetable marketing has, of course, been a key area of concern in recent months and, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, and by leave of the House, I would take this opportunity to comment on this important matter. The Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission has, as you know, been responsible for the marketing of beets and cabbage, carrots, onions, parsnips, potatoes and turnips, excepting those that have been grown under contract for processing. You will be aware as well, Mr. Speaker, that the report of the special inquiry into the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission was recently placed in the printer's hands for reproduction so that copies could be made available to the House. In view of the situation that has been created by the decision of Magistrate Gyles, I have undertaken every step to speed up the printing of this document so that it could be available to the public at the earliest possible moment. In the meanwhile, however, I have had a limited number of copies made up or co-ordinated by hand in my office, which I would like to pass to the Leaders of the Parties opposite at this time. I would perhaps ask the Clerk to do that. Further to this, and in recognizing the fact that -- or the likely concern about being able to digest a 123-page report in short notice, I have asked my staff to prepare over the weekend a synopsis which covers the highlights of the report and I've had 58 copies made available to be passed out to all members at this time, which will be of assistance to them in assessing the Baron Report. I believe that when the members get the report and the synopsis it is fair to say that the summary, or the main points of interest that the Commissioner arises, could be put into three main principal points, the first one being that the Marketing Commission structure should be converted into a producers' marketing board. A vote of producers respecting a producers' marketing board is not recommended at this time and the third major recommendation by the Baron Commission was that vegetables other than potatoes should be dropped from the plan.

There are a number of other recommendations, members will appreciate, which bear on these important issues, but I feel that these three are the principal points dealt with. It is now proposed that action should be taken with respect to these recommendations, and the government is prepared at this time to make the following further steps: That vegetables other than potatoes will be dropped or removed from the control of the Marketing Commission as soon as possible, and it is now my understanding that as there are little vegetables other than potatoes that this, in effect, is immediate. The potato growers will be invited to inform the Manitoba Marketing Board, which is the supervisory body, whether or not they wish to submit a proposal for the establishment of a producers' marketing board for potatoes. Should such a request be received, a referendum in accordance with the Act will be held to ascertain the wishes of the producers.

Though a vote has not been recommended by the special inquiry commission, the government believes and I believe that nevertheless it is very desirable that one should be held to ascertain the wishes of the producers. As an alternative to a producers' marketing board, a vote may also be held on whether or not a continuance of the Marketing Commission, should the producers make this request. In the meanwhile, the present Marketing Commission will continue its operations with respect to potatoes until June 30th next, and that is in order to carry out through to the end of the potato crop year an orderly marketing of potatoes now on hand. If, by this time, the producers have requested a referendum on a producers' marketing board or a Marketing Commission, the present Marketing Commission will continue its operations as far as practicable until the results of the referendum are known. If no referendum is requested, or if indeed a referendum has failed to carry favourably, the Commission will be wound up.

It is important to recognize, and those who will be reading the report of the Commissioner of Inquiry will recognize that the Commissioner of Inquiry has found that the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission has largely achieved the objectives which were set out for it, that of achieving the orderly marketing of the crops under its jurisdiction, of achieving a dependability of supply of a quality product to our consumers and of achieving some stability of price for the producers. The Commissioner has found no basis for the various charges that were levelled at the Commission and certainly at the Commission members. He has, however,

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) concluded that since the Commission has apparently not been successful in winning the support of the producers, the marketing scheme should be converted to a producer board for potatoes.

I would feel remiss if at this time I did not acknowledge the tremendous personal effort which has been directed by various people to the operation of the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission. I refer particularly to the efforts of the Chairman and the members of the Commission Board and to the Manager and staff of the Commission. The government accepted the request of a cross section of the vegetable industry to establish the Marketing Commission; the government took the responsibility in establishing this Commission. These people have done their best to make it successful. It is no particular satisfaction to them, or indeed to me, nor I'm sure to my predecessor, that the progress in marketing of farm products in Canada has traditionally been associated with turmoil and heated discussion, and that vegetable marketing in this province of Manitoba has proven to be no exception to that tradition.

There is no discredit in having launched a scheme of this kind even though it has not won the support that was expected. We have been scolded for establishing such a commission without holding a vote of the producers. In many quarters the same folk who scold us for this also suggest that there, for instance, was no need for a vote in the recent school referendum. Such is the nature of things. I suppose the matter of judgment or leadership when exercised by a government is always open to judgment or question.

There will undoubtedly be further developments of marketing schemes for farm products from time to time and I would, in closing, urge that the members of this House give favourable consideration to the proposed amendments to The Natural Products Marketing Act as it is important that the province have solid marketing legislation on its statutes. I think that we, as members, would want to be in a position to respond when a plan is put forward by a commodity or primary producer group and we are shown that this has indeed the support of that group that we are trying to legislate for. So that I would ask the members, fully recognizing the controversy that we can no doubt generate on this issue, to respect or to recognize the difference between the amending our parent marketing legislation and the problems that are related to it. We feel very strongly that our parent Natural Products Marketing Act has to be on the statutes and be on the statutes in such a way that it cannot be challenged. Thank you.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, it's my intention to move the adjournment of the debate but if anyone else wishes to speak I certainly have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the invitation of the Honourable Member for Lakeside?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON: I wonder if you would now call Bill No. 68 and the succeeding bills on Page 2 at the top of the Order Paper, and Bill No. 95 on Page 1. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second readings. Bill 95. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, as I was saying last Thursday when I was interrupted by the 10:00 o'clock adjournment, the two major points that I attempted to make at that time were the need for a master development plan in connection with this Act to protect and preserve historic sites and objects. This is something that should be drawn up from the inception of the new Act, and that an adequate budget, which I would assume would mount into several hundred thousand dollars, be given along with this new setup because I think it is very important that sufficient money be given; otherwise it's going to be a very piecemeal effort as it has been in the past.

And the other point that I attempted to make was the need for a full-time director. The Manitoba Society of Archeologists, or the Manitoba Archeological Society, recommends very strongly and I think it's a very good suggestion, the need for a full-time director who would best be an archeologist, to head up such a program. And of course if it's felt that this would be a very costly measure, and I think you'd have to pay a good price for a professional man, then perhaps some coupling of duties in addition to the administration of this Act, perhaps the man could be used in conjunction with the new museum which is being constructed, or perhaps could be given an appointment at the University and then use his resources from there.

There has been very little done, apparently, in the way of the decoration of historical sites since 1947 and I will certainly watch with some interest whether this committee is going to be active or whether it's going to soon fall into lethargy like the committee of some 20 years ago.

(MR. DOERN cont'd.)

The danger involved is that these resources will not be looked after, and this of course is the reason for the Act. If we look at some of the historical sites in Manitoba which have been endangered, if it hadn't been for the intervention of the Federal Government in some instances, we would be much poorer off than we are now. I understand that Fort Prince of Wales, for example, is being reconstructed by the Federal Government, but York Factory stands in a terrible condition. Lower Fort Garry, which is now a national historical site, was preserved for years as a motor club, and although this may have been a good thing in the sense that the Fort was kept open, I just wonder at the desirability of having private enterprise associated with historical sites.

There are apparently all kinds of needs for this new setup. For example, there are apparently a large number of old fur-trading posts on the Assiniboine which are decaying severely near the Souris-Assiniboine junction, Pine Fort on the Souris River and so on. And then there are numerous Indian burial grounds and Indian art. For instance, one of the newspapers recently carried an article on what are called "petroglyphs" which are apparently designs and art carved into rock, and there are hundreds of these in Manitoba. In 1957 there were only 11 known but since that time some effort was made to collect them and the number is now over 200, and as it says in the article, time is running out for many of the paintings, and refers to the sites flooded by the Grand Rapids Power Project and probably many others will be flooded by the development of the Nelson River, so that all of these should be catalogued and as many of them as possible preserved and protected.

There have been many very horrible examples of art that was desecrated or just simply wiped out. Apparently the ceremonial grounds at Rainbow Falls in the Whiteshell, and Basket Falls, tourists took the rock outlines of animals and built fireplaces with them. These of course were irreplaceable and simply ruined forever. But of course there were some good attempts; for instance in the building of Grand Rapids, the Hydro gave some moneys for preservation and for the investigation, and at the Floodway the University of Manitoba and the Province of Manitoba supported a crew or crews that went out to dig into the ground before these sites were lost forever.

One thing that I would like to raise here. I'm not sure of the exact relevance - it depends on the interpretation of what one means by a historical site, but I suppose if we use the term in a very broad sense this might also allow for the inclusion of monuments, and I would like to ask the Minister whether or not there will be any funds under this Act or any other Act for the building of monuments. For example, somewhere down the Trans Canada Highway, I believe, there's a white horse that was built. I must say that it's a very fascinating legend but it also reminds you of the - what is it - White Horse Whisky or something, that you also see advertised in magazines. But there's -- (Interjection) -- don't mention it - there's also been I think too few monuments built around this province and I cannot help but point out the most obvious example, namely, on our very Legislative grounds.

Last week I took a walk on the grounds to look at the monuments that were there and I must say it's rather educational. For example, in effect, other than a monument to World War I soldiers, there is no monument to a native Manitoban or a person who I believe set foot on Manitoba soil and played a direct rather than an indirect part in Manitoba's history. For example there's a statue in the front, a monument to Jon Sigurdsson, a hero of Iceland and a great patriot who fought for the independence of Iceland, but I daresay that if one were to question people on the street or in the schools as to who this historical figure was, they simply wouldn't know. Bobby Burns stands there, the great Scottish poet, and he is better known but again, played little direct influence in the history of Manitoba; Taras Shevchenko, Ukrainian poet, who was relatively unknown until a few years ago when the Ukrainian community released information on him and now he's more generally known; and Queen Victoria. And Queen Victoria, of course, lived some time ago. So the question is: Where are the native Manitobans? There are only a few statues that I know of throughout Manitoba and I suppose if we followed sort of an inverse logic here, if the monuments on Manitoba's Legislature are all in effect heroes of ethnic groups and men from other lands, I suppose we'd have to go to other lands to find monuments of Manitoba's heroes. That would seem to follow. So, as I plan to go to Europe in a month or so for a vacation, I'll certainly look around and see if I can find any of our statues over there.

The one that I think of most - and I speak here as an individual - is of course Riel, and I think there's a continuing interest in him. I notice that the Winnipeg Tribune, for example, is

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) beginning a series on his trial. I noticed in another one of our two daily papers, mention of an opera about Riel, and so on. Perhaps there'll be other opportunities to debate the question of whether or not some more suitable recognition should be given to him. I know there are other explorers and local figures who are prominent in Manitoba history, but to me he ranks first in terms of his influence on our province in a direct sense, and although his merits can be debated I, for one, am prepared at any time to stand behind any movement, or in favour of any movement to support recognition of his efforts in this province. So I would hope that some consideration might be given to this.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I think that there may have been some Centennial emphasis given to this bill because of an interest in our history. I think it is long overdue and I welcome this Act and will watch it with great interest to see that something is done to preserve, protect and in some instances, perhaps like monuments and other measures, in a sense even create certain sites and artifacts.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, in rising to close the debate, and dealing with those who have contributed to the debate in reverse order, I want to say, first to the Honourable the Member for Elmwood, who asked about the kind of signs and markers, that that is a matter which perhaps has not been determined in any detail or with respect to any policy. If I were answering the question from my own point of view I would say that I have always been much impressed with the work in this regard done in the Province of Saskatchewan when they celebrated their 50th and 60th anniversaries of that province. It's always seemed to me that the plan that they followed there was quite worthwhile and commended itself to me.

The honourable member said that we should have a master plan, an adequate budget and a full-time director and certainly I could not in any way quarrel with those three proposals. The master plan of course, or any plan, can follow from the framework of the legislation. That is to say we have to have the legislation in order to prepare the plan. I hope that we may look forward to having adequate budgets although that will be a matter of opinion I'm sure by those who are concerned and interested and I haven't the slightest doubt from some experience that I've had for the past almost nine years that we will never be able to have as much money as we would feel that might be properly and adequately spent. The matter of a director, I would think also that we would be hopeful that we would be able to add to our staff so that we would have a good framework within which to carry out the duties. Here again one must always be guided by the funds available that can be devoted to this purpose.

He spoke of monuments and I would agree with him that we have not enough monuments in our province to men and women who have made an important and worthwhile contribution and I would hope that one of the things that might grow out of the plans that would be developed under the provisions of this bill would be the provision of more monuments, more things that would stand as a monument to the devotion and the contribution which many of our citizens have made over the years of history of this province.

The Honourable the Member for Wellington said that many sites in the province are important to the history of Manitoba and he referred particularly to Stefansson. It's interesting that two specific references have been to Icelandic people and I'm certain that there's no question about the importance of the work they have done, next to those of us of Scottish origin. The matter of marking Stefansson's birthplace is one of the things which is being strongly urged upon us and I'm hopeful that perhaps we may be able to handle it within the framework of this legislation when it becomes law. There are many other sites and I would be the first to recognize this fact. One was mentioned to us on, I believe, the occasion of the resolution stage of this bill by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell who referred to Fort Ellis in the area of St. Lazare and there are many such throughout the province that ought to be investigated and adequately marked and protected where necessary.

The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition expressed his interest and the interest that all of us have from a tourist point of view and I think that this naturally follows, although I'm not certain that this work ought to be done simply and solely from the standpoint of tourist attraction but certainly they are an attraction when we have been able to mark them and preserve them and bring into some meaningful relationship our history.

He also mentioned the matter of signs which he felt were quite important and I concur in that suggestion and am hopeful that we will be able to devise and proceed with signs that will be tasteful and decorative and adequate to the purpose which they will be called upon to serve.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 68. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to in part cover some of the general points on Medicare on this Bill which were raised often in opposition. When I listened to the debate I sometimes got the impression from some honourable members that we were embarking on a rather new and dangerous scheme and I might point out that when we look at the history of medical plans - and we can trace some of them back in Europe as early as 1883 - if you look at a list of plans that were introduced you see for example that we have the following important countries establishing some form of Medicare, as we now call it, back into the late nineteenth century. For example, Germany - 1883, Austria - 1888, Hungary = 1891, Denmark - 1892, Belgium - 1894, Norway - 1909, Britain - 1911, Switzerland - 1911 and so on. So that up to the present I think that almost every civilized nation, and particularly when we look at our so-called western world, etc., almost all the nations of the western world appear to have some kind of government involvement in a medical plan. In fact the United States and Canada appear to be almost the two exceptions. One point of course raised during the debate was the question of doctors leaving, that if you put in a medical care plan you'll have a tremendous exodus of doctors and that it is the medical plan itself which in fact drives the doctors out, so that my colleague, the Honourable Member for Wellington, at one point put the question to the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain as to where will these doctors go. It was regarded as a rather flippant and ridiculous question, which it was not, because the Honourable Member for Wellington wanted to know if these doctors were going from one country to another to avoid a medical care plan where eventually they would wind up, because there was going to be in effect only one country left and that would be the United States.

I don't think that one can prove British doctors flee the United Kingdom because of the plan that is in effect there. In fact I intend to read a statistic later to that effect. I think that British doctors frequently leave their homes to go to the United States in the same manner and to come to Canada as well and many of them have also gone to Saskatchewan, they have left for better opportunities and higher salaries. Now this is no different than a whole class of other professional Britains who have left for the same reason, architects, and professional tradesmen and teachers and engineers and so on. People who simply could get a better standard of living by being in an average position or better than average position than they could in their home country. And I think another reason why some of them may have left Britain and why many of them leave Canada, and this is something that I think we must look into later on, is for opportunities for research. A lot of doctors are interested in something more than a salary. Many of them, I think, who have gone to large American centres have gone there for the great opportunities that are available to them. I think in particular of a friend of mine, a former school chum from the elementary, junior high and high school days, is the probably most brilliant person I ever ran into who is now a specialist in New York City at the Rockefeller Institute, and he is there primarily because of the vast amounts of money and machinery available to him. If we could have in Canada, and I'm thinking in particular of Winnipeg, some of the kinds of moneys available for research then I think there would be a lesser drain on the part of our medical men. Many of them like to dabble in research; not just on a full time basis but also also as a part time measure. When I think of this fellow I referred to, he would gladly come to Winnipeg; it's not the salary that bothers him it's the money that he requires and the facilities that he requires.

Another thing I suppose that we should concern ourselves with when we think of a Medicare Bill is an opportunity through this kind of a measure to practice what is called preventative medicine. Rather than allowing a person to get run down or ill and then going to the doctor there should be greater emphasis as there is in the medical profession on preventing illness and stopping it. It's cheaper, it certainly is more progressive in the long run.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface has frequently expressed concern about abuse of the plan. There naturally are the hypochondriacs who will always, I suppose, be over using their doctors but I think they're a very small percentage of the population and in a sense they are sick too and should be seen by the doctors. Saskatchewan doctors, for example, I think were rather pleasantly pleased when they ran into a Medicare plan. They, of course, had tremendous opposition to the plan, and I'm not exactly aware of how one would rate their present level of satisfaction, but I know that in one sense they certainly were better off and that is financially, that they found that their salaries went up in most instances by 50 percent which is rather remarkable. They've also increased in numbers and I suppose for authorities as to whether they like it or not one can quote various ones. I'm not going to try to comment on that

(MR. DOERN, cont'd) other than to say that I think any exodus has stopped with the -- I think they've found the government isn't interfering with their freedom to practice and so on. I think the Saskatchewan problem no longer appears to exist.

Now we hear a lot of talk about voluntary plans and coverages. We hear statistics by the Manitoba Medical Service about the percentages that are covered and so on and I think there is a great deal of deception in this and a great deal of error. I think if anyone looks to the United States as a good example of freedom in medicine or a good kind of medical operation, I think they're sadly mistaken. Many Americans have no coverage and many Americans have plans with varying degrees of coverage. As an example, one source that I have written by Doctor Thompson, who is involved in the Saskatchewan plan called Medical Care, they say that when you look at the amount of money that is paid to cover the costs of treatment and hospitalization that that is really a measure of how much coverage. In other words the amount of money you get to pay for the bills that you had there this idea of coverage really falls apart because it says here that less than 20 percent of the total expenditure for personal health care in the United States was met by insurance benefits in 1958 and only 26 percent in 1961. So on first view it seems that 70 percent are covered but when you examine the clauses in the contract that say you are not allowed to be covered for this or there's an exemption here or you pay a portion here, when you boil it all down it's a figure in the order of 26 percent six years ago. Maybe it's 30 percent but that's a very small percentage of a very costly thing.

And this idea I think of gambling on one's health, this is supposed to be a right or a freedom, then I think it is neither, I think it is folly. Because I once took such a gamble myself. I'm speaking from experience as a university student where I couldn't afford to carry Manitoba Medical and I gambled on avoiding the monthly premium and then ran into some back trouble, had a whole battery of X-rays and was handed a bill for either \$75.00 or \$95.00, which meant financial disaster. I think the idea of anyone who gambles on medical care, has no coverage and simply hopes that they won't become ill or a married couple they hope that the fellow's wife won't become pregnant or they hope that no disaster will befall them or no operations, well this is obviously sheer folly. No one should be allowed to gamble like that. If a person goes into heavy debt over serious health and so on they can be ruined, and ultimately society will pay. So I think this one reason why we want general coverage so that we look upon it as a social responsibility as we do in education. I think this is the sort of general philosophy that this party stands for and perhaps certain other individuals in this House that things like education, health and welfare should be a basic right of all individuals. We don't want everybody getting money for nothing and so on but basic fundamental minima should be set and people should have this as a right of birth rather than something they have to pay money for, or as a special privilege.

There are other questions one could go into and I'm not going to go into them all. There's no doubt that once you put a medical care plan in it's going to go up. Naturally it's an expensive thing, there will be rising costs year after year, coverage will probably be extended, doctors salaries will be increased, more expensive inventions in drugs, drugs are very costly, so that once we implement a medical care plan there's no question that it will significantly rise in cost.

I'm going to mention just one or two other short points, a question of ambulances - if my memory serves me correctly this is not handled in the bill, or this is not covered in the bill. This is one area that I think should be and this is one area that I think we have an amazingly bad record in this province. Only a few years ago - I think it's now been abolished - one would call an ambulance driver and the ambulance would come up and you'd have to put cash on the line before you were able to use that ambulance, and it just amazes me that there were no very serious incidents over that. I can picture a man with a very sick wife who collapsed from a heart attack or something, phoning the ambulance and they roar up and say you have to pay \$25.00 or \$20.00 right now and the man didn't have any money, this of course would not be the fault of the driver, but to say that to a man under tremendous pressure, it's a wonder that there weren't severe beatings or in the odd instance a shooting or two or a few rifles brandished against some of these ambulance drivers. I notice in the States we're now getting to some pretty high level of social concern, where a Chicago ambulance in the latest issue of Time carries a big sign on the side where you can use your midwest bank cards, sorry your credit card - signs on the ambulance just charge it up and so on. I think that's disgusting; I think it should be part of a plan and I think that it certainly shouldn't have been operated the way it was in the past.

And when we come to ambulances I think that too often the people who are involved in

(MR. DOERN, cont'd) operating them are not well trained. I know some of them are; I've spoken to some ambulance drivers and they appear to be able to take care of most of the routine problems and are experienced in handling sick people but I'm afraid that from what I can tell, having read of some of the training and some of the ease which one can obtain a licence - for example, I understand a station wagon qualifies as an ambulance and after a short course one can operate as an ambulance driver -- I think this is totally inadequate. Certain countries in Europe have doctors and all sorts of equipment, nurses who go out with the ambulances, and I think this is the way it should be operated. I think it's ridiculous to send out a wagon which is in effect a taxi painted white, pick up somebody at the scene of an accident then drive them to a hospital and then begin to give them any form of a treatment. I think that in many cases lives are lost and injuries are compounded.

Mr. Chairman, I think I will end at that point, only to say that I think that the idea that we should, or some individual should be allowed to gamble on their health, I think is sheer folly. I think that a medicare plan should be considered to be a social responsibility; I think it gives dignity to the people who are involved rather than applying for charity and special considerations which many people have enough dignity to turn down. So I think that although there are many things left out of this plan and many which we ourselves have raised, that the basic idea is sound and that although this is a first step that it is one that the parties in this House should support.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): The Honourable Member for Morris wished to speak on this debate. He asked me to adjourn it owing to the fact he has to be out at the moment.

MR. LYON: I believe we mentioned the other day, Mr. Speaker, that if possible we would like honourable members to participate and clean up this debate if we can. Perhaps somebody's gone out now to see if the honourable member is ready to participate in the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall we proceed to the next Bill and wait for the honourable member?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't planned to get into this debate today but I would just like to say a few words at this time concerning this particular Bill. Like, I believe most of my colleagues on this side, I feel the government with the terms and conditions of this Act has no alternative but to introduce compulsory medical care at this time. I know that it's always difficult to talk against those measures which have such great appeal as medicare and I'm one of those who certainly believe in meeting the needs of those people in our community who require help. I think medicare has certain virtues and possibilities but also have some reservations about medicare because I don't think I nor anyone else in this House can precisely predict what medicare might mean in the future and I don't think it would hurt for someone who has been in the business to give some observations just off the top of my head as it were, because I'd hoped to prepare a more formal set of remarks or organize my words a little better, but basically what impressed me is that since 1883 as the Member from Elmwood said when medicare first came in in Bismarck's time in Germany, where are the great schools of medicine of these eras where universal compulsory medical care has in fact become a reality?

I had the privilege a few years ago of going to England and Norway and examining these health schemes firsthand and visiting some of the hospitals where of course tradition and practice have led to a completely different system of medicine and medical practice than exists here. I saw in the largest hospital in London, England a waiting list of about 200 people whom the Dean told me their grandparents came to St. Thomas' for medical care and for their drugs. They have come for 200 years, in fact since Magna Carta and the pattern hasn't changed one iota. They were lined up and I said to myself as Minister of Health at that time for Manitoba, if that happened in my time I'd be run out of the country tarred and feathered. This is the sort of thing that worries you about medicare. And let me say this: I don't know of a doctor alive who wouldn't treat a patient as humanely and as fully and as properly, in slavery, let alone all these boogies we hear about what's going to happen to the level of care. I think that doctors will meet up to their responsibility but I do feel that -- I know there are things that I don't know -- but important than anything else I think is the organization of medical services. This is why, while not against Medicare entirely, I do feel that the regular implementation, extension of our present medicare program on a voluntary basis and easing into it gradually might be a lot more judicious than the compulsory scheme we have before us which demands this overnight. Because the big thing in Britain was that medicare predicated closed hospitals, and when I was there they were having conferences throughout the country how do we bring the GP and the average family physician back into the hospital? My honourable friend from Elmwood need have

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd) no fears of Britain - 22,000 doctors that they had when I was there were grossly understaffed, the medical doctors were most unhappy, the average GP was screening patients in his office and referring them, booking out, and the jaundiced ones went to the out-patients of the nearest teaching hospital and he was able to treat very superficially. He became the clearing house. That man was becoming unhappy because he was losing his prestige, he'd lost his academic brush-off with the hospital and he was losing his prestige as a physician in the community, because government had taken more and more off him, public health services and now his clinical practice, and of course it's a different system of practice I will admit, but nonetheless he was feeling less and less enchanted with the profession. I would say in this country we have to combine preventative health, the family physician should be doing more preventative health in his area, and medicare could help in that regard in that it will put more dollars in the pocket of that chappy, but I can see the danger of him becoming gradually squeezed out of the hospital and we would have to guard against this type of thing. I was always hopeful that the organization of services would precede a compulsory scheme of this type.

Now take the rural areas. When some members say, but when you bring in a compulsory plan without the laboratory and x-ray facilities and so on, how do you expect the people to get any more care or better care than they are getting now. And I would say, having been in practice in rural Manitoba again we have concern here because I don't know how a government can justify the establishment of a diagnostic centre to serve one doctor. He'll have to serve 5 to 9 doctors. This may be a good thing; a larger team of doctors treating a larger area for more ill and I think doctors under this situation would tend to be happier. It's possible that medicare would improve and enable this type of development to occur because just as unitary divisions are coming in, let me tell you, you can graduate 200 doctors a year, you're not going to get them into rural Manitoba unless you have the kind of facilities so that they can use the knowledge that they have acquired and serve in partnership with others.

Now I'm saying all these things knowing - and I think everyone in this House knows - that this is the way we're headed, but overnight compulsory medical care is going to put the squeeze on and I think that while on the one hand it may just bring about the kind of reforms that are needed in some areas, on the other hand I have the fears that this province or any other province wouldn't have the resources to do the kind of job as quickly as it has to be done and would lead to increased moneys into practice and into treatment and into closed hospitals and this sort of thing because the increased demands in service will have to be met.

The one thing that Mr. Hall, Justice Hall doesn't talk about in his royal commission report are the number, of when he estimates the expenditures, and I think they're very low, is the number of free calls, or the number of calls that every physician in this province has every day of his life; I'm sure lawyers have the same thing. A friend phones or you deliver your next door neighbour's wife or you have maybe five or 10 calls a day that you just say: Oh, here's a prescription; here's a sample, etc. Every one of these will now be charged at the full rate and those rates will go only one place - up; and I understand the Federal Government plans to pull out of this in five years or so, possibly.

So this is the sort of thing that you just wonder what you're getting into. I honestly wonder. Maybe it's the right thing; maybe it'll work out all right, but it's going to cost one hoot of a lot of money and it's going to require an awful lot of reorganization of medical services over the next few years. When some say the only thing compulsory about it is the premium, - the Member for St. John's said earlier - I'm afraid it'll mean somewhat more than this. But I make one plea, not because I happen to be a member of that profession but because I have in my time in this province, not really known of a person who needed essential care who didn't receive it with concern and dignity by dedicated physicians and I think we tend to overlook that. This isn't going to be a Utopia over night by any stretch of the imagination. Patients are still patients. They're still going to have the same problems and they're going to need this care. I think doctors will make more money and in this sense it may open hospitals, policies can be maintained and so on. It may lead to some better organization of services throughout the rural areas because there are areas where this has to be improved.

One thing I'd just like to say on research, that some member mentioned, and I just want to put this out and I think it's right. As the Minister said in his estimates, the work in research in this province is under the supervision of our National Research Council which I think is a very excellent body in Canada, wherein it prevents expensive duplication of research activities in different provinces and allocates certain major projects; for example, our work

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd) here in Winnipeg is not duplicated in other provinces and so on and a thing I'd like to see in education. But it's well developed in medicine and in research with less than a million people in our province, and so on, the areas of research that we can go into have to be by that restricted. We have to specialize in certain areas of research which means we retain certain types of specialists in limited fields which I think is the only way it can properly be done. But research of course - Manitoba in that connection has filled most of our American universities with their top research people over the past 50 years and no doubt this type of thing will continue.

So I think your people interested in certain fields if they can't find their opportunities here, go anyway. But doctors in England, I have no question in my opinion, did come over here in large measures because of the closed hospital system in that country which is a distinct increased possibility under a Medicare system.

Now in just saying these few words, I just wanted to put it on the record, Mr. Speaker, my general observations on this. I support the measure on the basis that the Minister and this government have no alternative really. I see possibilities for it; I have apprehensions about it. Certainly the Minister and his commission are going to require all the support we can give them in their early days of organizing and improving medical services in this province.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in connection with this bill, wherein a short time ago the President of the Manitoba Medical Association had asked our provincial doctors to keep quiet and not debate this medical Bill 68 which is before us and I also noticed reading one of the daily papers that the Vice-President had made the same statement to our doctors in Manitoba not to become in any manner, shape or form to be guilty of debating this bill and from the information that has been passed on to me I think there's a point or two here that we'll have to study and watch very carefully.

I have been told that the doctors have been raising their fees. An operation that would cost \$250.00 a year ago, today will cost you \$350.00; and an operation that would cost \$75.00 to \$100.00 is costing \$125.00 to \$150.00 today; and their fees are going up accordingly. I think that's one thing that this Board that is set up to look after these things will have to study, the cost of fees very closely because I believe that we'll have to pay a lot more for the medical care that we'll be getting than has been suggested to date. We are told that the cost will be in the neighbourhood of \$35 million but I'd almost bet a new Panama hat - and I look terrible in a Panama hat - but I would almost bet a Panama hat that within a five year time that fee will be doubled or maybe more and we'll be left holding the bag, as the previous speaker mentioned. That we'll have to foot this bill ourselves.

Now I'm 100 percent in support of the proposition that facing us today, that a high quality of comprehensive medical service should be available to every citizen whether his income be large or small, Mr. Speaker. I agree that the Federal and Provincial Government should bring such services within the financial reach of every family. Let it be clearly understood, too many are willing to imply that anyone who opposes a welfare state method of human needs is indifferent to such needs and are satisfied with the status quo. Now we're not satisfied with the status quo; we like to see people treated in a manner that is becoming to the citizens of Canada at a reasonable cost; and I think that we'll have to do quite a bit of work on this bill yet before it is where it should be to do the most good for the people of Canada - not only Manitoba, but the people of Canada.

The Federal scheme is to have . . . characteristics. It is to be universal. That is, it will be a compulsory program in which all must participate whether they wish to or not. It's to provide a comprehensive coverage, starting with physicians services, other services will be added over a period of time until all aspects of medical care are covered. It is to be administered by governments or government agencies; existing medical insurance carriers will not be permitted to participate. Its benefits are to be portable so the individual will not be penalized if he moves from one province to another. It is to be financed entirely from public funds. The individual, no matter what his financial resources, is not to pay for any part of his medical service other than that as a taxpayer. Now we do know that we have people, and a good many of them, who cannot afford to have the medical attention and care that they deserve and that is coming to them and we have to help them along some lines, and I think the system that we're working under now is about as good as we can get because I don't hear of anyone that is suffering from the lack of medical care today; and if we are thinking of the future and we don't want to mortgage our children's lives as it were, why we should think twice about passing

(MR. SHEWMAN, cont'd)this bill.

I'm happy to see that the bill comes into effect on proclamation and I would suggest that we take this bill and hold it just as long as we can because in reading an article last week that Ottawa was giving this serious consideration - the medical care that had - was giving serious consideration of making some amendments to it but it didn't state just what the amendments were. But when we see what has happened in other countries, Mr. Speaker, where they've had medicare schemes for quite awhile, that the doctors in Great Britain were not happy and are not happy with the scheme that they have today and the patients are not happy with the way their scheme is working out in Great Britain. Then there's other countries such as Germany who has had a medicare scheme since 1823, I think it was, and some of the other countries such as the Scandinavian countries have had this medicare plan, free hospitalization, free health insurance and such like and their plan is heavily subsidized by the government over there to maintain the standards of health and so forth that they have, but they tell us that it does not compare even with our system that we have here today or the systems that we anticipate.

Then they have - France has had a medical care system for a good many years and they've had a lot of trouble with their scheme and it seems that if you get into a scheme such as this, that there is the trouble of providing service both from the doctors' standpoint and from the hospital care. It means that we will have to spend a great deal more money in providing services in hospitals, rooms and such like. That has been their experience in Italy and the same thing has happened when you read about Austria and these countries that have had this system for some years.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that we should give this serious consideration, as I mentioned before, that we shouldn't drag our feet - if that's the right expression to use - and see if we can't possibly get a better deal from Ottawa than we are getting because the Province of Manitoba and other provinces are forced into this compulsory scheme; and if we're going to be free enterprisers and believe in free enterprise, I think this bill needs some more study.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Chairman, I hadn't planned on saying anything in this particular debate, but I felt that I had to get up and deliver myself of a few words in connection with it. It seems that many debates that we have listened to in the House in connection with this bill on medicare have centred on the problems that will be developed as a result of the introduction of this bill through this House for the citizens of this province. I don't know of any bill, any one of the 118 or whatever it is that have been passed or are being passed through this Legislature that will not involve some problems. I don't know of a single thing that this House has done, is doing or will do that doesn't involve some kind of problem. The Medicare Bill will obviously, and I don't think anybody would argue against it, involve problems, but that's one of the things that I think we are here for, to meet problems, to solve them as well as we can and go on from there without any expectation that we're going to reach a millennium at an foreseeable time in the future, and if doctors are opposed to it then that's their concern; they take the position that they feel they must. There are many doctors who favour the bill and they will take that position. But in the long run the co-operation of those who oppose the Bill, who oppose the idea of Medicare, will have to be brought into it and we'll have to have their co-operation in whatever way they feel that they can give it, and if any give here or give there is necessary then that will have to be done both on the government side and on the side of the medical men that are going to be involved in this scheme.

It's foolish I think to expect that any enactment whether of this government or any other government is going to turn out a kind of an operation that will represent a well-oiled, smooth running operation or plan. There aren't any such things and I don't think that there will be. Hospitals create a problem. They are no sooner built than they are full to overflowing. You have to get staff; you have to provide accommodation and people themselves, because of their many differences one from another, create their own individual and collective problems. But the Medicare Bill is something that is coming and will come whether we wait until July 1st, 1968, or July 1st, 1998, eventually it will come and there are nations in Europe that have set the example that we now, very belatedly, are beginning to follow and if they have made mistakes we can learn from their mistakes and move on to some sort of a better arrangement than what they have come to.

The idea of this proposal being a compulsory scheme is, as other men have pointed out in this House, a complete misnomer. It isn't any more compulsory than the schools are compulsory or the police force is compulsory or the fire department or the water system or the post office or hydro or telephone or anything else you want to name. If these are supported by taxes or by public subscription, they're all compulsory if you want to

(MR. PETURSSON, cont'd) use them, and Medicare will be in the same category. If you're going to use it, if you want to call it compulsory you can call it compulsory but you should also refer to all these other things as being compulsory because that's exactly what they are and I can't see the object in continuing to emphasize the fact that this is compulsory and that anything else is not compulsory. If you're living in an organized community you're living the kind of a life where you find that many things are compulsory. Even to driving your automobile; you're compelled to drive along the road, you can't drive on the sidewalk; and you're compelled to park in certain places only and only for a restricted time. This too is compulsory. -- (Interjection)-- Pardon? You're compelled to go to school, yes. And we also are compelled to sit in this Legislature and listen to a lot of things that we would prefer not to have to listen to. I feel that this should be the emphasis and not the other, that is we see that there are going to be problems and we don't have to be convinced that there are going to be problems; we realize that there are going to be, but the fact of the matter is that Medicare is a needful thing. There are great numbers of people now who need the services that Medicare would give to them and I have here a little clipping from a paper that points to that fact, but points to people who are now being deprived of the kind of medical help that they would need, but which they can, I hope, and will be given whenever this scheme becomes a universal plan - and it has to do with Indians and Eskimos.

I was taking this clipping for another purpose but it suits my purpose at this moment which shows the infant mortality among Indians and Eskimos as compared to other Canadians. In 1956 for instance the mortality rate among the Indian babies being born at that time was 96 per thousand live births. Among the Eskimos it was 238 per thousand live births whereas other Canadians were 32. The mortality rate has decreased somewhat in later years to the point to where now among the Indians the mortality rate is 62 per thousand live births; among the Eskimos down to 95 per thousand but among other Canadians 24. --(Interjection)-- I don't know. I'm just pointing out this fact that something has changed it to what it is now. Now if Canadian people are going to get Medicare I think that Indians and the Eskimos should also be beneficiaries of something that other Canadians are receiving.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): They're getting that now. Aren't they getting that from the Federal Government?

MR. PETURSSON: Well, then they'll continue to get it from the federal government with whatever help the provincial government can give. The average age of death for native people, it says here, in a report from the Community Welfare Planning Council, the average age of death for native people is 34 years as compared with the national average of 62. I'm simply pointing these things up that there are problems and there are people who need the kind of help that Medicare whether federally administered or provincially administered need and that we mustn't fool ourselves into thinking that we're going to have a system that is completely free of problems or emphasize the fact that because we're going to have problems that probably we should do without it. Individually and collectively, we all have problems of one kind or another but they are there for us to dissolve and to overcome and to rise above. So I think that the less we emphasize that side of it and the more we emphasize the necessity of it, the farther along we'll get.

I don't know of any other bill where difficulties have been given the same kind of emphasis as the Medicare Bill has been given and it seems to me that the reason these difficulties are being emphasized so greatly is that there is a tendency to back away from it rather than to move ahead with it.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I'm going to be one of those who rather reluctantly vote for this Bill. I believe the stage and pace has been set by Ottawa and personally I have my regrets. Like many in this Party I've always had the feeling that a health scheme of this type should be voluntary. Personally I always felt that the only real type of insurance we need of this kind was the disaster type of insurance which prevented a family from financial ruin for the rest of their lives and my own hopes were that something like that would materialize.

Now I must look at any sort of a health scheme, not purely from the magnanimous, big-hearted side, although I do feel that in Manitoba there are few if any people suffering for medical services, and I must look at it though from a businessman's viewpoint and small businessmen have to very carefully avoid the permanent type of overhead type of expense that they can never back away from. You can assume overhead costs if you can see that you can cut your losses in tough times or if sales aren't as good, but you must be always in a position

(MR. LISSAMAN, cont'd) to be flexible. Now the thing that scares me about the modern trend is Senator McCutcheon said in '62 - '63 the per capita cost of government, of all three levels of government in this country at that time were \$207.00 per capita. Now if you divide a million people, just roughly for round figures, into our budget you come up with about \$354.00, just for one level of government; you take the federal budget of over \$11 billion and you come up with something like, divide \$20 billion, it's something like \$575.00; and taking my own city with a \$400,000 budget, and this doesn't include a deficit position, and divide that by about 30,000 people and you end up with \$133.00 there, so our costs of government since '62 - '63 when Senator McCutcheon recorded it as being \$207.00 per capita have now gone \$1,162.00, certainly over \$1,100.00 per capita. Now the ironical part about it is that these aren't strictly government costs and when we get into such a thing as a Universal Medicare Service, costs are simply going to go out the window.

Now it was rather interesting that the Honourable Member for Elmwood touched upon the services in Austria. In 1965 the then Member for Wellington, Mr. Seaborn, commented on the Austrian situation and I would like to quote a paragraph from his speech, and I quote:

"Seventy years of compulsory health insurance in Austria should dispel the notion that given enough time government health plans will solve their inherent problems. I think it is of particular interest too that in 1958 a newspaper in Vienna ran a series of articles under the title 'The Malingerer is Among Us' and the reporter examined in full details the various techniques of getting ill for the specific purpose of acquiring social security benefits. And in 1959 the Director of the Control Board of the Austrian Health Plan concluded his report by saying, 'It is vain for the health plan to appeal to the federal government, even if their deficits were continually covered by general revenue, the root of the evil would remain the vicious circle' -- I beg your pardon, I've misquoted. "Even if the deficits were continually covered by general revenue, the root of the evil would remain the thoughtless irresponsible claims for benefits." And he goes on to say, "We suffer from a vicious circle. The compulsory health plan as everyone knows only makes a half-hearted effort to plug the hole through which these resources vanish. As a consequence the other participants in the health scheme show little inclination to reach fiscal stability. A patient at least three if not four quarters of the year. Indeed it might be economical suicide for a doctor to discourage the hypochondriacs. The beneficiaries of course seeing ever large amounts of pay cheques deducted for social security are literally trained to maximize their claims." This is a report from Austria.

Now I spoke of growing government costs which strictly in the sense of certainly older people are not strictly government costs, and I wonder if I might again quote from Mr. Seaborn's speech of a year ago -- two years ago, I beg your pardon, it was 1965. And in speaking of Sweden he says, "Sweden is a country of 16 million and 70 percent of the Swedish population carried voluntary health insurance prior to the introduction of the compulsory scheme in 1955. Total expenditures of these three voluntary schemes rose between '46 and '50 from 25.6 millions to 38.8 millions and by 1954 the expenditures were 55.4 million. In '55, however, during the first year of compulsory service expenditures jumped to 136 millions.

Within five years the expenditures had grown to 200 millions and in 1961 exceeded 240 million under the compulsory health scheme. In 1961, Madam Speaker -- his referring to our Speaker at that date" -- "a married couple in Sweden with an annual income of \$3,000, which is a modest standard living in that country, had to pay 27 percent in taxes on every dollar of additional income and a couple earning \$5,000 had to surrender 42 percent of all additional income to the tax collector." And then he goes on a few paragraphs further on to relate Britain's experience. "The original estimated cost was given as 70 million pounds; the actual figure was 170 million pounds. Within ten years it had risen to 800 million pounds and last year was 1 billion pounds."

Now the thing that shocks me and scares me to a degree is the fact that leaving these costs where they lie in a purely volunteer type of service where you can procure a doctor's services or not as you see fit you're in rather a different position than when these are accumulated through a compulsory state scheme and the collection of those costs have all the authority of the tax collector behind it. Now if we were to experience -- I just worked out a rough proposition -- that if we were to experience a jump in cost comparative even to Sweden and our estimated cost is 34 million here for a year, in five years this could easily become 123 million.

Then there's the question that I can't help pondering in my mind, is have we as citizens of this country to take any one class of people, regardless of whether they be professional people, ditch diggers or so on, and impose the operation of this service -- a compulsory service.

(MR. LISSAMAN, cont'd) To me it doesn't seem quite morally right. And in connection with the method that is being chosen in this province, the method of premium collection, I think this is an excellent way to keep people conscious of the costs and we may escape by that method some of the extreme growth of costs.

I was rather amused when - you will recall during the recent, several months ago, discussions in the Federal House when the Old Age Assistance was raised and Minister Sharp immediately tagged this on - or directly connected it with a special tax to raise the money and I can recall the argument there was much the same as the argument we get here. Douglas objected very strenuously to this. There is this great feeling, quite apparent among the socialists that feel that we mustn't ever tie the direct cost in a tax to the cost of the service. I don't subscribe to this theory or practice. I don't believe the public are really that easily fooled, but certainly for the intelligent ones it's necessary in my opinion to tie the cost of the tax to the cost of the service so that people do have an understanding of what these so-called free government services really do cost the individual.

Now I think I have voiced quite a few of the objections and suggested at least that recommendation in an effort to keep costs down. I would like to suggest one other recommendation seeing that our hands more or less appear to be tied by Ottawa and we are forced to go along this road. And that is that I believe that it is important that - the Honourable Member for Morris suggested what may be happening to doctors fees - and while no doubt board and commissions will be set up, I have never been wholeheartedly in support of boards or commissions getting too great a power because the rate-payer, the taxpayer, the voter, can't get at them very easily, and I would suggest that this schedule of fees that we set up should always be brought to this House for the members and the future members to give it their scrutiny. I believe this again might have a very real effect in keeping the costs of such a scheme down -- and heaven knows, and I know there are a lot of people think there's no value in history, but all we have to do is look at the history of this all over the world and you can see that costs grow disproportionately to the services rendered in my opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. I would remind him there are five minutes . . .

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Thank you very much. I had no intention of getting in but this last rabble rousing speech really got to me. It moved me right to my heart; right to the quick. And now I'll deal with one or two of the items brought up by the Member for Brandon. He says Socialists are reluctant to tie the cost of the service and openly admit to them. In other words we're suggesting always that the costs should now be tied directly to the service. I would only refer the member to a speech made by one of the ministers -- I'm not sure which; perhaps the Provincial Treasurer, perhaps the First Minister -- when questioned as to the licence fees and motor vehicle tax and why they are no longer related directly to the cost of highways. The answer was, it goes to the consolidated fund and it was never considered that motor vehicle tax, gasoline tax and licence fees should ever relate only to the construction of highways. And I agree that that's the way you run a province but apparently the Member for Brandon feels differently about it.

In listening to the Member for Morris and the Member for Brandon, I don't think this is a Conservative Government, it's a schizoid government if I ever ran across one, because I've never heard such complete differentiation and opposite points of view as I've heard. I believe the Member for St. John's referred to this government as introducing this legislation half-heartedly - sort of being the reluctant bride. If ever I saw a display of the reluctant bride, this certainly was it. I suggest they get together occasionally and talk this bill over, maybe they'd come to some agreement. But it shocks me really to hear speaker after speaker get up and talk about health as being a personal responsibility. What utter nonsense. Is it 70 years ago or 80 years ago that this province, and not very much longer than that this country decided that education cannot be left or should not be left to the individual. We do not accept it as the right of the individual to decide whether he or she should have their children educated. I suggest to you that if it's proper to be concerned about the mind of the future generations, it is equally as proper and equally as important that we be concerned about the health of this generation and the future generation. The two go hand in hand; you can't have one without the other.

I further suggest to you when you deplore the costs and the terrible costs of this effort, if there was some terrible event occurred and this country had to go to war, would anyone in this legislature disapprove of the cost? Would anyone in this legislature dare to get up and suggest that we should not spend the money? Mr. Speaker,

(MR. MILLER, cont'd) I say to you that the health of this province and the health of the people of this province and of Canada as a whole, is equally as important as any war effort that we could ever launch; at least it will save lives, it won't be expending lives unnecessarily. The suggestion that if we had to pay for it directly maybe we would learn to be judicious about its use, maybe we'd appreciate its value. We spend money on war efforts and we have and we should. That hasn't prevented wars; it hasn't prevented us from not having wars. So this concept is nonsense. The idea that free enterprise must prevail - I'm not going to get into the whole question of free enterprise, public enterprise, but to think for one moment that health can be treated as free enterprise is as nonsensical as saying that education shall be treated by free enterprise. The idea that we should go back perhaps 150 years and only those of means should be able to send their children to be educated is as dead as a dodo. Surely, in this year of 1967 we can at least hope to achieve what other countries have done for years, recognize that health and education are parallel efforts on the part of any civilized community. We're behind the times. We have to grow up. Let's do it without this kind of rancor. This Bill will pass because the government introduced it; the fact that it will pass half-heartedly and without even government or front bench full hearted support is regrettable. I'm happy, however, that the Federal Government has imposed these qualifications so that it will go through because once it's through, there's no power on this earth, I'm convinced, that will ever convince the people of Manitoba to get rid of it, despite the dire predictions that we hear from the other side and from the members to my right.

Now the suggestion that the costs rise, certainly they rise. Educational costs have risen and I suggest to you we've only scratched the surface, but that's no reason why we shouldn't have a health scheme. Our costs are rising in every fact. In private business, too, costs are rising. The costs of our products that we buy have risen all the time; this is part of the economic pattern. But to say that because costs rise the plan is faulty is nonsense. This plan can work, will work, providing all support it. It will not work if there's any thought in anyone's mind that maybe they can convince others a year from now to kill it. Then you will get those people who are against it to launch the sort of attack that will try to discredit it; and I would caution members of this House to recognize their responsibilities in this matter. They have an obligation to us, to this generation and future generations to see that health is adequately covered. I know it's 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30; I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 this evening.