

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:30 a.m. Monday, May 1st, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
 Reading and Receiving Petitions
 Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
 Notices of Motion
 Introduction of Bills
 Orders of the Day.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address this question either to the Minister, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture or the Honourable the Attorney-General because it seems I'm not sure which one gives me the answer. The other day I had requested a copy of the membership list of the United Producers Vegetable Association. I was told by the department that this is privileged information; the Minister refused to give me the answer to the question the other day. Now in light of the fact that in Law Amendments the other day the Association said they had no objection to members of the Legislature having this list, I request that the list be tabled.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I mentioned to the honourable member the other day that if he wished to get the list there was a means for doing it by means of Order for Return or Address for Papers. There is a much more rapid way for him to do it, that is to contact the Vegetable Growers in question and to get the list from them as they said would do, they would give the list to him. So I suggest he do that; that's the fastest way.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the First Minister. First of all I'd like to welcome him back to the House. While he was away the newspapers carried a story regarding the education mill rate for Winnipeg in general as a result of a letter of his to the Chairman of the Metro Corporation. I wonder if we would be able to get copies of that letter.

And a second question, in view of the fact that the Minister has the figures for Winnipeg, can he also supply the House with the figures for mill rates for the other school divisions in the province?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): First of all let me thank my honourable friend for his welcome, and perhaps I ought to say while I have this opportunity that I can't speak too highly of the Expo '67. It is an event, an occasion, an achievement of which every Canadian can be very proud and I urge any member of the legislature and perhaps any other in the province that might be thinking of going to Expo to see it. It's a wonderful Canadian event, and reflects tremendous credit on those who had the responsibility for carrying it out and it's something which I think would make every Canadian rejoice.

Respecting the letter that I wrote to the Metro Corporation, I'll be glad to furnish a copy of that letter together with the attachment that went with it. The figures for the various divisions in the province are being worked on and will be available in due course but I do not have them at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you have a supplementary question?

MR. MOLGAT: No, I have no other questions on this, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Virden.

MR. MORRIS D. MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I had the distinct privilege yesterday when the Pony Express entered the Province of Manitoba of representing this province in accepting this scroll and passing it on to the first courier this side of the Manitoba - Saskatchewan border. You may know the pass - I knew very little of this myself until Saturday. The Lieutenant-Governor was unavailable, the First Minister was out of the province so I had to go with a little bit of advice and do my duties. I did mail a letter to the Queen - and sometimes all switches close in front of you. I was in the hotel this morning and a former member of this House, Mr. Tommy Seens, accidentally picked up my grip in lieu of his and the information I had is in that grip so he's on the way. Of all mornings this has to happen.

The history of this pony express was started early last year. A boy raised in the Caribou country was in Mexico and decided to promote Expo: He started this pony express to Victoria and it was such a hit, and I had the clippings in that brief case to show this, that they in Victoria then started to promote it to Expo and this is in Manitoba now. And I might say I had my Pan Am

(MR. MCGREGOR, cont'd) hat on yesterday morning; I won't recommend them on a cool chilly day. There was several other points but I guess, trying to raise from memory in a few moments, that is the main ones and I do appreciate representing the province on that occasion.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): . . . the Honourable Member from Virden knows whether the pony express has a set of sleighs with him or not for this morning.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. When he presented the White Paper to the House there was attached to it a schedule of salaries for teachers. Subsequently I asked him a question as to whether or not he intended to make some revision in this, as it appeared to me that the schedule was out of line with what was actually being negotiated. The Minister indicated that there was some planning. Has a decision been arrived at insofar as changes in that schedule, and what are they?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, there's one change as I recall in one of the salary schedules for P1A4's. I'll get a copy of that this morning and distribute it -- give the honourable member a copy.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Provincial Treasurer, it's in regard to coloured gas. My question is, if a farmer has a truck of course with a farm licence on and he has no car, could he use this truck with coloured gas seven days a week?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer and Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Fort Rouge): Well, Mr. Speaker, there are no limitations put down on the use of coloured gas in a truck bearing a farm truck licence.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. Is May 1st the deadline for the time when studded tires are supposed to be taken off and if so will that period be extended in view of the weather?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, April 30th was the end of the period for which studded tires are permitted. I think that if any of the studded tires have not been removed that there will be no one out actually looking for them at the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Some days ago I asked him whether the Federal Government and any of its agencies would be paying the provincial sales tax of 5 percent. He did not have that answer for me then and said that he would inquire. Has he found out the answer?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I had the impression that I answered that Provincial and Federal Governments do not tax each other. I think I answered at that time also that this does not apply to the agencies of either.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. In this case though the Provincial Government, Manitoba intends to tax itself does it not? Are not all of the provincial departments going to pay the sales tax?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Is it true that whereas the University and United College accept five basic high school subjects for entrance that Brandon College, or what will now be Brandon University, is going to accept four?

MR. JOHNSON: Not to my knowledge Mr. Speaker. I've heard nothing to this effect.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. LYON: . . . on government business, I suggest that we move to Committee of the Whole House and clean up the work there if possible remembering always that we adjourn at 11:00 o'clock to go back into Law Amendments Committee. So I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the bills standing in the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House, with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 79. Is the Committee ready to proceed? Section 1 223 (a) passed ---

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, it was on this Bill that I had asked the Minister about the

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) other matters than straight deposits, and exactly what was going to be covered, how far the coverage was going to be on the insurance, that is debentures, 5 and 10 year certificates and these various matters. I had suggested to him that it be part of the law that any of the matters that were not covered, any of the types of certificates or anything that was sold by these companies and was not covered by insurance should have written on the documents or on the sales information that these were not covered, so that there would be no possible confusion in the minds of the public that they were dealing on the one hand with a company that was under the insurance plan and yet that the particular certificate that they were buying was not one that was protected. Has the Minister investigated this and will there be such a provision?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I have no change or nothing official to report, as I thought perhaps that I had explained it. This is a matter which is under consideration at the present time. We are aware of the problem but I have no report to make nor do I have any legislation to offer on the matter.

What I assume the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is proposing is that in effect we should adopt a negative notification so to speak, that for all those not covered by the deposit insurance that there should be some way of saying that this is not covered by deposit insurance. I'm really not certain that that would be either practical or feasible. There is of course under the rules of the deposit insurance corporation a requirement that only those who are under the plan and are insured will so state and of course a prohibition from anybody else so stating. But as to going one further step and on all other forms of paper that might in some way be considered to be a deposit from the standpoint of the general public to have a requirement that it is not covered I think as I say would be very difficult to administer.

I think it much more useful thing for us to be doing, as indeed we are, is the consideration of extending the principle of the deposit insurance to these other fields of financial arrangements which from the standpoint of the public are probably regarded in the same light as deposits even though technically they might not be deposits.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I recognize that if we could extend it to cover the other matters or other certificates sold it would be an advantage, but at the moment we don't. What I'm concerned about is this, let us say X Company advertises that they are covered under this plan and that for certain of the certificates that they sell, they are in fact covered. But their advertising will read that they are insured under this Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation and may give the inference that all of the securities that they sell -- they won't be saying that, I'm not suggesting that they would and I don't think again that the inference would be a deliberate one on their part -- but they will obviously be saying that they are covered under this Act, and some people may get the impression that all of the matters in which they are dealing with those companies are so covered. I am just afraid that we may be building up some problems for the future for people legitimately and the companies legitimately, stating that they are covered under the Act would get the impression that some other items are covered as well when they are not.

The remainder of Bill 79 was read section by section and passed.

Bill 113, was read section by section to (vi) and passed.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I want once again to raise the question of the use of the term "indigent relief". During discussions in committee I raised objections to the continuation of the use of that term. I understand my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare was going to take under advisement as to whether or not we can cease using this term both in the Municipal Act and in the Social Allowances Act and I trust and hope that when we deal with the Municipal Act the next time, provisions will be made for the ceasing of the use of this term.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, on this bill it only has to do with work projects that are carried on by the municipalities, cities, or towns rather than social assistance in itself? Am I correct in that assumption?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): It also deals with welfare services, a new definition of that, and treats welfare services also as indigent relief for purposes of sharing both with the Province of Manitoba and with the Government of Canada under the Canada Assistance Plan.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well to be more specific. Where a municipality now authorizes certain welfare monies and services to indigents, for the lack of a better word up to now --(Interjection)-- recipients of aid, my Honourable friend says -- does the municipality under

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd)11 (c) section 2 have to get the approval of the Minister or can a municipality, when this Bill receives Royal Assent, set up what they determine to be basic needs, or can a municipality use the basic needs as set out in the regulations and the Act and authorize payments up to that figure without consulting the Minister; and having made the payment, can they submit their bill to the government for payment?

MR. CARROLL: Yes they can, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHOEMAKER: My honourable friend says, yes they can, but there was about four questions there. They can pay out money to people that they term to be indigent without applying to the Minister for a set sum? As soon as this bill is passed they can submit all bills without sharing in the cost; the government will consider them full payments under the Social Allowances Act?

MR. CARROLL: No, Mr. Chairman, they've always been able to pay out to persons in need amounts that they have deemed to be adequate for the purpose of sustaining the family. There have been certain changes resulting from the Canada Assistance Plan which requires municipalities to pay in accordance with a schedule that has been established, a schedule of need established by the Municipality; they must provide an appeal procedure and they must pay out to any person within their municipality regardless of their residence status and this sets up a new set of conditions. We are requiring them to do all of these things if they are to share additional benefits such as work activity projects with ourselves and the Government of Canada.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Every municipality I am sure has indigent cases where the social allowances branch have turned down for one reason or another. I know of one or two in the R.M. of Rosedale in particular; and I know of one or two cases in the R.M. of Rosedale where just a month ago they paid out certain relief monies. Now will the province pay those relief monies in full as soon as this bill receives Royal Assent?

MR. CARROLL: I'm not aware of the province ever having refused to share in the cost of assistance provided by a municipality. If my honourable friend has a specific case in mind I'd be glad to hear from him, but the municipality has the right today to pay out to persons in need and share those costs with us. This allows them in addition to meeting the basic needs of individuals to share in additional costs as well - such as work activity projects and other kinds of welfare services that heretofore they have not been able to share.

MR. SHOEMAKER: As I understand it, the sharing of the costs, unless it's been changed, has been limited to 40 percent of all relief costs of a municipality or town, or 80 percent of relief costs over one mill. Does that remain unchanged? --(Interjection) --That remains unchanged?

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Minister could clarify something for me. In cases where a municipality now has a social worker on staff or has had one for the last 2 or 3 years, to provide the type of services which I think would be classified under welfare services, the new interpretation of welfare services, would their program now be covered insofar as grants are concerned - I mean the cost of running the program, the staff and so on - would they qualify in any way for any government aid rather than just the cost of the relief being paid out. I'm talking in terms of a social worker who is on staff to provide counselling and case work and assessment and referral. Would they now be able to get a certain amount from the government for this person's salary or these peoples' salaries?

MR. CARROLL: Well under the Canada Assistance Plan, a base year of 1964-65 was established and all additional administrative costs beyond that year are shareable with the Government of Canada. So that if additional staff is brought on, new staff is brought on this year that new staff will be shareable with the Government of Canada, if this is over and above the staff that they had prior to the base year that was established.

This reference here to welfare services could involve the hiring of an agency to perform a certain welfare service for a municipality. For instance, the day nurseries could be engaged to perform a certain service for the municipality and that cost would be shareable under this welfare service definition here.

MR. MILLER: . . . penalizing those who in '64-65 may have had this program because the Minister mentions this is anything that occurs since 1964-65 and in a sense it seems to me that a municipality looking at this would say, well let's fire our help for 2 or 3 months and then re-hire them and then we can qualify for assistance which is a backdoor method of achieving something. I'm sure the Minister wouldn't want them to do that, and yet they are penalized

(MR. MILLER, cont'd) because prior to '64-65 or since then they have had this service. So it seems to me that what we're talking about is encouraging others to go into it, but not recognizing those that have already established this.

MR. CARROLL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I recognize this as a very real problem. This is the case we tried to make with the Government of Canada, because they are the ones that established this rule, and we indicated that we had a pretty sophisticated welfare organization here in Manitoba, paying out on the basis of need whereas many provinces had other systems in force and we felt that we were being penalized by establishing this base year, and have established these kind of services prior to that time we certainly didn't stand to gain as much as some other provinces who were less highly refined in their administration of welfare services. I recognize your point. You can't evade it by firing your staff for a period of time and then re-hiring them, because they have established this base year and it remains firm, unfortunately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of the Bill 113 was read section by section and passed.) Bill No. 21. Section 1--passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before you pass No. 2, I'm not going to try and make any projected opposition to the changing of the coming into effect from the royal assent to proclamation. The Minister as I understand it, while we were dealing with the matter in the committee at one stage, and I trust it was facetiously, suggested that it could be January 1st, 1968 when this Act was proclaimed. I hope my friend will clarify that he was being facetious when he made that statement in committee and I want to appeal to my Honourable friend the Minister of Labour, if indeed I should have to appeal to him, that there will be no undue delay in the proclamation of this Act. I know from past experience, and I'm sure my honourable friend the Minister has had a number of complaints in respect of the application of garnishment orders to employment, so I am sure that he has had dealings with this as I have and I am sure other members of the assembly and I ask him again now in this committee to proclaim the legislation just as quickly as it's possible for him to do so.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Chairman, I think I'm going to share a secret with my honourable friend. For this momentous bill, I hope to have it proclaimed on Labour Day.

MR. PAULLEY: Not today, in some jurisdictions Labour Day, May 1st?

MR. BAIZLEY: I believe our Labour Day is sometime in September.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 21 and Bill No. 75 were read section by section and passed.) Bill No. 95. Is it agreed to go through this page by page? (Page 1 to 4 were read and passed.)

MR. DOERN: On page 5, subsection (18). If I understood the Minister correctly on this particular bill he seemed to indicate that the money set aside this year would be available for this Act but he didn't really indicate whether there were going to be additional funds available as well because the present budget seems to include an item of about \$12,000 and I assume that there are things now being done which take up that amount of money so I do not understand how we're going to in effect use the same money we have now to open up a much large operation and in effect hire additional staff. I wonder if the Minister would explain how he proposes to open up a whole new area on the present budget, which seems to be rather small.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I think it's a question of maybe a difference of terminology here. I'm not certain that we're opening up a whole new area. This is basically a replacement for an already existing statute and in itself this legislation does not imply any new general activity on the part of the Province of Manitoba. It may well be that the procedures are rearranged and strengthened but even if we didn't have this particular bill we would still be spending money on the general objects that are visualized here, so that - how will I put it - the new money or not really doesn't bear directly on the matter, if I might put it in those terms. I have tried to say that the presentation of this bill did not envisage any special expenditures or indeed any special amount of money being devoted to this, more than has been done last year. I can tell the Committee - of course, this is a matter really for estimates rather than at this stage - but that annually there was allocated \$1,000 for this purpose for quite a long period of time. In the last fiscal year, 1966-67, \$10,000 was allocated and for 1967-68, \$10,000 is being allocated, the same amount of money as was last year. I think I suggested \$11,000 in the estimates, I checked back and the estimates under the heading for Historic Sites has a larger amount but that is for other purposes connected with this particular field, but \$10,000 is the amount of money that is allocated in the estimates this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 5 passed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Minister indicated that he was going to go "hog wild" on a spending spree on historical markers but certainly newspaper articles said they were a year ago. "Government money seen for historical sites". A big headline on May 20th a year ago: "Funds due for restoration, preservation, Steinkopf says, Province being surveyed." He says he doesn't know of any place on earth that's as barren as Manitoba in respect to historical markers, and I was certainly hopeful as I know a lot of other people were, that we were going to make some new inroads here. This wonderful new book that was introduced as one of the most outstanding in Canada just about a month ago, has less than one page on historic sites marked by plaques or cairns. Nothing at all.

Incidentally, incidentally I drove 100 miles around Winnipeg yesterday with my car, drove up to see Old St. Andrews Church on the Red. You'd never find it. I drove up and had to drop in and ask a storekeeper up there where it was. How could you get to it. Certainly we need to be spending some more money in this, particularly in Canada's Centennial year and Manitoba's coming up and I for one am alarmed and discouraged and dismayed because my honourable friend doesn't seem to have any enthusiasm at all for this particular bill. He says we're going to pass it but it doesn't necessarily mean a thing and I must express my concern because of his lack of enthusiasm.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't going to say anything until the very last comment about my not having any enthusiasm. Mr. Chairman, I must reject completely that suggestion. I have an enormous amount of enthusiasm for the preservation of the history of the Province of Manitoba and if I had \$100 million to do it with, I would be sure that we would do the job that could well be done and would be very fitting and proper for this province. All of us have, I'm sure, certainly those of us who have paid attention to the history of the Province of Manitoba have a great amount of enthusiasm and interest in it and I hope that if I have conveyed any impression of not having any enthusiasm that that impression will be corrected as of now.

We have to, in our joint responsibility with respect to financial expenditures, of course we have to consider all of the obligations of the province and it isn't always possible to get as much as we would like, but let there be no question of our enthusiasm or my enthusiasm about the general object of preserving and refurbishing and enhancing the historical sites of the Province of Manitoba and the history of our province and as long as I have any responsibility I'll do my very best to see that that work is carried forward.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'll be very brief but the Minister says if he had a lot of money. Well I recognize that if you're going to have expensive signs you have to spend money. On the other hand when we were discussing the bill on second reading I made some suggestions to the Minister and I believe it is essential that we mark these sites. They don't have to be expensive markers in all cases. As a beginning if we simply had a sign saying where things are, this would solve a good deal of the problem; just a sign. These signs, I think, Mr. Chairman, could be made by the government themselves at very little cost and I referred at that time to our Provincial Jail. I know for example at Headingley that there's some furniture made there by the inmates. Is there any reason at all that we couldn't have signs made there or at the jail at Dauphin or elsewhere. I think all of this is part of the retraining that we want to give our inmates. We have cases every year where people who are before the courts ask to be sent to Stony Mountain instead of being sent to Headingley or one of the provincial jails because they say they learn a trade if they go to Stony Mountain. Well surely there are things like this that could be done. It would not interfere with private enterprise because it's not being done now.

The Minister says he hasn't got the money to do it, then it's obviously not going to be done by private enterprise in the near future either. Now shouldn't we then be doing it through our own resources? We are using some of the inmates now for the development of parks, for work to do with - not directly with this sort of a place, but they could be - they could be used to clear some of these, in the same way as we use them right now in our park operations and certainly at the institutions themselves there would be no reason the signs couldn't be made.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on this point, the suggestion of the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party is most intriguing to me. I do note that there was some qualifications insofar as having the inmates of our penal institutes go into competition with private industry. Now it's not for me to stand up and protect or come to the defence of the sign

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) companies of Manitoba. I respectfully suggest to my friend that he's possibly correct or is correct when he suggests that the Minister in his capacity of Provincial Secretary in charge of historic sites should see that they're amply marked; I agree with that most heartily. But I question very much whether private industry or those who work in the sign industry would appreciate the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition in that the inmates at Headingley should go into the sign writing business. Because while they may not be making signs at the present time or the Minister may not be getting these signs made at the present time, I'm sure that we feel that he should but we don't think, as far as I am concerned, that it should be done on the basis of being made in our penal institutes, unless of course the Honourable the Attorney-General may be in a position to pay comparable rates of wages to the inmates of our jails to what will be paid in industry generally, and also that the inmates would have the full opportunity of joining a union of their choosing.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I disagree totally with the comments of the Honourable Leader of the NDP and I would suggest to him, if those are his feelings, then he ought to go and speak to the people who are in the furniture industry, because right now furniture is being made. He ought to go and speak to all the labourers in the province, who are not being employed on park projects because we're using inmates and I didn't hear him object to those. If he thinks we should simply keep the inmates doing nothing at all in the jails and sitting twiddling their thumbs, that's a different philosophy of reform and retraining than what I have.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friend would inform me as to where one might purchase the furniture that is being made at the Headingley institution and what type of furniture is being made.

MR. MOLGAT: If the gentleman would visit Headingley Jail he would find out quite readily what furniture is being made, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAULLEY: I ask my honourable friend where it is being sold?

MR. MOLGAT: It's not being sold but nor will the signs for historical markers be sold, Mr. Chairman. I don't know of any great market for signs for historical markers except the Province of Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: I ask my honourable friend where the furniture is being used outside of the institutions?

MR. MOLGAT: By the province.

MR. PAULLEY: Where?

MR. MOLGAT: By the provincial departments.

MR. PAULLEY: Where?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude from what the Minister tells us in his replies and so on that this Act appears to be nothing more than a bit of bookkeeping; that a number of things are going to be consolidated and so on but some of these grandiose schemes that are mentioned in here in regard to the acquisition of historic sites and maintaining and renovating them and purchasing artifacts and paleontological objects, etc., that all this is going to be simply sort of "pie in the sky", long-range possibilities but there's nothing behind this Act. All we're getting is a couple of thousand dollars more than we've had in the past and certainly none of these aims will ever be achieved with the kind of moneys that are going to be behind the Act. So all I can conclude is that these sections in this Act are simply something that may happen some day but the intention of the government is certainly not to carry them out.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, would the agricultural museum at Austin come within this Act, that is the setting up of it, in the preservation of it? Because I understand that if the province were to declare the agricultural museum at Austin, "the" Manitoba agricultural museum and say this is our number one project then there is available from the Federal Government large sums of money for its promotion. Now I wonder if I'm correct in that assumption.

Another matter, Mr. Chairman, is the one that has been touched on by every member on this side of the House that has spoken yet, is that it wouldn't cost a great deal of money to put up a few markers. Manitoba Regulation 9/62, dated February 19th, 1962 outlined "it is hereby ordered that the following described parcels of land are declared to be historic sites." Five years ago on February 8th there appeared in the regulations a number of places in the province that were marked as historic sites. Who knows they were outside of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or some person that might have stumbled across them in the Manitoba Gazette? This is the one for instance that notifies the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd)-and nobody else - that there was in fact declared an Arden Campsite, "all that part of the northeast quarter of section 13 township 15 and range 14 west of the principle meridian in the Province of Manitoba known as the Arden Campsite and extending toward the confluence of the creek with the Whitemud River." And that's all there is. There's nothing there, absolutely nothing there to tell the people that it is an historical site or that in fact the province declared it as such. And since February 8th, 1962, if this is the one that I think it is, it's all dug up; it's been all dug up by people seeking gravel. They've dug it all up so that what was once a historical Indian burial ground is no longer nothing but piles of gravel. This is what's wrong with a lot of these things; and it doesn't cost a lot of money. There's seven or eight more set out in the regulations and surely to goodness it wouldn't -- it wouldn't take half as much money as the Cabinet voted themselves for an increase in salary as it would to - how many signs could you make with the five or six thousand dollars that you voted yourselves, each one of you, for an increase in salary? Let's establish some priorities and get up some historical markers anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Remainder of Bill 95 was read section by section and passed). Bill be reported?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, just before the Bill is reported I would like to reinforce to the extent that I can my honourable friend from Gladstone's suggestion about some assistance and in this case it doesn't need financial assistance, at least at the outset, to the Austin Museum. Now it's true, I'm sure, that this would not be called a historic site as such but there certainly are historic objects there and on page 3 you will see that part 2 deals with "objects of historic or prehistoric interest". Well now the machines that are being collected, that have been collected now over a period of years at the Austin Agriculture Museum, are certainly of historic interest and an excellent job has been done up to date by the people there. They have had some assistance from government departments; they have had assistance from the Department of Agriculture, from the Department of Highways and no doubt from other departments as well. But they need more buildings.

The object of historical interest are machines that mark the evolution of the agricultural industry in the Province of Manitoba. They have collected these usually by donated and dedicated service of private individuals who have spent time and money and a great deal of effort first to find them and then to get them, and they have had assistance from the Highways Department in transporting them to the sites, and anyone who has not visited that site certainly should do so; there's great historic interest there. And now they can get -- and I'm not usually one that is arguing for tapping the government sources anymore than is necessary but this museum needs building. Some of the machinery there that is completely irreplaceable should be under cover and the buildings that are required are large buildings -- they can get assistance from the Federal Government if this Government of Manitoba will take one simple action and that is to declare that memorial agricultural museum at Austin to be "the provincial agricultural museum". Now there is no other in the Province of Manitoba; there is no possibility, I would suggest, of there being another one because these folks have already scoured the country for these old implements -- and thank goodness they did it because if they hadn't showed the initiative and the energy to get these old machines gathered up they'd have been gone, really gone. So the country has been scoured so greatly that I don't think there's a possibility of a competing museum being started up. If there were there might be some question in the government's mind as to whether it would be within its rights in declaring this one to be "the" provincial agricultural museum; but if there's no possibility of that, surely they could take that step and in addition to the help that they get from the Provincial Government, they could then receive considerable help from the Federal Government as well under a program that's already in effect.

I notice that though the Honourable Minister of Agriculture is not in his own seat he is listening and I'm sure that the Honourable the Minister of this department would have his wholehearted support in taking this action. The Honourable the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs has given valuable assistance to that museum at Austin and I would join with the Honourable Member for Gladstone in suggesting to the Minister of this Department that he take an urgent look at this situation, confer with the two honourable or three Honourable Ministers and decide on a policy immediately that will give this worthwhile museum some very much needed help.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 68.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under Bill No. 68, the other day in Committee my

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, proposed that the bill be not reported and suggested that it should include a clear statement of the schedule of fees, suggested that unless this was in it that the bill should not be reported. The Minister's reply to that was that this was an impossibility because what the bill did was to simply empower the corporation to negotiate for fees under Section 36 and that you couldn't include something that had not yet been negotiated. We have been looking at the Act further since then and I agree that under the present circumstances if negotiations have not yet been started, and the corporation not set up that you can't have a schedule at this time. So we are not going to insist, Mr. Chairman, that the schedule be in at this time. But I think that the events of last week, with the Minister being advised by letter that the MMS were going to increase their fees, the fact that apparently there was no consultation with him, makes very clear the need for the schedule of fees and the method of remuneration to become part and parcel of this bill.

We have been looking at the bill to see how we could proceed to amend it to make sure that this would be done after the negotiations have been completed. Now I would ask the advice of the Minister in this regard. I have looked at it and I cannot see how it could be done except by amendment to Section 36 and I have a motion prepared for that which would call simply for, once the negotiations are completed, for the schedule to be presented to this House at the next session whereby we would then discuss it here in the session and it would be added to the bill, to the present bill as a schedule. In other words this bill when passed will become an Act; under this Act it would be understood that at the next session we would have to have another bill which would present the schedule and the details under Section 36 of the agreement and these would then, under that bill, become a schedule to this Act, and I would like to know whether that's the proper method or whether I should make such a motion on a prior section.

I think that the Minister will agree in the light of the present circumstances that we must see to it that this is part and parcel of the Act. It's a question here of fairness to both groups. I think that the statements made last week by MMS do not represent the views of all the doctors in the province; in my opinion it's the views of a small group. This does affect however all of them. I think that insofar as the public this becomes a major cost item in the province, some \$35 million, and the public have the right to know. We, the members in this House, must know that we are in fact getting for them the very best arrangement possible and that to leave it simply to regulation with no reference to this House, not being a part of this Bill, that we would be failing in our responsibilities to the public, to the doctors in seeing to it that the bill will in fact be a workable scheme once put into effect.

So if the Minister could advise me if there is another means of doing this I would move another motion, but if not then I will, under Section 36, move an amendment to Section 1.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): I don't think the amendment is really necessary because under 36 the corporation is empowered to negotiate with the doctors a fee. The fee for service or the fee schedule have to be approved by Order-in-Council. When the Order-in-Council is approved it will be published in the Manitoba Gazette. Now the corporation are going to have to work between now and July 1st, 1968, and the corporation will have to start negotiations with the doctors as soon as possible after the passage of this bill. So I foresee that there will be every possibility that before this House meets again that the negotiations will have been completed. From that point on I refer you to Section 24, subsection (2) on page 12 of the bill. Section 24 subsection (2) says that "not less frequently than once in each year and at such other times as the Minister may request, the Board shall give detailed consideration to the benefits designated under clause (a) of subsection (1) and to the amount of the premiums from time to time fixed under clause (d) of subsection (1)."

Now in order to review the premiums annually we will also have to review the fee for service and if the fee for service is known through the Manitoba Gazette, the members of the Legislature will have the opportunity to comment on it if they wish to do so.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, this is not -- Mr. Chairman, this is not what my Leader is asking. We do not want to be presented with a fait accompli. We are asked to pass a very important piece of legislature. We have asked, we on our other side, I have said time and time again that my main concern was that all the citizens of Manitoba receive medical care when needed. This was the main concern and that this medical care should be of the highest possible standard. Now I still maintain, Mr. Chairman, that this could be achieved by installing a voluntary health insurance plan with limited government participation; limited to helping those who cannot afford to pay their own way and also limited to a disaster and catastrophe insurance plan for everyone, should their medical expenses require a certain percentage

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) of their income.

Now on second reading, Mr. Chairman, I voted on the question of the principle of a health insurance plan, stating that although we oppose a compulsory plan, I would vote for second reading because we could not afford to pay our share for a national health program while not taking out our share of financial help which was available. At the time, having accepted the words of the government, the words of the Minister, I personally blame the Federal Government for imposing this compulsory plan on the provinces, but since then I found out that this was not exactly the case and that I was not completely right. It appears that the Minister had given the House the wrong impression, certainly the impression that this was a must, it was the only way that this could be done.

Now in committee, Mr. Chairman, I did not suggest that the bill be delayed but that the government prepare a new one providing for a voluntary plan and allowing approved carriers as well as the government agency to provide certain basic benefits. I explained then that I did not intend the motion to be a non-confident motion and I proposed that the members should come back and sit for a week or whatever time is needed, without indemnity, and that we would have this prepared in ample time for the target date. Well the members of the government, as well as the members of the New Democratic Party opposed this, and the government I feel, should take this responsibility then of imposing a costly unnecessary compulsory plan on the citizens of Manitoba and for forcing out private enterprise.

Now this, it appears, is going to be the case. We are faced with it. Well, we can't just say well all right if this is what you want, write any plan you want. We are faced now with trying to get the best possible plan, that the government should accept the responsibility and they insist on having this compulsory plan. They're wrong when they say this is the only plan that they could have. This is absolutely wrong and we have other provinces to prove that this is wrong. Now this is socialistic legislation; there's no doubt about that; but if this is what we want -- first of all we're not quite ready for this plan; the Minister has not given us the proper information. We are asked again by this government to sign a blank cheque because this is exactly what it's doing. We know nothing of the negotiating that went on between the members of the medical profession, other interested parties and the government. The government hasn't said anything about that. We know that they've been negotiating for quite awhile. We're told by - we have newspaper articles that quite a bit was done. I have a report of the Tribune of June 6, 1966 where "doctors to get full payment in medicare". If I may quote: "Manitoba doctors will be paid their full fees under the Medicare scheme in this province instead of the pro-rated percentage now given through the Manitoba Medical Service. This was revealed Saturday by Dr. Robert Tanner, a medical health officer in the Provincial Health Department. It is safe to say at this point, that under the intended Manitoba plan which will fit into the national medicare scheme payments will be the schedule and not on a pro-rated basis. That's why the government must know the cost of this operation." We read this in the paper but this is all the information that we have. Now we're faced with the situation that it would appear - I'm not saying that this is the case - but it certainly would appear that the government is raising this fee in anticipation of Medicare. That's certainly the impression that the people of Manitoba have by the latest development that we had last Friday and last Saturday. We're told on the one hand that they will get 100 percent of their fees, it will not be any longer pro-rated, and then last Friday the doctors are asking for 90 percent. Now why aren't we given more information before we're asked to pass this thing?

Now the Minister tells us the same thing; he tells my Leader well, this is not needed, your suggestion that we give the schedule, and I think the idea's a very good one. We can't be accused of delaying anything. We only ask that this schedule be presented to the Legislature next year at the next session. Now this is not going to delay anything, and the Minister said, well, this is not needed because it says that we have to look at our premiums, study our premiums once a year. What has that got to do with it? All right, no doubt the Minister will say well, you'll have to know how much it will cost. But why is it that the people of Manitoba, and that we're asked to pass this bill without having any idea at all, any idea at all what it's going to cost? Now would we be acting as responsible people if we were to say to the government, yes, give us this; when it's all finished, just tell us what the schedule is and it will be published. If this is the case, I'm no legal genius, as you know, Mr. Chairman, but if this is the case, if all that is needed is that this government, the cabinet, later on at some date when everything is finished publish a list of this; if this is all that's needed, what are we doing here? We might as well let the Cabinet run the province. We are here to represent all the different

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd)taxpayers in the province.

I said, Mr. Chairman, I repeated many times, that I was not for the compulsory plan; but we have no choice now. This is the plan that we're going to have in Manitoba. I for one, and I know that all the members here agree that this plan will not work without the full co-operation of the medical profession; but does that mean that we cannot negotiate? That we will agree to all their demands? I think not. We have to know what this will cost. I should say, "necessarily agree to all their demands," maybe we will; but I think we have to have an idea how much this will cost. We're told repeatedly that we have priorities and that there's a high cost in government. We are faced now -- we had another compulsory plan that the people of Manitoba were not too enthused with - the hospital plan - and this year, in fact the Minister for some reason or other or the government probably will not give us the opportunity to look at the annual report of the Manitoba Hospital Commission. I should say discuss this in this House; apparently there won't be time. And we are faced now where the Minister is talking about reducing the standard in these hospitals, reducing the standard in this plan that is about 10 years old, and we are bringing another plan and we're told the sky's the limit; just approve this in principle and we'll do the rest. Well this is not good enough. I can't see why the Minister will not agree with this proposed resolution of my leader. Why?

In committee he told me that it would be delaying the plan. Now there is no delay; we will be ready for the target date. Why can we not have the schedule of fees and why won't the Minister spell out if it is the intention to pay 100 percent of the costs of the doctors - and I certainly don't blame the medical profession for trying to get that, don't blame them at all -- but is this the intention of the Minister or are we still going to remain on a pro-rated basis?

I would like to suggest to the Minister that he, he review the Act of Ontario. The first time it was passed they were suggesting 100 percent would be paid and they had to cut down to 90 percent. Now doesn't the Minister think that this is important enough, isn't this information that we need as members of this House, who were not present when there was negotiating between the doctors and the Cabinet Ministers and the government and the Minister is refusing to give us this information, does he think that it is asking too much for us to ask, before we give this blank cheque, for asking that this schedule, the fee schedule become part of this contract. We realize that the Minister was right in Committee this is why, as my leader said, we're not pressing the point. You must negotiate and you can't negotiate when this board, this commission has not been established. Well, when we pass this bill, even with the amendment that my leader is suggesting, we pass the bill, we're creating this board, we're giving you a chance to negotiate and surely they should have a schedule ready for the next session of this Legislature.

Now I challenge the Minister to tell us why, why he will not agree and support the motion of my leader. If he has a valid point, we might consider it, the same as he said they could not negotiate before until this bill was passed. Well, this rectifies that. Now if he has a valid point for saying, no, you cannot have this schedule of fees, it will not be known until it is a fait accompli, and still ask us to pass this bill with our eyes closed, because this is what it is, I would like to ask the Minister to explain why he cannot support this amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word or two in respect of Bill 68. I've listened with a great deal of interest to the previous speakers in respect of this bill. As far as I am concerned there are two or three basic objections to the bill and we have discussed them in the House and in the committee. First of all the prime disappointment, I presume, that we have to the bill is the delay in the provision of the needed service to many people in the Province of Manitoba who at the present time are not receiving adequate medical care because of the fact that they cannot in their present economic situation, either pay for the services at the time or in advance of receiving them because of the premium structure in the Province of Manitoba.

So first of all I repeat our objections to the delay of a year in the institution of this plan. While the Minister might say that the reasons are obvious, namely that the federal authority delayed the coming in of the scheme for a year themselves, or until such time as the economy advances in Canada, they may bring it forward, which we doubt of course very much. We object to this, that there's no basic reason for Manitoba not going ahead by itself as they did in the Province of Saskatchewan. I'm not going into the history of Saskatchewan and the institution of the Medicare plan there, except to say that even with the change of government there was no indication or desire on the part of the government that took over from the previous government abolishing or throwing the scheme out; rather to at least give some consideration to

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) improving and advancing the plan.

Our second objection, Mr. Chairman, is the question of premiums. We have maintained all along that the premium structure of a medicare scheme is an improper one if it is to be the sole basis of the contribution within the Province of Manitoba. We object most strenuously to this. May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the reasons and logic of our argument has been emphasized by what has happened within the last few days in respect of MMS. Here we have the Manitoba Medical Service organization almost at the snap of a finger increasing the premiums being paid by the participants in the scheme presently invoked in Manitoba. What is the net result of that, Mr. Chairman?

The net result of that is that the costs that have to be borne by those on low income and by those on fixed income unless they are recipients of municipal or provincial aid, are immediately forced to the payment of increased premiums. I won't argue as to whether or not there may have been some justification for an increase in the amount of payments paid to the doctors. I do however question, Mr. Chairman, and I have questioned this before, on what basis is or are the fees that the doctors claim they were only receiving 80 percent of their schedule based on. The claim now is that because of the fact that the doctors were only getting 80 percent from their fee schedule previously, they should receive an additional 12 percent of an increase to 90% in their basic fees. Well I want to ask, Mr. Chairman, 90% of what? During my employment with the CNR I received a certain amount of wages as a result of an agreement or negotiations but I didn't think that I was receiving enough, and I'm sure that most of the workers don't think that they are getting any more than 65 or 70% of what they feel they are worth too. They don't set their hourly rate and then after the agreement is over say well I'm only getting 50%, 60% of what I think that I am entitled to. So I would like to really know what 90% is based on and 90% of what.

But the net result of that, no matter how that was arrived at, within the profession and negotiations between the Medical Association and the Medical Service, is really between them at least at the present time, but I question it, and I want to re-emphasize to the Minister of Health that I think that there has been a breach in the undertaking between the Government of Manitoba and MMS - a breach that I think that is very important because I'm positive statements were made in this House that prior to agreement or prior to any change the Minister or the Government would be notified of change. And it's not enough, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister of Health, as he did the other day to say that he received a letter of a change in the rates, which, of course, means a change in the premiums automatically, that he had received this information at the same time as the announcement was made publicly. This wasn't the undertaking at all. I recall distinctly the First Minister -- and he's back now and maybe he can come into the House and substantiate or otherwise, my allegation right now -- that he said, that unless there is more discussion and consideration of the situation in Manitoba we might even have to undertake considering the institution of the setting of the fees and the premiums somewhat in the line of a public utility.

As I recall it this was said or inferred. Now what is going to happen, what is going to happen as the result of the change in the fee schedule directly starting the 1st of July? As I say, many of those on fixed incomes are going to be faced with an increase in premiums which they can ill afford to pay; and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that because of their inability to accept the increased premiums, many of them are going to have to withdraw from MMS for the period of the full year at least until the Manitoba federal scheme comes into being.

I think this is an illustration, Mr. Chairman, of how necessary it was for the federal authority to say that we must have 85 percent participation in order to start. I think this is a good illustration of the results of a privately operated insurance medicare scheme because it does not take into consideration income of individuals who desire, not only desire, but need these services. And this is why I say to my honourable friend the Minister of Health insofar as Bill 68 is concerned, for heaven's name change your thoughts at the present time of having the premium as the basis of payment into the scheme. What does the Act say at the present time? In section 22. "Every resident who is neither a dependent, nor a recipient of public assistance, nor a member of the regular forces of the Canadian forces, or the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Force, is liable to the corporation for a premium". A dependent of course is those under 21 if they are going to university. And then a little further on in the Act; "If anybody irrespective, irrespective of their ability to pay a portion of a premium, if they fail to pay it, then the municipality in which they live has the right under the Act to make the cost of the premium a charge against property or the individual can carry it on the municipal tax roll level."

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) What does that mean, Mr. Chairman?

It means a lien against property at the municipal level for the payment of a premium. If it is the desire to use the premium as a methodology of having registration, well and good, and it can be a nominal premium; but, Mr. Chairman, if the premiums are going to be set -- and if I understand my honourable friend the Minister of Health, they are going to be set on the same basis as the premiums are now being set under our privately operated MMS -- then this is going to impose tremendous hardships on many people in the lower income groups. The people in the media range that are not able to obtain public assistance because their income is over and above the level that the Minister of Welfare decrees is the level beyond which they will not make their contributions.

So I say first of all, Mr. Chairman, we've got a very, very vivid example of what can happen to private insurance premium schemes as a result of the action of the MMS over the weekend, and again I repeat I predict that many people in Manitoba are going to find it more difficult than ever to pay their premiums and as a result there's the possibility within the next year many will not be covered who are covered at the present time. I say we have had that example and surely the Minister should take this into consideration and reconsider the basis of the contributions into the medical fund before it does start next July 1st.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, we are going to rise I understand in three or four minutes and there has been so much talk about the schedule of fees that are presently used and will be negotiated for the future, that is the doctors' fees in respect to the plan, and the effect they will have on the operation of it, I wonder if my honourable friend the Minister would undertake to supply the House with the schedule of fees that are presently used as of May 1st this year. Could he undertake to do that? So that at least we would know what the schedule of fees are now, the MMS fees. Or are the MMS fees not available to subscribers of MMS; are they not or why can't we have a schedule of fees so at least some of the members of the House will know what they are now and they will know if they say well there's going to be a 12 percent increase or an 18 percent increase, or a 2 percent increase, at least we can sharpen up our pencils and figure out what it's going to be. So I think it would be most helpful if the Minister, before we sit again at 2:30 or whenever we do sit, if he would just supply each and every member of the House with a schedule of fees that the doctors now use when submitting bills to MMS subscribers.

Incidentally I'm one of the members of the House I guess that according to MMS are making too good use of the plan and one of the fellows I guess that they propose to increase the premiums by 18 percent. Well it would be helpful to me I'm sure, not only as a subscriber, but as a member of the House to at least know what fees I was paying, and it would be helpful --(Interjection)-- my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside said do I not know what I'm paying for every service rendered by the doctor? I sure don't. I have no idea. And I would like to know, and surely to goodness we are entitled to know, not only as subscribers but as members of the House and I urge my honourable friend the Minister of Health to supply members of the House with the schedule of fees that are now used by the doctors, that is before 2:30. They must be available, let's have them.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted Bills No. 79, 113, 21, 75, 95 without amendment and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon.

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