

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:30 a.m. o'clock, Thursday, July 8, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be of interest to members of this House if I give a recap of the position that I propose to take at the forthcoming meeting of Finance Ministers which will take place in Ottawa on Monday and Tuesday. It is a fairly lengthy document and I'll try to summarize it, assuming that members are interested in knowing the position I propose to take.

I consider that the Conference, which will be of Ministers of Finance of Provincial Treasurers, will be a very significant, very important one, not only because it will deal with the subject of tax reform but because we will be discussing the country's economic situation with special emphasis on Mr. Benson's budget, tasks which have been referred to the Conference by the Prime Minister and the Provincial Premiers prior to the Constitutional Conference which took place last month in Victoria.

Although tax reform and economy are certain to receive the greatest attention, I believe that we will spend some time in examining proposed changes in the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, the legislation which underlies revenue equalization payments which are now being made to seven out of the ten provinces and which also covers Ottawa's principal program of assistance to higher education. In addition, we will be considering suggestions for major alterations in the financing of the hospital insurance and medicare programs. So that you see, Mr. Speaker, the agenda is large and it is replete with important matters of an urgent nature such as was touched on last night when the Honourable Member for Riel spoke briefly on the very question of fiscal problems.

It may well be that there will have to be a meeting beyond that of next week to complete the agenda. It will deal with various items and I want to comment briefly on those.

The current economic situation is Manitoba's most immediate worry. The unemployment figures in this province have remained significantly lower than the averages for Canada, as was mentioned only recently in debate here by the First Minister, but the national picture remains very unsatisfactory. The damage to the country in terms of lost production and human misery must be stopped and stopped quickly, and yet we believe that Mr. Benson's budget contains very little of substance to give promise of an about shift in the economy towards full employment.

The federal proposal is to remove the three percent surtax, which we believe will have only a negligible effect on those in the lower income groups who are the ones who need relief the most. The other personal income tax cuts announced by Mr. Benson effective July 1st, this month, the elimination of tax on taxable income of less than \$500, the reduction of progressive rates on taxable income not exceeding \$3,000, and the elimination of tax on guaranteed income supplement payments, will help more people in the low income groups but these people should never have been paying income taxes, a process which has been described as "robbing the poor."

Marginal tax cuts are just not enough to break the back of unemployment, and at the meeting that will be held next week we will press Mr. Benson to reveal any further plans he may have to ensure that the winter of '71-72 will not witness the same tragic jobless totals which were experienced over the past winter. Until the Federal Government commits itself unequivocally to full employment as its first priority, rapid improvement cannot be expected, and by full employment, Manitoba means the three percent level of unemployment which was set as the optimum level by the Economic Council of Canada, or hopefully even lower. Ottawa has talked about full employment but seems to have concluded that a five percent unemployment level, more than 400,000 Canadians without jobs, is an acceptable goal. We question this very strongly.

On the question of changes in tax, what is called tax reform by Mr. Benson, we will be expressing extreme disappointment. We have argued that reform was not the proper term to

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) be used. Reform implies significant changes with improvements, but Mr. Benson's new legislation holds promise of neither of those. In addition, we believe the package is incomplete since it deals only with income taxes and does not suggest any changes in indirect federal sales tax and other major federal revenue sources.

Collection of capital gains will of course be discussed, and we believe that the example of the perpetuation of inequities are as numerous as are the pages in Mr. Benson's new tax bill. Because of the system of taxing at half rates, a calculation made in our department would indicate that a single man with no dependents who earns \$10,000 a year income in the form of regular salary would pay \$2,285 in income tax in the first year and another single man with no dependents with a \$10,000 capital gain would pay only \$844 in income tax. And a third man with an income of \$10,000 in the form of dividends would pay even less, only \$193 in income taxes. We believe that this kind of inequity is not acceptable and should not be accepted.

On the question of tax exemptions, we feel that there is further perpetuation in inequities by the use of exemptions rather than tax credits, something we've asked for for some time, which really means that \$500 tax credit is worth \$500 to everyone who is eligible to receive it, but a \$500 tax exemption or deduction under the new tax system would be worth nothing to a taxpayer with no taxable income, only \$110.50 to a taxpayer with \$500 in taxable income, up to a worth of \$305 for a taxpayer with an income in excess of \$60,000, a tremendous variation in worth by way of exemptions instead of the use of tax credits.

On the question of natural resources, we are opposed to the continuation of special tax treatment for natural resources industries which is afforded by accelerated capital write-off provisions in the new legislation. We feel these industries should be taxed on the same basis as manufacturing and service industries.

On estate taxation we found that one of the most regrettable announcements made by Mr. Benson was the abolition of federal estate and gift taxes effective next January 1st. Unless the provinces fill the void with their own legislation prior to the end of the current year, individuals will be able to receive vast sums of accumulated wealth from others without any tax obligation whatsoever. The new tax on capital gains will have a minimal effect in reducing this free transfer of assets. The removal of the estate tax will also have a serious revenue effect on Manitoba. At present, the province receives some four to five million dollars annually as its share of the federal estate tax and another one to two million dollars in equalization payments directly related to estate tax revenue. After the end of the '71-72 fiscal year the bulk of these payments will cease and the province will be required to cover the revenue loss from other sources. We will strongly urge the Federal Government to reconsider this position. If a reason's related to equity and the avoidance of tax jungles among provinces, and that there should be a continuation to apply and administer a most equitable tax which really will tax those who have not worked and earned to receive the moneys which they do receive as a result of the death of another person.

On the question of revenue guarantees there has been a false impression among some commentators - and I include in that group the current Leader of the Liberal Party - there's a false impression that the Federal Government's proposed revenue guarantee would cover estate tax revenue losses for the province, but this is not correct. The revenue guarantee would cover only personal and corporate income tax losses and then only for three years. The guarantee would expire two years before the maturity of the new system when the lowest personal rates are to be in effect.

There are some other matters I would like to touch on very briefly.

We propose to press for improved revenue guarantees, for greater flexibility for provincial income tax systems within the tax collection agreements and improved tax equalization and revenue stabilization arrangements.

We are opposed to federal efforts to apply arithmetic controls on hospital insurance, medicare, and post-secondary program expenditures, and we will reiterate our opposition on the grounds that arbitrary ceilings on federal assistance will perpetuate already serious service disparity levels among the various provinces. This argument is particularly significant now that the tax reform proposals have placed provincial budgets in an even more vulnerable position than before.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the agenda for the Ministers of Finance meeting contains many items of fundamental importance with implications for the province, and for the nation as a whole, which may not fully be felt for years to come. The provinces are being

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) asked to accept Mr. Benson's analysis of the economic situation and to support federal fiscal policy decisions. In reaction to it, it would seem to the Government of Manitoba to be both inaccurate and inappropriate. For the future, the provinces are being asked to accept the tax system that threatens their viability and therefore their constitutional responsibility to provide key services to their citizens.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just a few comments on the Minister's statement. I think we all recognize the seriousness of the fiscal problem that is facing Manitoba and we want to endorse his efforts to make sure that we do get a break. It's going to be necessary for Manitoba to have a balanced budget program to see the programs go ahead that most of us advocate and support.

Some of the points that the Minister mentioned, I think, may require pointing out. One of the questions that comes to mind is how much money is there in a capital gains tax. It strikes me, without having the figures, that it's really not a very big money-maker from the point of view of taxation, whether it's federal or provincial, in comparison to the other methods of taxation. The same category, that is not being a big money-maker, applies to the natural resource industries, changes in taxation in that respect. Whether it's doing away with the depletion allowance or whether it's change in the Mineral Taxation Act, there's not that much in terms of total dollars that's evident from these two forms of taxation.

I think what is of great concern is the over-all picture, that is the amount of money that the public spends out of the total GNP, or whatever figure you want to use. The usual figure that is quoted is somewhere of the order of 40 percent of the dollars in circulation are handled by governments of one level or another, whether it is federal, provincial or municipal. We talk frequently - although I notice the Minister didn't use the term today - we talk frequently, and the Government of Manitoba talks frequently about the ability-to-pay principle. What is never added to it is the ability to pay who and what is done with the money.

And this is what is of most concern I think with most people today, is there any really much left in flouting or in advocating more emphasis on the ability-to-pay principle because how much money is there left there for government to use. I have a feeling that probably there isn't all that much money left there. In order to get from government handling 40 percent of the money in circulation to get it up to 50, such as some other countries are at such as the Scandinavian countries, and I think Great Britain is at about that level and probably many of the western European countries - and it's hard to judge the Communist countries - but as we edge towards it I think what most people are asking is how far can this go, because I think they realize that there are built-in escalators that governments have great difficulty in controlling.

The Federal Government, the Minister has pointed out, has indicated it would like to put a ceiling on some of its welfare payments and higher education payments to the provinces, and he has indicated that they will oppose this move by the Federal Government. But the reason, I think, that the Federal Government has imposed these ceilings is that they recognize that in these two areas you have the strongest cost escalators that you'll find in any area of government spending. They're much more uncontrollable than a highway program or a construction program or other programs that people don't get a dependency on from day to day.

So I think when they say that they're trying to -- when the Federal Government says they're trying to control them, it's probably with good justification because I think people in general are more concerned about the total spending of government than they are about government finding a new source of taxation which might be natural resources, capital gains or an ability-to-pay principle applied to the personal income tax.

So I think that in answer to the Minister's statement, although we give him full endorsement to put Manitoba's case for a better split for a province that is not a "have" province and particularly to make up for the loss in the estate tax, which four to five million dollars to Manitoba is a lot of money; on the other hand, we ask him to recognize the fact that people are saying to governments in the field of welfare and education, which are very important but where those high escalators are built in, to recognize the fact that in over-all terms we keep bumping up against that problem of if you haven't got the money how far can you go in further taxation in controlling more of the proportion of money that is in circulation. So with those rather general comments, Mr. Speaker, we wish the Minister of Finance success in his efforts next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL MCKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): . . . and just before I do I would like to -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Right. I'm sorry. We will have the oral question period in a minute. Any other ministerial statements or tabling of reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk) introduced Bill No. 107, an Act respecting The City of Brandon and certain Neighbouring Municipalities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie) introduced Bill No. 106, an Act to amend The Development Corporation Act.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member from Portage la Prairie posed a question with respect to the operations of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation when he enquired whether or not it was a policy of MACC to advise farmers against using the services of accountants in their business, and I answered yesterday to some degree that I thought it was a silly proposition and indeed I find that it is. I would have hoped that the member would have not put the question to me out of its proper context. I have checked into the matter since yesterday and I find that there was a letter sent to an applicant that suggested that a section of the application should not be filled out by an accountant but by the applicant himself as he is the only one that may project what he might do in the future, and that an accountant should only be used to assist in calculations and that kind of thing, but the projection of his involvement in his own business should have been made or should have been filled out by himself, and that is just part of the over-all application form.

I would also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Portage should not continue to put questions in this way, and in particular not to delete the name of a person on a letter if he is going to table that particular letter because it makes it awfully difficult for me, or the Corporation, to try and locate the application or the file. However, having done so I would just leave it at that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not table the letter referred to. The letter referred to, I offered it to the Minister by way of help to him in order to answer the question, and that was the way the letter was sent to me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In your address this morning on taxation and your approach to Mr. Benson's new tax reform you mentioned that a 1972 withdrawal of all shared cost medical, hospitalization and post-secondary education, these shared costs will be withdrawn and that a new tax formula will be -- (Interjection) -- Is that not right? Are they going to continue -- well, I'll ask the question. Are they going to continue with the same shared cost formula they've been using over the past five years?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member misunderstood me. The post-secondary education shared cost program does expire at the end of this current year and negotiations are taking place for a revision in the formula. Those negotiations indicate a desire on the part of the Federal Government not to withdraw - their desire may be to withdraw but they're not proposing withdrawal - but they are proposing an arithmetic ceiling, that is just a percentage ceiling, and we in turn have said we want your co-operation in reduction of costs and holding the costs in line but we don't want to just get involved in arithmetic and percentage increases. But the proposal in that regard is for a two-year agreement on a different formula which is now being negotiated.

The other programs do not terminate this year, but we are already starting to discuss any changes that the Federal Government is proposing in relation to the formulae and to their attitude in advance, knowing that what we do in one field may well be an indication of negotiations in the other. As I recall it, the hospital program is one which requires five years' notice and notice has not been given and the medical program I think runs until 1975.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the — it should have been to the First Minister but I'll direct it to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Reference was made in yesterday's Tribune to the fact that there's four insurance companies will look after coverage for anyone whose company has left the province. Could you give me the names of those four insurance companies?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday in a similar form of question, there will be a statement issued very shortly in connection with this entire matter of interim coverage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health and Social Development, and since he isn't here possibly the Minister of Labour might be able to answer it. During the time of the Flin Flon strike, were there people that were receiving strike pay that received welfare payments? And the second part of the question is, were there people that were receiving unemployment pay that were receiving welfare payments?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): I wonder if the honourable member would repeat the second part of this question. I didn't hear it.

MR. HENDERSON: I was wondering if at the time of the strike if there were people up at Flin Flon that were drawing unemployment insurance that still drew welfare payments, or that were drawing welfare payments.

MR. PAULLEY: The answer to both questions is it is possible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Resources. Does the Water Control Commission have jurisdiction over lake levels in provincial parks? Does the Water Control Commission have jurisdiction over any changes in levels of lakes in provincial parks?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Only if it's referred to them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question. Then is it correct that the level of a lake in a provincial park can be changed without reference to the Water Control Commission?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the title that the member has used is Water Control Commission; I assume that he's referring to the Manitoba Water Commission. If that's the case, then the answer is as previously, that if it is referred to the, yes; if it's not referred to them, it would be controlled by whatever agency is responsible for the regulation, which could be the Director of Water Control.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and relates to an Order for Return filed April 7th requesting certain information about the government hail insurance activities. Will the Minister say whether he intends to provide this information before the end of the present session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I would hope so, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is a meeting of the Public Utilities called for this morning to hear the report of the Telephone Commission, and depending on whether that meeting does or does not take a lot of time, we would like to have the option of returning to the Legislative Chamber. So I am suggesting that the House adjourn for the purpose of that meeting, to be recalled by the Chamber calling system, that is the buzzer, and that if the buzzer does not sound before 12:30 then we return to the Chamber at 2:30 with the mace not having left the table, and at that time, by leave, permit oral questions and then proceed with the regular routine business of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? (Agreed) In that case, I'll be leaving the Chair to return at the pleasure of the Honourable Assembly.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I did intend to call the motion of the Honourable the Minister of Finance but I note the Member for Rhineland isn't here. Perhaps there is just some problem as between the two meetings, so we'll give him the benefit of the doubt and proceed with other government business. Bill No. 36, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Morris. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I had adjourned this for the Leader of our Party who is not in the House at the present time. Could we have it stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 53, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. The Honourable the Minister.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield) presented Bill No. 53, The Health and Social Development Advisory Council Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide some explanations of why we are proposing the establishment of a Health and Social Development Advisory Council which is provided for in Bill 53. This bill provides for a citizens' council to advise the Minister of Health and Social Development on matters involving health and social services in the Province of Manitoba. The council would have authority to undertake studies and reviews on specific matters and issues, either requested by the Minister of Health and Social Development or as deemed desirable by the council itself.

The council would consist of not less than 21 members and would be constituted of a broadly-based citizen membership representative of the various regions of the province, representative of consumer interests and representative of professional interests as well. The Deputy Minister of Health and Social Development and the Chairman of the Manitoba Health Services Commission would also sit as members of the council but would not have the right to vote or to be elected as an officer of the council.

Mr. Speaker, as politicians we should be keenly sensitive to the need for more responsive government, that is for government bureaucracy to be more responsive to the needs of its citizenry. It has become quite obvious that inputs at various times and in various ways from citizens at large, including the direct consumers of government services, contribute greatly to the continuing improvement of government programs. We are therefore giving high priority to sustaining and developing more citizen and consumer participation in the formulation of delivery of government services. This approach represents an essential component of our over-all planning system.

We in government are not the only ones sensitive to the need for more and better citizen participation. A number of widely accepted studies and reports have called for greater use of citizen consumers in advising the decision makers and providers of services in the health and social services field. Some of the more important reports pertaining to the Manitoba scene have specifically called for what we are proposing in Bill 53, that is a broadly-based citizen advisory council representing provincial-wide interests in the field of health and social services. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I refer you to the report of the Social Service Audit and the Ryant-Spearman report stemming from that report.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time there are a wide variety of citizens boards, committees and councils which serve the Department of Health and Social Development in many meaningful and important ways. However, because of the traditional structure of programs in my department, which are gradually being changed, and this I will elaborate upon more fully later when discussing the Estimates -- I have already discussed this during the Estimates but I hope to do this further during this present session when we talk about this bill in Law Amendments.

The existing citizens boards, committees and councils are for the most part oriented and are either concerned with health matters or with social services matters but never both together. As we move towards a more complete integration of health and social services under

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) the umbrella of one department, there is a need to integrate certain citizens advisory functions that have heretofore been carried out by a variety of specialty boards, committees and councils. This is provided for in Bill 53.

The proposed advisory council would for the first time bring together, into one advisory body, broad-ranging health interests with broad-ranging social service interests and would permit a more effective global approach to the problem of health, poverty and social disorganization in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge support for this bill to all members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, this bill in my opinion doesn't quite call for the sort of advisory council that was proposed in the Social Service Audit and was agreed to in the last Spearman report. What they visualized I think was something that would have a greater degree of independence than this commission or council will have. They envisioned it as being something like an economic council. However, the provisions in this bill are that the members of the council should be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or Cabinet and then report to the Minister of Health and Social Development, so that in effect they may well be what I sometimes refer to as tame pussycats. It will be possible to forecast their decisions, and reporting directly to the Minister I think will possibly be a damper on their being able to have as much influence as we would like to have them see. For instance, there is no provision in the bill that after they have reported to the Minister that then they can publish any of their findings. It appears to be the end of the matter when they have reported to the Minister and perhaps the Minister could consider putting in some such provision.

They can initiate studies, but again I see no provision for staff in this bill, and of course this would be a tremendous handicap when they are trying to do any research or write any reports of consequence. Now it's possible that the Minister will find some way to provide for this; and, if not, this could effectively prevent them from doing anything of much substance.

This bill is another example of government by regulation. It provides that the Minister can appoint special committees, appoint the chairman and vice-chairman, the by-laws are submitted to him, he governs their term of office, their remuneration and even their quorum, so that in my opinion there will be more control exercised over this body than was originally intended and, as a result, I think that it will have a stultifying effect and that the council will not be the important influential agency that it was meant to be.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Here again, Mr. Speaker, we find in this bill the relative clause that has been referred to by other members in the House from time to time dealing with various bills that are brought forward by the government.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite concerned about the composition of the council as the Minister has suggested here. Here we find the total dictatorial attitude of the Minister and he is going to appoint these, he's going to appoint that, and yet at the same time he wants regional representation to represent the various geographical regions of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, in this Province of Manitoba we have already established regional areas. We have regional development corporations who geographically represent the various parts of the Province of Manitoba, and in the municipal field we have regional areas of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why the Minister has not considered asking either one of these corporations to make an appointment to this body.

If this government believes in democracy, the closest thing we have to democracy is the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. They are the civic arm who are so close to the people, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they would probably be better qualified to make an appointment to represent the geographical areas. I think it would show the government has the sincere desire to be democratic if they adopted such an attitude. The cooperation that would exist between the provincial arm of government and the municipal arm of government I'm sure would be enhanced by such an action by the Minister, if he allowed the various regions to make their appointments rather than have it done by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

So I would ask the Minister seriously to reconsider that particular section of the bill which deals with the appointment by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council rather than have it done by the regional areas of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, or, for that matter, he

(MR. GRAHAM contd') could use the regional development corporations of the area which are also equally concerned with all facets of development in the Province of Manitoba.

I think it is also a little presumptuous of the Minister, Mr. Speaker, when he dictates to that council and he says it should not be left to 21 members, that there will be one chairman and one vice-chairman whom he will appoint. I think in the interests of harmony, and an effort to make the committee really work, Mr. Speaker, I believe that probably the 21 members should maybe appoint their own chairman and their own vice-chairman. We have seen many cases where an appointed chairman could actually work to the detriment of a committee because of a lack of harmony and a lack of confidence in the other members of the committee because the chairman has not been elected by the members of the committee themselves but rather been appointed by some outside source.

The purpose of the committee, Mr. Speaker, I cannot fault the Minister for. We have had in the past many citizens committees working at various aspects of government in an advisory capacity and I find here the Minister is continuing that process. But there is one difference here again, Mr. Speaker, where the Minister says that he or the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council will have the authority to establish and pay such remuneration as is fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

I think it's been a great commendation of the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, that in the past we have had many citizens committees that have acted with no remuneration. We've had people come forward from time to time on various advisory committees and acted without fee, gladly, for the interests of the Province of Manitoba, but here we find the Minister says that he is going to fix the remuneration. I have no argument about the out-of-pocket expenses, I think they should be paid and they have been paid in the past, but here we find that not only are they going to get their out-of-pocket expenses but they are going to be paid a fee.

Mr. Speaker, when we are faced with a rising budget such as the province has been faced with, a 15 percent increase in the past year which is unheard of in the past, and we know that in this Province of Manitoba there are many people who are willing and able and well qualified to offer their services voluntarily, I wonder whether the action of the Minister in this particular instance is justified.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that there will be others who will want to make comment on this bill and I'm sure that there will be some amendments which will come forward when this bill goes to committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Would the honourable member submit to two question? Would the honourable member not agree that there is still a possibility that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or myself, as Minister of Health and Social Development, asked different organizations, or the regions in the province, the intended seven regions in the province, to either suggest or elect, locally, persons that would sit on the council. It leaves it open for that. The second question, Mr. Speaker, is the bill allows for payment of fee for service but we don't have to pay anything. It's left open, depending on the amount of service that is given. Would the honourable member not agree with that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, in answer to the first question, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister asked whether or not the various regional governments, the geographical regions could not appoint or suggest a member, but the appointment is made by the Minister. I would suggest that that part is the one that I am most concerned about. If the Minister had suggested that -- (Interjection) -- No, I would hesitate to make that appointment, Sir. I believe that it should be the local people that make that appointment, those that are in a particular region. They are the ones that probably know the qualifications of their own people better than anyone else, and I would have no hesitation in allowing those very people to make that appointment and I think the Minister should do that.

With respect to the second question the Minister asked, I realize that he doesn't have to pay them and it may very well be that he will not pay some of them, but it would be most inconsistent if he paid some and didn't pay others, and if he paid one I would think that he would be very inclined to pay them all. I'm sure that he would have no trouble finding 21 who would be glad to act and probably do a better job for the sake of Manitoba than for the sake of the pay cheque that they receive.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Health and

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I will be closing debate. I would only like to make a few comments pertaining to the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

First of all, it's I believe a step in the right direction when we talk of a bill to set up health and social development advisory councils. So far as the possibility of either electing, appointing by the local organization or by different public agencies in the different regions of the province, the bill leaves that opening. If the Minister ultimately makes the appointment after asking for names by the different regions, I think this is something that I have no tendency of apologizing for. There should be - I shouldn't say trust, but there should be a good working relationship between the advisory council, the Minister and the officials of the Department of Health and Social Development, otherwise there's no way that we can actually do anything worthwhile if we're working at cross purposes. There's nothing wrong -- my best friend is a person that will oppose me in public debate and that doesn't mean that I can't sit down with him and be quite friendly, and I say the same thing with the 20-odd boards and commissions that are under my jurisdiction in the Department of Health and Social Development. We disagree on many things. They present new ideas; I do the same; and there's a possibility of not falling into a rut and changing the structure for the betterment of the department and for the services it renders to the population of this province.

I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that the bill that I've presented in second reading today will be sitting as it stands now for many years to come. I do hope that at the next session that I will receive suggestions from the membership of the committee to make certain amendments to Bill 53, and I'm quite sure that at looking at the different people that we have in the regions of our province that could sit on such a committee that they will suggest things that could be included under this Act.

The only reason, Mr. Speaker, we actually said in the bill that we'd like to have at least 21 persons sitting on the advisory council, as I said a while ago in answering the question, we anticipate seven regions of the Department of Health and Social Development in the Province of Manitoba and we'd like at least three per region to be sitting on this advisory council. Moreover, we'd like to have representation from other associations which would be over and above the 21 members of the council.

Mr. Speaker, other comments and clarifications could be made when we discuss this bill clause by clause in Law Amendments.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 68, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Could we go then back, Mr. Speaker, to Bill No. 51 which I didn't call. The Member for Brandon is now here and I suppose he . . .

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I've had an opportunity to look in some greater detail at the terms outlined in this Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act and to look again at the explanations of the Attorney-General.

There are some matters here which I think bear a little closer scrutiny. The intent obviously is to place the responsibility for compensation of those injured in criminal actions with the Workmen's Compensation Board, and I can see that this would, if it becomes an effective method, would eliminate the need for having a separate administration for this purpose, and the Attorney-General has given some support to this idea.

There is a problem that occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, in using the Workmen's Compensation Board as the administrative authority. The Act suggests that the way in which people will be compensated for criminal injuries would be in the same way as if they had been injured on their job or employment. I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, how they would deal with a person who suffers loss or injury who would not normally come under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) I'm wondering how the administrative machinery would apply to a professional person, who I believe probably is not now covered under the Workmen's Compensation Act, or people in the sales categories and other categories that are not normally covered by the Act. This seems to me to be something that some explanation should be given on because it isn't immediately obvious to me how this might be done.

There were some comments, too, about the way in which people will be compensated who come to the aid of a police officer and who, by their actions, suffer in their desire to help a person being attacked or to help an officer in his enforcement of the law, suffer some injury or loss, and it seems to me that perhaps the proposed changes are going to make the compensation somewhat less favourable to a person who offers this assistance than was the case or the intent under the previous arrangement.

I believe that the Act originally provided that authority was given for compensation up to a sum not exceeding \$15,000 for pain and suffering in addition to other damages that might have been claimed, and I believe not too long ago there was a case of a man who went to the assistance of a young woman who was being molested and who did, as a result of his desire to help, suffer some personal injury and some loss of time at his job. I would think that rather than reduce the kind of compensation that might be available to people who volunteer their assistance, the intent should be rather the other way, that we would encourage or certainly ensure that these people who have given this assistance are given suitable compensation for the damages that they may obtain. So I feel that this amendment perhaps is moving away from this position rather than toward it. Certainly there must be some reasons for this and I think that it would bear some further exploration and no doubt the Attorney-General will be able to provide in greater detail his background and support for the change.

He also notes that in the case of loss of property as a result of these acts of assistance would not now be perhaps specifically covered, and I can see the reasons for this, that it's very difficult to perhaps decide how much money was in possession of the person who claimed after the event that he had lost it, so that probably this can be supported, this change.

In another part of the bill it is the intention to change the regulations somewhat to provide that written decisions will only be given by the board in the case of an appeal. Now, I think it's well understood that boards sitting on cases of decision are rather prone to avoid written decisions if it's possible, but I think the question could fairly be asked, how would one determine whether it is a proper case of appeal if they do not have a written decision upon which they can judge the reasons for the decision having been arrived at.

So I think this really could not be supported. I think it's most important that written decisions be given so that the people concerned can read these, examine them, decide whether they feel the judgment was proper on the basis of those statements which have been given to them in writing and then make their appeal or not. I think it's very difficult to ask a person to proceed to make a judgment without having before him the reason for the decision of the board. I would hope that the Attorney-General can give some reasons which possibly are escaping us for making this change.

Mr. Speaker, I have some other points with which I would like to deal, but I see that the time is 12:30 and it might be a convenient time to stop.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 12:30, the House is now adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon.