



PROCEEDINGS

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025

Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison

of the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba



Volume IV No. 26A

February 23, 1960

2nd Session, 26th Legislature

DAILY INDEX

Tuesday, February 23, 1960, 8 P.M.

<u>Adjourned Debate: Re Cancer (Mr. Wright): Mr. Johnson (Gimli)</u>	851
Mr. Paulley	853
<u>Motion re Compulsory Insurance (Mr. Paulley)</u>	855
Mr. Hillhouse	859
<u>Adjourned Debate: Re Fair Wage (Mr. Harris): Mr. Christianson</u>	861
<u>Motion re Housing (Mr. Orlikow)</u>	863
<u>Motion re Retaining Wall (Mr. Desjardins)</u>	866
<u>Motion re Crippled Children (Mr. Gray)</u>	866
<u>Motion re Fish Nets (Mr. Molgat)</u>	869
Mr. Hryhorczuk	871
<u>Bill No. 28 (Mr. Shewman): 2nd Reading: Mr. Campbell, Mr. Lissaman</u>	872
<u>Bill No. 85 (Mr. Groves)</u>	874

The Progressive Index of Votes and Proceedings will be
published on Tuesdays on the last page.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, February 23rd, 1960.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. We were debating this immediately before dinner. Are you ready for the question?

MR. GROVES: I don't want to speak Mr. Speaker. I would beg that the -- I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ROBLIN: It would be more in order if you just asked for the item to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Minister of Health.

HON. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to this resolution of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks because I have some feelings in this regard.

I think that first of all, and I'm sure that the honourable member concurs that certainly everyone in this House or anyone concerned with this problem doesn't like to see people become impoverished through prolonged illness and the cost associated with cancer diagnosis and treatment, nor for any disease for that matter. Now I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time the only charge that is made for diagnosis for treatment of cancer in this province is the surgical and medical care supplied for private patients -- that is, patients going to their own private physician and seeking his services. The Cancer Foundation which is the treatment section of our cancer set-up in this province as we know the Cancer Society, is mainly concerned with collecting of public funds for the National Research body which is mainly concerned with research. This Society also supplies to any cancer victim free dressings throughout the province on request. The Cancer Foundation which is the treatment section at present provides complete diagnostic services including biopsy services to both in-patients and out-patients. In the coming fiscal year this will be extended to biopsy service in the physician's office.

The Hospital Insurance Plan as we know takes care of all hospital charges for cancer patients both during periods of diagnosis and treatment during these periods in a hospital and as out-patients. Now the treatment services available to the province -- the people of Manitoba include radium and the radioactive isotopes which are becoming more to the fore, radium substitutes, X-ray therapy of all types, cobalt therapy and so on. And chemo therapy, that is, any patient suffering from a cancer can receive the most modern drugs through these facilities of the Foundation.

Now all the Cancer Foundation's function and treatment other than surgical and medical diagnosis to the private patient is supplied by the Foundation through the St. Boniface and the Winnipeg General Hospitals. And in addition to the above facilities, a complete diagnostic service or tumour service is maintained at both hospitals, and every physician coming across cancer is required to report this or to notify of the disease, and this tumour service which exists at both these hospitals both for private and public -- so-called private patients, and patients coming directly to the Foundation for therapy are followed through this resource. The Cancer Foundation, I might point out, also if a patient is in need and cannot pay his transportation in to attend a tumour clinic or follow-up clinic, this transportation is provided by the Foundation. I don't think this was realized -- it has been for some time. In addition to this, the patient has the benefit of the leading specialists in that field who regularly attend these tumour clinics which are held once a week. As we have said with regard to medical or surgical care, patients may, of course, provide on pre-payment basis for this care through the doctor-sponsored or other plans, and treatment of the so-called medical indigent -- a person between -- in that category between a person receiving a social allowance and the person who can pre-pay for their services is, of course, available by the highly trained teams at both our university hospitals, where they have the very best in medical knowledge and certainly all the diagnostic equipment that is necessary for treatment, and treatment facilities.

Now the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks made reference to the estimates being a

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli) cont'd) little down this year from last in our cancer estimates for this year. I would be able to make a fuller explanation of this at the time we come to the detailed estimates but I can assure him that the services are up this year. The reason why the provincial share is down slightly is because the hospital plan has now absorbed 27 instead of 15 percent of in-patient services which left more money available for the Foundation to use and, or they have -- as they are going ahead each year they have been adding more physicists, more personnel, and expanding in every way. As you know, they maintain both the treatment centres at St. Boniface and Winnipeg General.

Now I thought I should check on the statement made by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks which I noticed in Hansard. I think I would like to correct him. In Saskatchewan he said, in '58 they had 20,560 new cases of cancer. I would like to inform him, and I'm sure he'll see his error when I point this out, that last year in Saskatchewan there were 1,470 people treated -- or in '58 -- by their treatment facilities. In Manitoba there were 1,200. I checked this up in their annual report for that year and it appears that the incidence of cancer in Saskatchewan over the past number of years is 2.45 per 1,000 population, which means that their annual incidence of new cases should never be more than 2,500 based on a population of a million. Actually, last year in Saskatchewan there were 1,830 -- in 1958 that is, there were 1,830 cases of cancer diagnosed and in Manitoba last year 2,687 in the same year. It is suggested that the figure quoted by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks pertaining to Saskatchewan of 20,568 refers to all patients seen at the cancer clinic. I think he realizes that. And this is broken down into the number of patients coming in for first diagnosis of 3,800; the number of patients previously discharged coming in for follow-up 163; the number seen at the clinic but not admitted 274; and the number who came in for diagnosis of cancer and it was not cancer -- that is, it was a non-malignant disease, 500 of this group -- or 572. It is evident, therefore, that this figure certainly cannot in any sense be compared to Manitoba.

In Manitoba, of course, these figures are not in the same category because thousands of these cases are reviewed annually by the Foundation and in the doctor's private office, and the doctor is asked to report his private patients' progress. I would like to point out to the House that no matter where the physician is in Manitoba when he makes a diagnosis of a malignant disease and notifies the Cancer Foundation, this patient's name is entered on the registry and the patient is -- the doctor if he doesn't make a periodic report, of course sends in a complete -- is asked by the Foundation yearly to send in a complete statement as to the patient's condition, whether there is any evidence of deterioration and so on. It's a very full service. I would point out that only in Winnipeg, in the two major university hospitals, is cancer treatment other than medicine -- medical care or surgery carried out; that is, these facilities are all concentrated in these two centres, and very wisely so, with the highly technical staff required, and certainly any patient in this province who has not prepaid care and who is in financial need has available to them at any time the tremendous facilities available at our University hospitals. And I think that something should be said for this service. Really, they are the finest facilities that -- there's no finer treatment a patient can obtain anywhere. They certainly needn't feel like second class citizens going to these university clinics for the further diagnosis and treatment of cancer; these stations are all treated on an equal basis for this disease and in these facilities. If the honourable member cares to go to either one of these two hospitals today he will find the most modern facilities and offices available. The young men who walk around in white, many of them have four years post-graduate work following their medical degree, and are probably far more competent than most of us who are practicing in rural Manitoba. These are teaching fellows and so on. These men are tops in their field. I think our university clinics must become more and more important.

As I come to my estimates I will point out to you the tremendous job done in the past year on a home care experiment where 25% of the patients were private patients, as we call them. These facilities in this ever increasing age of medical advance where so many more of our patients can be treated on an out-patient basis and treated and diagnosed without admission to hospital and with the ever increasing cost of this highly technical equipment, the centralization in these resources is becoming ever increasingly more sensible to a

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli) cont'd) taxpayer than to us in the plan who have anything to do with our hospital plan. But I merely wish to point out that I abhor, as I have said, as much as my honourable friend, the financial embarrassment that can result from prolonged illness so commonly associated with cancer, but I can't help thinking of the many other crippling illnesses which are certainly just as disastrous to the person and certainly that there is the machinery in this province today for people who are able to cover themselves in advance, and certainly I've never seen nor heard of a patient who was diagnosed or who felt he may have this disease -- anything to prevent him going to a university clinic is beyond comprehension -- the best facility we have in the province.

Now, I might also say, to me it's always -- Social Allowances Act, I think, will go a long way towards helping in this regard. I often think it isn't so much the cost of the medical care during the illness that is so disastrous, it's the lack of earning power and the inability of the patient following extensive treatment of any nature to get back on his feet. This is the distressing thing with old people -- the aristocrats of Manitoba who find it so difficult when they have prolonged surgery and so on, medical illness, and feel indebted to anyone when they do recover, and I feel our Social Allowances Act is tailor-made to prevent people getting into that category. So in closing, Mr. Speaker, certainly I think that if the patient has no resources to cover his medical care, the facilities of our teaching hospitals are available to all, for the diagnosis and treatment of cancer, and I would point out that Manitoba in the past years has gone a long way towards meeting the resolutions presented by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a word or two in connection with this most important resolution that is before this Assembly. I, first of all, would like to say thank you to the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare for his remarks in this connection. Now it seems to me that the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare has gone along exactly the same line or very close to the same line that we used to hear from his predecessors in office in connection with this resolution. My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition says that it is a--(interjection)--I beg your pardon? I didn't quite hear you. Oh, that was a private conversation. That's lovely--because I think, Mr. Speaker, there's nothing that a member of this Legislature appreciates more, when he is attempting to sort of get his thoughts together, than private conversations from the other side of the House, and I appreciate it very, very much, because it does help us in getting our thoughts together. So I say to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, thanks very much for the private conversation with the First Minister.

Now then, as I was attempting to say, that it appeared to me that the present Minister of Health and Welfare has followed the same line of reasoning as that of previous Ministers of Health and Welfare, and then the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition says, "Hear! Hear!" which indicates to me and we of this group, that there is a compatibility between the Conservatives and the Liberals in this very vital and important field of human endeavour. And I can understand it because they have followed along the lines so often together in holding back progress in the field of advancement of human endeavour. So I can see quite readily and quite well, Mr. Speaker, why there is this compatibility between my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition and the government on the other side. But, Sir, I don't think it's enough. I appreciate very much the fact that the Minister of Health and Welfare has brought to the attention of the House that in respect of the treatment of cancer, that the patient under our Manitoba hospitalization scheme is entitled to hospitalization, and I cannot help but to remark apropos of that, that the government of today has already gone on record in debates in this House to say that Manitoba hospitalization was foisted on them and had they had been the government, it would have been delayed. Interesting tonight, in defence of the actions of the Conservative Government in respect of cancer, to hear the Minister of Health and Welfare, whom I admire very, very greatly, say that one of the facilities that a patient has who is suffering from cancer is hospitalization under the Manitoba Hospital Service Association, or scheme I should say, not association. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that my friends on my right, seeing as they are most anxious to get together with the Conservatives, only adopted the federal plan in respect of hospitalization on June 1st, 1958, because their tenure of office was nearly up. So there is a great compatibility between the two of them, and yet this evening, one of the factors that's alleviating,

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . in the opinion of the Minister of Health and Welfare, the cost to a patient who is suffering from cancer is the fact that we have, shall we call it, state hospitalization now in Manitoba.

The Minister has also told us that through prepayment of our medical bills, many of the citizens of Manitoba are covered for the costs of cancer treatment. He's perfectly correct. I suggest though, in connection with that, until such time as we have a comprehensive medical scheme which we of our party and alone in the Chamber have suggested, that there is only a comparatively small percentage of the people of Manitoba who have full medical coverage. It's growing, it's true. It's growing. Yes, Mr. Minister, I agree, and I appreciate the fact that it's available at a cost--(interjection)--I have it. I have it. As a matter of fact, the Minister asked me if I have it, Mr. Speaker. I have it, and I have half a dozen other adjuncts to it because I happen to be fortunately one of those individuals, and I make no bones about it. I happen to be fortunately one of those individuals, while not wealthy, am in a financial position where I, as the head of a home and a family, am able to take the advantage of the schemes that are offered. But I suggest apropos of that, unfortunately there are altogether too many who are not in the same fortunate circumstance that I am, and those are the people that we of the CCF Party, and in this House we of the CCF Party alone, are constantly appealing for more consideration to--or for. Oh, it's fine for my honourable friend to say "to" is right. Certainly it is "to", but it is "for".

Now then, the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare mentioned the fact that the university clinics are available. They are available, and let there be no mistake that we of this group are fully appreciative of the men and the women who are constantly at work in their endeavours in the medical field. We appreciate their dedication to service and duty and know that they are doing their utmost in these fields. Let there be no mistake about that. We also appreciate though however, Mr. Speaker, that in the province to the west of us, in addition to the devotion of these individuals in the field of medical research, there has been more active participation by the government of the people, and we're suggesting that for Manitoba. The Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare, when he was speaking, made mention of the fact, and I appreciate him saying this because it is so true, that one of the factors that has to be taken under consideration in the treatment of cancer is the loss of income. And I think that he would agree with me that on a severe case, indeed if not in all, in a case of cancer, it is a long period of time normally when an individual has recovered sufficiently from the onset of the disease until they are able to return to their normal livelihood. We have the many schemes which are providing at the present time for some semblance of insurance of loss of income. Most of them terminate within 12 or 15 weeks. Most of them only are for a proportion of the real wages of the individual concerned. But here is what is happening. Here is what has happened. In this province and in other provinces the individual concerned has had, notwithstanding some insurance to cover him for his loss of income, that that insurance has not been sufficient to even assist him in paying for the cost of surgical treatment. We appreciate very much the fact that Manitoba has made strides in the field of diagnostics, biopsies and the likes of that in respect of cancer. And all we're saying to this House is it's not enough. If I jotted down the figures of the Honourable Minister correctly, and I hope he corrects me because I don't like making statements that are not correct, but if I jotted down his figures correctly, he said that in 1958 in the Province of Saskatchewan, there were 1,830 individuals who had been diagnosed as having cancer, and in the Province of Manitoba in the same year, there were 2,687.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): In that year.

MR. PAULLEY: In that year. Yes, in that year. Now then, Mr. Speaker, what a difference--what a difference between the treatment and the care that these unfortunate individuals, and I say unfortunate because it can happen to any of us, here in the Province of Saskatchewan there were 1,830 individuals who have been--the diagnosis said that they had cancer, and notwithstanding the fact of their loss of income, if they were wage earners, all of their hospitalization bills were paid for; all of their treatment bills were paid for. What is the situation in the Province of Manitoba? Where there were approximately 800 more or 2,687, they had their hospitalization paid for. And what else? They were diagnosed as having cancer and the most expensive treatment or other aspect of cancer other than the loss of wages was hanging over

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) .. their head unless, figuratively speaking, they were treated as indigents and I suggest this--

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): You're speculating now, Mr. Speaker--

MR. PAULLEY: I'm not speculating at all.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Oh, yes.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm speaking from what of I know, Mr. Speaker, and I would say this, and I don't profess in any way, shape or form to be a physician with a medical degree, but I think that it's true axiom in any art of healing that one of the factors that is most conducive to healing is the condition of the mind without worry, and while it is true in the Province of Saskatchewan, the wage earner is not covered for his loss of wages here in the Province of Manitoba. In addition to that worry, he has the worries of medical treatment and when I say that, I want to pay a tribute to many devoted men in the medical profession because I can say without equivocation that in the medical profession itself, I have yet to find any practitioner who deliberately goes out in respect of a normal patient and extracts from them as much as the traffic can bear. And I appreciate as I'm quite sure that all members of my group appreciate, the contributions of the medical profession as a whole. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding that, the patients themselves are faced with this huge expenditure and there is, I think the Minister of Health will agree with me, that by and large the cost of surgical treatment in cancer is relatively high. Now then, I think that it is recognized that insofar as cancer is concerned, it's one of that type of diseases that nobody asks for. It doesn't appear from anything that I've been able to read that this disease is one which by virtue of a way of living, a man or a woman may bring on to himself or herself. It seems to me that in respect of cancer that even the medical profession as alert and as informed as it is, has yet not been in a position to be able to say, this is the cause or that is the cause. And for that reason, forward-looking people have recognized that in respect of this disease, it is one of those which lends itself, because it is so costly; because it is not the result of riotous living or any other type of living, that all of us collectively should join our resources in order to alleviate to the individual who is unfortunate enough to become afflicted with this disease, in order that he may not be faced with insurmountable charges and costs--a general principle, Mr. Speaker, of sharing and uniting in the so-called brotherhood of man which we so often extol as one of the greatest virtues that we have.

And so I say, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare; I appreciate very much, as indeed every thinking person in Manitoba and Canada will do, the efforts of the Cancer Research Foundation; the efforts of those devoted men and women in the field of cancer research and treatment and all of those, layman or otherwise, who are constantly giving of their services and efforts in an endeavour and an attempt to find the causes and the cures of this disease and the alleviation of the suffering caused because of it. That we all appreciate. But what we are asking in this resolution of the Government of Manitoba is to put on the Statute Books of this province where we collectively--where we collectively as residents of this province recognize the full implications of this disease and that the burden should be shared among us all, rather than being inflicted on any individual who is unfortunate enough to have this dread disease.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear your seconder.

MR. STANES: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. STANES: The honourable member is unavoidably absent from the House. May I ask the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand again?

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party.

MR. PAULLEY: It's been rather a rugged day today, Mr. Speaker, however I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that whereas each year finds an

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . increase in the number of motor vehicles on our highways, and whereas each year also finds increases in accidents caused by motor vehicles involving injury and loss of life to persons and damage to property, and further whereas many owners of motor vehicles do not carry insurance against injury and loss of life to persons, and damage to property, therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to the advisability of the establishment of compulsory motor vehicle insurance in Manitoba with the government as the insurer.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in introducing this resolution, I did for a moment think that I should do exactly what the Honourable the Attorney-General has suggested, simply to read my remarks of last year. I think they were rather good remarks. As a matter of fact, I didn't read them until the other day, and outside of numerous grammatical errors--

A MEMBER: Dramatical as well.

MR. PAULLEY: And outside of other interjections, it wasn't such a bad speech at all. Unfortunately, unlike the late former Minister of Education, I haven't got any letters to prove it, but I do know that despite the fact that I haven't received any personal letters to substantiate that speech, there have been a considerable number appearing in the local Press both here and elsewhere, because of the fact that more and more people are beginning to realize the necessity of compulsory automobile insurance. As a matter of fact, even my friends on my right at their conference here just a few weeks ago, had before them the resolution for the consideration of a system or scheme of compulsory automobile insurance, but in true Liberal fashion, referred it to a committee, and I am sure as far as the old-time Liberals in this House are concerned, if they treat it like many resolutions that they received, when they were on that side of the House, that that's where it will die. But I have a little more faith in the new generation, who by some unfortunate circumstance have attached themselves to the Liberal Party, and I sincerely trust this new virile young element within the Liberal Party, at least will persist--

MR. CAMPBELL: Do you mean this little group here?

MR. PAULLEY: You know, Mr. Speaker, if it wasn't for the fact that there was a limitation of a debate or a limitation of a fact that I can only speak once on this in introducing it, after that comment from the Leader of the Official Opposition, I would beg the indulgence of the House to let me start all over again, because I thought it was very cute. I think that's the funniest one in the House this session. And you know, there's that old saying of sometimes truth is more strange than fiction. But I vary the saying, Mr. Speaker, that since the time we introduced this resolution a year ago, more and more people are coming to the conclusion that we're not so far out in making this request to the legislature. Now I can appreciate very much that those members that are in this House who happen to be in the insurance business are not going to like this resolution, and I anticipate as was the case on its introduction seven months ago, that there will be a certain number of members of this House who will stand up, and they will quote statistics and insurance rates and the likes of that to disprove our contention, aided and abetted by that very influential and well-informed member for Selkirk. But I will be interested to hear if he takes part in this debate, what his reaction will be to it in light of the consideration that his party is supposedly going to give to this very important subject. Now basically, what does it mean? We're asking that no person shall be privileged to drive an automobile in the Province of Manitoba until such time as he or she has given proof of financial responsibility and in addition to that, we are suggesting that because of the compulsory nature of this resolution, that the only logical corporation who should issue this insurance is the government itself, just exactly the same as we have done, Mr. Speaker, in respect of hospitalization insurance in the Province of Manitoba. Now is it wrong? I suggest that it is not wrong. During the debate of a year ago, we had examples from some of the members here of other jurisdictions which have a compulsory automobile insurance, and they pointed out that in those jurisdictions that the premiums continuously went up which proves to me or indicates to me what we of the CCF have consistently and persistently drawn to the attention of this House, that where you allow private capital, in this case as exhibited by the insurance companies to come under a compulsory scheme initiated by government, naturally because they have a corner on it. Because the people are forced into it by legislation, without control on the premium rates, of course

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) .. they'll sky-rocket. And that's why we're persistent in suggesting that it should be the government who is the ensuring agency--to prevent that. The other day I noticed on the editorial page of The Winnipeg Tribune, February 15th, 1960--and I want to read a few excerpts from it because in this, Mr. Speaker, The Winnipeg Tribune are agreeing with the basic principle of compulsory automobile insurance, which we are enunciating in this Assembly. They never slipped so fast as when they supported your administration. And I want to say this--and here I want to read a few excerpts from this editorial: "This newspaper has contended for several years that Manitoba law could do a great deal more to protect the public from financially irresponsible motorists. Three main changes should be made in the present legislation; (1) motorists should not be issued licence plates until they show proof of financial responsibility. The underlying assumption of the present safety responsibility law is that such a motorist must be involved in an accident before authorities ask for proof of financial responsibility--before he is required to show that he can pay for the physical damage he had done." Isn't that so true, Mr. Speaker, in the laws of the Province of Manitoba that anyone, and incidentally, anyone irrespective of whether the car that he is driving is in mechanically good condition or not, can obtain a licence to drive that car, and he can drive that car as long as he likes insofar as financial responsibility is concerned until he has an accident, and that accident can involve the taking of a life.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Would insurance stop that accident?

MR. PAULLEY: No, no, and it's a pertinent question. I agree that the insurance would not stop that accident, but the insurance would assure to the individual full compensation--not full, I shouldn't use the word full compensation. Now I know my honourable friend is going to turn around and say that haven't we got that under our financial responsibility laws because that is his line of reasoning. I ask him, who is it at the present time who creates the funds that pay under financial responsibility if it is not all of the motorists in the province, when requested so to do. Irrespective of whether you have insurance or not--there is no exemption. When you go in the year to obtain your licence, the registrar of motor vehicles, or the person on the other side of the counter doesn't say to you, "well now, have you got insurance on your car? And if so, we will not make an additional charge for financial responsibility for those who haven't got it". No, of course not. I think the argument that financial responsibility covers this, is not valid.

And then the Tribune article goes on to say, "this newspaper feels that this should be changed and all motorists should be asked to show proof of financial responsibility before they can get their licence plate". Further, "this would not be difficult or impose a hardship on car owners. All they would have to do would be to show pink insurance cards, or liability bonds". Now then, there I differ with the editorial of the Tribune, because once again and this is typical of the Tribune, and it's typical of the Free Press, that they are not interested in government entering into these enterprises, hence the last sentence that I read out is understandable from The Winnipeg Tribune. And it goes on, "and then to prevent abuses, it should be made an offense to drive a car which is not covered with this type of protection. Otherwise, there might be a danger of cancellations, or allowing policies to lapse after licences had been obtained". I think this contention of the Tribune is very, very valid, that it's not simply enough to show--(interjection)--I beg your pardon? I couldn't hear myself think on this side. I think this is very, very valid--(interjection)--I beg your pardon? I didn't hear that one either.

MR. ROBLIN: Carry on.

MR. PAULLEY: Thanks. Possibly I'll be able to read the remarks of the Honourable the First Minister in Hansard tomorrow. I say--I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I think the argument of the sentence here in the article of the Tribune was valid because unless--unless this was done, and that is continuing proof of financial responsibility, if only on the issuance of a licence, it was necessary to show proof, the licence or the insurance could be cancelled, and then the same could prevail without it. And then the third article, or third item that the Tribune goes on to say is that, "the third reform needed is the limits of the Unsatisfied Judgments Funds should be reviewed. The present maximum is ten thousand, the largest amount that can be paid to the families and dependents of traffic accident victims". And then they say that this is not realistic in view of the awards being made by many of the courts in many fatal accident cases. The article then goes on to say, "in the past, when the subject of compulsory car

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . insurance has been discussed, it has become confused with state automobile insurance. The two are quite distinct. Manitoba motorists can be required by law to carry insurance coverage without plunging the government into car insurance business. In Britain, compulsory car insurance is working well. The British system does not involve the government in administrative costs, nor does it take car insurance out of the hands of private companies. Manitoba should have a similar system for the protection of motorists and pedestrians"--and I disagree with the last two paragraphs of the article in the Tribune, because one of the basic principles--one of the basic reasons that the government to the west of us in 1946 adopted a compulsory government operated system of automobile insurance was because they recognized that where you have a compulsory feature of legislation such as this, that the individuals concerned should pool their resources to the benefit of all. What happens when we are talking of our privately-owned automobile insurance companies--and I know that there's many in this House that are interested in them, both as agents and directors? Each year the administrative costs and the profits and loss are chargeable on the premium to be paid by those who have to take out the insurance. But in a government-operated scheme, the question of profits does not necessarily enter into it, because the accumulated premiums belong to the people. If there is a surplus in one year, it goes to offset a deficit the following year, and to adjust the rates. It is normal procedure insofar as private companies are concerned, that if there is a surplus in one year, well--if there is a deficit, we won't take into consideration the surplus that we had last year in an adjustment of rates, but we'll increase the rates on the succeeding premiums. So while there is the attempt to recoup for deficits, there isn't the consideration in our privately-operated companies for any benefit to the premium-holder for surpluses of the preceding year.

Now what has happened in Saskatchewan I think, and I'm not going to argue the details of the respective rates, because like--as the Honourable Member for Wellington was pointing out this afternoon, apropos of comparable labour rates, it's pretty hard. But I would suggest this, and I think it is a truism, that the insurance rates in the Province of Saskatchewan under its publicly-owned insurance company, are less than they would be were there not the system of compulsory publicly-owned system in Saskatchewan, and I suggest this also, Mr. Speaker, that by virtue of that system being in operation in Saskatchewan, it has a tendency to keep our rates a wee bit lower here in the Province of Manitoba than they otherwise would have been, because more people would be paying heed to our resolution and more members of this Legislature would be prepared to support it than any evidence has been given in the past on the introduction of this resolution. In the Province of Saskatchewan, while there were years in which there were deficits, there were years in which there were surpluses. The overall picture all over the years since its inception has been a net accumulative surplus of about four millions of dollars. In the year 1958, the surplus amounted to, if I recall correctly, some \$750,000. And what has been the net result? In this year, 1960, it has been announced that on certain vehicles, namely farm trucks of a certain category, there will be a reduction in the premium payable in respect of the owners of these trucks. What would have happened by a comparable company in private business with this accumulation of surplus? And the surplus of last year would simply have been taken then as dividend and shareholders' profit. But in the Province of Saskatchewan by virtue of having this insurance by the government, the shareholders in the corporation are all of the people in the province who drive automobiles. It has been suggested in some quarters that, and I think with all due respect to them, without very much thought that some of the profits in the insurance field have gone into consolidated revenue. Of course this is not so. I might say in the debate of last year as I reread Hansard, there was an attempt of one of the honourable members of this House to bring into the discussion of the automobile insurance, a whole debate on all aspects of the Saskatchewan Insurance Corporation. I suggest--I think that is a good scheme too, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what we are dealing with here, and in this resolution are two and only two principles; the first principle is, should or should not every individual who owns and drives an automobile in the Province of Manitoba accept as one of the responsibilities for that privilege that they should have by compulsion to take out an automobile insurance premium for the protection of any unfortunate victim? And secondly, is it not logical, as it is within our hospital insurance scheme, that where we do this by compulsion that the benefits of that should accrue to those who are affected?

(Mr. Pauley, continued). . . . I realize and I appreciate many of the features of the present financial responsibility laws of the province of Manitoba. I appreciate very, very much the job that the Motor Vehicle Department is doing. I have my criticisms of them and will eventually or soon be drawing them to the attention of this House. By and large, I think that they are doing a pretty fair job. I suggest that there is no time for complacency by the government or by this House. It's simply because of the fact that advancements are being made in the field of financial responsibility, that we should not pursue our endeavours further. I pointed out that under our present act, and I think this is indisputable, that we all are entitled to one thing before we have to prove that we have financial responsibility. I suggest Mr. Speaker that is wrong, and we of the CCF group are proposing this resolution, realizing as we do that there might be some argument, that some poor individuals may find it a little difficult financially to accept this additional cost, which there will be, for the operation of their car. We appreciate that, but we have no hesitation in introducing this resolution because we feel that in the field of modern transportation with our ever increasing provision of speed highways, with our automotive industry, ever increasing the horsepower of our vehicles that we purchase, it is a responsibility of government to make sure that each and every individual without the first chance, should be required to show financial responsibility. We note with great interest looking at it from the aspect of premiums for the benefit of my colleagues and friends in this House who are in the insurance business, that the Manitoba Farmers' Union has set up a premium pool or a pool in order that they may obtain a cheaper rate through co-operative buying in the field of automobile insurance but we are asking, the CCF Party in this resolution that the resources of all of the automobile drivers in the Province of Manitoba be pooled for the protection of all who may, as a result of automobile accidents, have financial loss. The basic principle again is we allow through the building of our roads potential weapons of death and destruction to be on our highways and we do that to the collective revenues of the Province of Manitoba. We say that while we do that collectively it is our responsibility of government to collectively insist that the people who may be unfortunate victims of an accident are covered through a compulsory automobile insurance scheme.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, if I heard the Honourable Leader of the CCF correctly I believe he said that there was a reduction in the insurance rates in Saskatchewan this year?

MR. PAULLEY: On certain trucks.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Is there an election being held in Saskatchewan this year? (Laughter)

MR. PAULLEY: In answer to that Mr. Speaker, I do not know, I don't think that any election writs has been issued but may I assure my Honourable Friend, the Member for Selkirk that if it is the people of Saskatchewan in their wisdom will re-elect Tommy Douglas.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Well my reading of the insurance history of Saskatchewan has proven to me beyond any shadow of a doubt that whenever there's a reduction in premiums in the Province of Saskatchewan it's a sure sign that an election is a few months off. (interjection) And my further reading of the insurance history of that province has shown me that there's a reinstatement of these rates immediately following an election. As a matter of fact the rate fluctuation in the Province of Saskatchewan is the highest rate fluctuation of any Province in Canada. It sometimes amounts as much as 45%. Now, Mr. Speaker, all that I'm interested in is highway safety. I don't care whether highway safety is attained through compulsory insurance or what it's attained through as long as it is attained and I think that the Province of Manitoba in its three-pronged law has achieved the greatest degree of highway safety of any province or state on the North-American continent. It amazes me to hear the Honourable Leader of the CCF extol the virtues of compulsory insurance and hold up as a paragon and something to follow these states that have compulsory insurance. In conversation with Mr. Bailey the other day I was surprised when he told me that he had recently received a letter from his counterpart in Great Britain inquiring into all the facets of Manitoba's Safety Responsibility Laws. Now Great Britain has had compulsory insurance for years and if Great Britain is interested in Manitoba's Safety Responsibility Laws I think that it is only right to assume that compulsory insurance in Great Britain is not achieving the objective which its framers thought that it would.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable member would permit a question? Is not the compulsory automobile insurance system in Great Britain operated by the

(Mr. Paulley, continued)... private insurance.....

MR. HILLHOUSE: Private insurance companies, yes, but nevertheless it's compulsory.

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask a supplementary question, and did I not say that in my remarks, possibly the honourable member did not hear me, that I appreciated that and that was one of the basic reasons for the ever spiralling increase in costs because of the fact that it was in private hands.

MR. HILLHOUSE: No, no, I'm not referring to rates at all, I'm referring to the fact that compulsory insurance does not bring about highway safety. That's my point, regardless whether the compulsory insurance is written by the government or by private companies and I refer to that fact that Mr. Bailey's counterpart in Great Britain had inquired just recently of him of all particulars regarding our Safety Responsibility Laws in Manitoba. Mr. Bailey also informs me that he has had similar inquiries from India, from France and from all over the world and I know as a fact too, Mr. Speaker, that in reading the proceedings of the National Safety Council, I think at every meeting that that Council has ever had --- every national meeting that it's ever had that Manitoba Safety Responsibility Law has been held up as a model to be followed by all. Now, as I said at the beginning I'm only interested in highway safety and I think that Manitoba is achieving that end. In Manitoba today without compulsory insurance 96.8% of the motor vehicles are insured, whereas in the State of Massachusetts which has compulsory insurance only 90% are insured. Now in the State of New York, which introduced compulsory insurance 3 years ago, you know who the greatest insurer in that state is? The assigned risk plan. Since the State of New York has introduced compulsory insurance its premiums have soared to a height never before reached and the claim frequency has increased to a height never before reached. Now it was in 1947 I believe that Manitoba introduced its present Safety Responsibility and Financial Responsibility Laws and at that time there was registered in Manitoba a hundred thousand motor vehicles and the claim frequency at that time was 19.6 for every hundred vehicles on the road. In other words, 1 out of every 5 vehicles had a claim made against it during the course of a year. Now the latest figures available to me are for 1958, and in 1958 there was 275,000 motor vehicles registered in this province, and the claim frequency had been reduced by one-half. Now as far as the Province of Saskatchewan is concerned no statistics are available. As far as the State of Massachusetts is concerned, no statistics are available.

Now another point that I would like to bring to the attention of the House is this, that since 1954 the number of uninsured cars in Manitoba involved in accidents has been reduced from 1,668 to 847. It has been cut right in half. Now another thing that might be of interest to the House is this, in Saskatchewan the number of suspensions for non-payment of judgments has reached such a staggering total that it is becoming a matter of grave concern to the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office officials.

Now back in 1944 my predecessor, the Honourable J. S. McLenaghan when he was Attorney-General of this province, set up a committee to report back to this Assembly on indemnity for motor vehicle accidents and highway safety. That committee was composed of R.M. Fisher, now Dr. Murray Fisher; G.S. Rutherford, the present Legislative Counsel, W. R. Cottingham, the Chairman of the Municipal and Public Utility Board; G. L. Cowsley, the Commissioner of Taxation; and Herbert Hunter the Superintendent of Insurance; and if this House today were appointing a similar committee, I submit that they could not have obtained better personnel than were obtained for that committee. Now that committee was instructed to report with recommendations as to (a) any suggested amendments to the existing financial responsibility part of the Highway Traffic Act, and I might say that at that time we did have a financial responsibility law in Manitoba, but under that law all that happened was that the car was impounded if it was involved in an accident until such times as the judgment rendered against the driver of the car was satisfied; (b) any legislation designed to provide other, or more satisfactory methods of indemnifying persons suffering damage from the operation of motor vehicles on the highways; (c) the principles upon which such indemnity should be based, and (d) any other matters relating to the indemnification of persons suffering damage from the operations of motor vehicles on the highway, having in mind the two-fold purpose of providing adequate indemnification as aforesaid, and if possible, reducing the number of accidents resulting from the operation of motor vehicles.

(Mr. Hillhouse, continued)... Now that committee held meetings at which representations were made by all persons interested in promoting highway safety in the Province of Manitoba, and at those meetings various suggestions and various plans were submitted as the best methods of achieving the objectives assigned to them. But the committee, after due consideration and due deliberation, came up with the recommendations that now form our basic law in respect of highway traffic. Now during the course of that committee's hearings certain representations were made regarding compulsory insurance and the committee found that compulsory insurance is definitely not a safety measure. Now I'm not going to burden the House by reading the reasons why they reached that conclusion, but the reasons are to be found on page 18 of the report of the committee and to me they are quite satisfying and they're quite cogent. Then another reason why they recommended it as they did and opposed compulsory insurance was that the State of Massachusetts, which at that time was the only State in the North American continent which had compulsory insurance, had not a very satisfactory record from it. Now another reason why they did not adopt compulsory insurance was due to the fact that under compulsory insurance claim frequency increases, rates increase, larger awards are made by courts, very minor injuries are exaggerated, and there is much more litigation over accidents. Now a still further reason why they opposed the compulsory insurance scheme of Massachusetts was due to the fact that owing to the unfortunate increase in accidents in Massachusetts which occurred after the introduction of compulsory insurance, insurance premiums had to be raised resulting in the Legislature of Massachusetts taking steps to fix insurance rates by legislation. Then another reason why they opposed compulsory insurance was on the grounds that it takes away the underwriting judgment of insurers which is essential to the efficient operation of any insurance scheme. In other words, an insurer has a right to determine the type of risk that he's going to take and the premium that he's going to charge for carrying that risk.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that anything has happened in Manitoba since that report has been submitted to this Legislature to make us change our minds about changing the recommendations that were then made, and for that reason I feel that I must oppose this resolution. I'm not opposing the resolution, as I said, because it has the element of compulsion in it. I am opposing the resolution because I feel that our main objective is highway safety. Highway safety cannot be achieved through compulsory insurance. Highway safety can only be achieved through every driver in the Province of Manitoba saying to himself when he gets into his car, I'm not going to have an accident today. Highway safety can be achieved in Manitoba if motorists will be a little less selfish and a little more thoughtful of other people using the roads. Insurance rates are not fixed by insurance companies. Insurance rates are fixed on the highways by the number of accidents. All that insurance companies do is to gather together these statistics and determine what the ratio is between losses and premiums and they fix the rates accordingly. As to the arguments put up by the Leader of the CCF, if I had been opposing the Honourable Member in a court case and he had submitted the argument which he did submit in support of his resolution, I wouldn't even have put in a case for the simple reason that he didn't make his.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Speaker, before we deal with the proposed amendment to the Fair Wage Act, perhaps it would be well to take a look at the history of this Act and to see how it arrived in its present state. When this Act was originally passed in 1916 it dealt with only government contracts, the very good principle being that contractors working on public works, paid for with public funds should be obliged to pay a fair scale of wages. The Bureau of Labour which administered the Act got information as to wages negotiated by unions or paid by reputable contractors and published the yearly schedule. The Act recognized the fact that one level of wages existed in the major centres, Winnipeg, and another lower level in the smaller centres, and also that hours of work varied in rural and urban areas. During the '30s the Act

(Mr. Christianson, continued)... was extended to cover private construction, and because of the very low level of all wages and costs and the low level of private construction, it had very little actual effect.

Today, however, the Act has the effect of making all contractors in Zone A, the Winnipeg area, pay their tradesmen the rates which were most recently negotiated by the Winnipeg Builders' Exchange and the Winnipeg Building Trade Unions. Now these Unions pride themselves on having the best tradesmen as their members and their rates are based on supplying the principal contractors with the best of these skilled craftsmen. This schedule the Labour Department is charged with enforcing. Another lower scale is enforced in Zone B, the area outside of Greater Winnipeg. Contractors regard the Act as a safeguard to themselves, in that all competitors must pay the same wages on any job. Those with the best equipment, the best foremen, and the most efficient tradesmen, know that their competitors must pay the same scale to their tradesmen whether they are skilled or not. The most experienced carpenters receive the same pay as the least experienced because the scheduled rate is both the minimum rate and almost always the maximum rate. Now this situation does not help union strength. No one has to join a union and pay dues to have their rates of pay enforced, the Department of Labour does it for them. Because of the difficulty of small contractors in getting good tradesmen, there have grown up syndicates of tradesmen who contract for certain jobs - finishing, woodwork, plastering, etc., mainly in house building. They generally work long hours and divide the contract price between them. Now the main reason this has grown up, mostly in housing contracts, is because house builders are the hardest hit by this Act. They must endeavour to keep prices down in order to retail their products in the widest possible market. Outside Zone A, in the smaller towns, there are many complaints that the rates are imposed without the people's desire or their consent. Here too, in most cases, we do not have the same level of skills, and hours of work are usually longer than in the cities. It is obvious then that the construction trades enjoy a position not shared by the steel worker in a plant, the carpenter in a sash and door plant, or in any other industry. In these other areas wages are the subject of negotiation and are enforced by the contracting union or by the individual effort nor does any other province have this type of legislation. B.C. does enforce a relatively lower rate on their public works. Obviously we've come a long way since this Act was first passed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the extension of the Act to all the areas of the province? Well if there are grounds for believing it an unfair wage act in Winnipeg, it certainly would not help to extend it to all the areas of the province. But the reason behind the amendment is, I think, mainly with respect to the hours of work. Now it is usually the case that the hours of work on construction projects in remote areas are longer than in the cities. This is so mainly because the employees desire it. There's little recreation available in the construction camps; men are away from their wives and families; their cost of maintenance is much higher. Their main object is to make a lot of money in a short time. In the city the tradesman has plenty of recreation. He lives at home and many of them hold second jobs. In fact we hear many complaints about moonlighting. To extend the Act to the county would not meet, I think, with the general approval of labour. Schedule A, Part II of the Act dealing with public roads and bridge work sets out 120 hours as the maximum straight time for each two week period and this seems to meet with the approval of most of those engaged in the road building business. Another phase of activity that suffers from the Fair Wage Act is the winter works program. Productivity in winter is usually less than in summer and yet contractors must pay the same rates. This raises costs and hence discourages winter projects, particularly house building.

Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the Act presently only covers inspection of working conditions on public works entered upon by the Minister, and not on private or municipal projects. I agree with the honourable member that the department should vigorously implement its inspectional duties under the other Act mentioned and prevent any recurrence of these most unfortunate accidents that he mentioned. However, these do not come within the scope of this Act. I cannot see how the extension of this Act in its present form to all areas of the province can be in the general public interest and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETERS: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kildonan, that

(Mr. Peters, continued).. the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, Whereas an increasing number of citizens of Manitoba are now living in the cities and towns of this province; and whereas many of our people lack proper housing accommodation; Therefore be it resolved that this House urge the government to give consideration to the advisability of establishing a departmental division on housing, adequately staffed, and with sufficient funds so that cities, municipalities and voluntary non-profit organizations, interested in improving housing for their citizens would be encouraged to proceed with an expanded program of housing development, under the terms of the National Housing Act.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, from 1945 to the end of 1958 there was built in the Dominion of Canada over a million and a quarter houses, and yet despite this tremendous building program, the largest building program which we've ever seen in this country, the housing problem is today as serious as it ever has been, because despite this large building program, a program which has gone a considerable way to meet the needs of the people in the middle and higher income bracket, practically nothing has been done to meet the needs of the people in the field of housing in the low income brackets; to meet the housing needs of the old people; and to meet the housing needs of people with large families. At the end of 1955, Mr. Speaker, there were still in Canada 350,000 families who are not maintaining their own household. This means in fact, Mr. Speaker, that over 700,000 families were sharing accommodation in housing. This has not changed materially since 1955. Surveys made have indicated that the sharing of housing accommodation is almost entirely due to a lack of income. In a survey made in 1951 it was found that 99% of the families with incomes of over \$6,000 a year had their own dwellings but only 90% of all families had their own housing accommodations. Obviously those with the lower incomes have had to share accommodations. The need to provide housing for low income families, for families with large number of members and for the old people, has only now begun to be met. In this province we have begun, in this last year or year and a half, to provide some of the housing needs, particularly for the elderly people.

Surveys made in the cities of Canada prove conclusively that the low income families occupy the most obsolete housing areas in the cities. They are the people who have been short-changed almost completely by our lack of housing planning. We have had many surveys made in this city and indeed in every city in Canada as to the housing needs. The Winnipeg Free Press, which incidentally has been very lukewarm editorially to the problem of the state helping to provide housing, reported on September 14th of 1959 on the most recent survey made, the Urban Renewal Survey made in the City of Winnipeg, and I quote from the article which appeared in the Free Press of that day: "The survey shows that 125 city blocks need to be redeveloped from the ground up and another 150 blocks need to be rehabilitated." Now, Mr. Speaker, we had thought in the City of Winnipeg that the first priority for housing and rehabilitation was in that area from the CPR tracks to Notre Dame, and in the Point Douglas area for which the Honourable the First Minister proposed to the City of Winnipeg a year and a half ago a complete rehabilitation scheme, but according to the Free Press and the quote from the Urban Renewal Survey, the first priority for housing and rehabilitation is now in the area in my own constituency, and I'm not proud of this, in the area from Main Street to Salter and from Sutherland to Selkirk.

Now, Mr. Speaker, surveys which have been made indicate that while we have refused to subsidize adequate housing we have consistently subsidized substandard housing. A survey made by the Emergency Housing Department of the City of Winnipeg in 1955 in the CPR to Notre Dame area brings to light some very interesting figures. The Public Welfare Department in that year, February of 1955, was looking after 4.3% of the city's population, but in the survey area, Mr. Speaker, 18.9% of the public welfare caseload was in this area. The indigency rate in the City of Winnipeg at that time was 7 per thousand; in the survey area it was 30.7 per thousand. The Children's Aid Society protective caseload for the City of Winnipeg was .9 cases per thousand; in the survey area it was 5 per thousand - 6 times as high. The

(Mr. Orlikow, continued)... Juvenile Court Delinquency rate for the City of Winnipeg was 4 per thousand in 1955; in the survey area it was 10.63 per thousand. This is an indication, Mr. Speaker, of what poor housing means to the people of an area.

We had recently prepared by the Welfare Council of Greater Winnipeg, an organization which meets the approval of the Provincial Government as witnessed by the fact that they are this year receiving a grant from the Provincial Government, an urban redevelopment study was done under the auspices of the Greater Winnipeg Welfare Council -- survey of the south Point Douglas District, the district in which the Honourable the First Minister proposed to the City of Winnipeg that a redevelopment scheme be begun. And here is what they reported, Mr. Speaker. Of 309 residential buildings examined, only 1.76% could be classified as being in good condition; 25.26% are in fair condition; 27.72% are in poor condition; and 45.26% Mr. Speaker, are in very poor condition. They further report in the same area that the survey of dwelling units showed the following percentage of major defects: poor to very poor state of repair, 42%; toilets shared by more than 6 people, Mr. Speaker, 20%; bath non-existent, 27%; wash hand basins non-existent, 32%; heated by stoves, only 34%. Mr. Speaker, I think that these figures indicate very clearly how serious the lack of adequate housing can be in the large urban areas in this province as in other provinces.

One needs only to look through the files of the newspapers, which as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, are not noted for their sympathy to public housing, to see the large number of individual cases which are reported on as being in very serious need. The Free Press on March 4th of 1959 had a story which was headed "Shack Towners to Lose Home" and I will quote just a few sentences from that news report. "In a shack town at the corner of Grant Ave. and Nathaniel Streets, 14 families wait to see what is going to happen to them. They are squatters living in tin, tarpaper and wood shacks." It goes on to quote one of the women as saying: "My husband is a veteran; maybe they will give us a veteran's home", said Mrs. James H. who lives with her husband and five children in a two-room shack they bought eight years ago. "If they don't find us another place we'll just have to live in a tent." On May 12th the Free Press reports as follows: "Demand doubles for emergency housing in city." The story says as follows: "Somewhere in Winnipeg 20 people, 13 of them children, are trying to live in 4 rooms. Nineteen children who should be at home with their mothers are cared for instead by the Children's Aid Society because the mothers simply cannot find suitable accommodations. Our Emergency housing service deals daily with the hard core of Winnipeg's housing problems", the report of the Welfare department said: "During the past 5 years we have received an average of 30 applications monthly from families with severe housing problems. During the past month our registrations from families with housing difficulties has doubled. Twenty families with 115 people reported serious over-crowding. Another 12 families with 53 people report to seek emergency housing because their present homes are in unsanitary buildings which violate health regulations. Applications have been received from 49 families involving 302 families. There's simply no suitable accommodations available at rents they can afford to pay."

On July 11th of 1959 the Free Press has another story headed: "They'll be on the streets Monday." This story goes as follows: "Welfare organizations and other service groups from around Winnipeg have been trying to help Raymond Dunn, his wife and eight children, but time is running out. Unless their luck changes by this time Monday the family of 10 will be out on the streets. Their home had been condemned in February, 1958 and last June 22nd the bailiff ordered them out. Mr. Dunn is a good worker but until two weeks ago his profession was painting. There is not much work for painters in winter months. Tiny Mrs. Dunn works hard to keep their children fresh and neat. The \$55 a month home they were evicted from in Old Kildonan was something entirely different. Most of the windows are missing; plastered walls within were broken and dirty. The past few weeks Mr. & Mrs. Dunn have investigated many advertisements for rented houses but they claim nobody wants to rent a home to a family with 8 children. This points to the need for low cost accommodation said one welfare official and it's ironic but the Dunns would be better off right now if they were on relief. Mr. Dunn makes \$225 a month as a Steward at a Canadian Legion Hall." Mr. Speaker, some measures in a small way have already been taken. The Free Press reports on one of them. On March 28th, 1959, the heading of the story is 'Old but happily independent', and it goes on to say as follows:

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) "earlier this week a happy group of oldsters, all war veterans and their wives, celebrated the 2nd anniversary of what, to them, was the beginning of a new life of security and comfort. The celebration was marked quietly in the sanctuary of their own homes in the Canadian Legion Gardens at 675 Talbot Ave., Elmwood, homes that have been provided for them at a low rent of \$43 a month." Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for Winnipeg Centre helped a good deal with the development of this project and I'm sure that he can tell us more about it. The article goes on to say: "The gardens which consists of 40 low rental units was the first project of its type in the province. I think that's important to keep in mind, Mr. Speaker. The first project of its type in the province. To the first tenants and others that have followed the project has made the difference between a hazardous and strenuous existence and a happy and worry-free life. Many of the veterans and their wives had been living in third floor flats dingy rooms in the city slum areas. Each has his own comfortable suite consisting of a spacious living room, a large bedroom, a modern kitchen and a standard bathroom. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one group of people who have been doing well out of our inaction and that is the slum landlords. The Free Press on October 15th, 1959 had a report which reads as follows: "Can't stop slum landlords." The story reads as follows: "Winnipeg is virtually powerless to do anything about landlords who make fat profits with slum housing," Welfare Director, C.A. Patrick said Thursday. He said the city had gathered information concerning revenue from housing units which are among the worst in Winnipeg. These units owned by four landlords accommodate roughly one out of five families which receive social assistance in Winnipeg." Mr. Speaker, under the Social Allowances Act and the arrangements between this province and the city, this province is subsidizing the people who live in those inadequate housing units and is subsidizing these slum landlords. The article goes on to say: "Slum properties are very profitable. It is in the landlord's interest to keep them in poor condition. If they fix them up the taxes go up. As they are the taxes and maintenance are very low and they never have a vacancy."

Mr. Patrick said it was almost impossible to force landlords to bring their properties up to decent standards. In the 94 housing units studied by the welfare department there were 388 health act violations in one year in 1958. There were 43 cases of defective plumbing; 9 of the houses had bedbugs; 117 cases of defective walls, ceilings and floors; 32 cases of leaky roofs; 39 of filthy bedding. A total of \$210,000 was collected in rental payments for the 94 properties in 1958; total taxes paid were only \$20,744. Low rental housing built under limited dividend legislation paid its owners an average of 12.5% of the full assessed value compared with almost three times as much 32.8% collected in 1958 by the four slum landlords. Taxes paid on one limited dividend project last year equals 23.3% of the rental revenue -- this compared with 9.8% paid by the slum landlords. Mr. Speaker, I think that the few cases I've given are proof, sufficient proof as to the need. Canada was the last major industrialized nation to adopt subsidized public housing as a national policy. By the terms of the National Housing Act the Federal Government supplies 75% of the capital investment and of the annual operating loss if any. The provinces and municipalities share the other 25%. All the provinces in Canada but Prince Edward Island and Quebec have passed complementary legislation. Under the terms of the legislation not too much as yet has been done, but close to 10,000 units have been authorized and as of the end of September 1959, 6,225 have been completed. I want to point out to the members of this House Mr. Speaker, that none of the units completed have been in the Province of Manitoba. Financial Post, January 4th, 1960 carries a story about what is being done in the City of Halifax. I would just like to quote one paragraph: "At present the city (that is Halifax) is already tearing down tenements in the midtown area; building a \$5 million Mulgrave Park development; planning a 200 unit subsidized housing scheme called Westwood Park. Preliminary plans for Westwood Park have already been drawn up and tenders are expected to be called about the end of June. The project will include a considerable number of one-room units designed as senior citizen housing." In the city of Toronto, Mr. Speaker, one project, the Regent Park project has been built which has provided adequate accommodations for 1,062 families. Two person families have been provided with three room units; three or four person families with four room units; five or six person families with five room units and so on. Mr. Speaker, projects under the present legislation must be initiated by the municipality then approved by the province and the Federal Government. There are few municipalities in Canada

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) and few are in this province which have the staff to initiate the needed projects and few have the finances required for a real attack on the province. Certainly very few of them have the trained personnel which is required. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Manitoba through the establishment of a housing division with an adequate staff could help the local municipalities evaluate their needs, help them make concrete plans for those people who are now inadequately housed. It is also my hope Mr. Speaker, that the province will give some thought to the setting aside of an adequate amount of money. I would suggest Mr. Speaker, \$1 million a year for ten years. This money might well be used to meet 15% of the present 25% which is let by the Federal Government to the Province and the municipalities. If this were done Mr. Speaker, only 10% of the money required for public housing development would have to be found by the municipality or the non-profit organizations which are already showing real interest by moving into the field of elderly persons housing as the result of the legislation which was passed recently in this House. Now Mr. Speaker, with such a program I believe that we might begin to meet the needs of the people of Manitoba in the field of housing; one of the most important requirements which is left for this province to look after.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the honourable member for Elmwood that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. GRAY: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, my motion whereas part of Tache Avenue in the City of St. Boniface is continuously being washed out the the Red River; and whereas the St. Boniface Hospital as well as other property is in danger; therefore be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba petition the Federal Government for the construction of a retaining wall along the east bank of the Red River from the Norwood Bridge northerly to the line of La Verendrye Street.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak too long on this motion and I think that it is self-explanatory. The Mayor and the members of the Council of the City of St. Boniface has on numerous occasions petitioned the Federal Government trying to have them look into this matter. So far all they have received is promises. This dates back for a number of years I think it was shortly after the 1900's that the first request was made. But instead of getting better it's getting worse. At this continuous washing out of part of the Tache Avenue is caused by the flood waters of the Assiniboine because this is about the spot where the Assiniboine flows into the Red River. In fact it's the spot that over 200 years ago explorer LaVerendrye set foot when he came to Western Canada. The St. Boniface Hospital is in danger, the St. Boniface Hospital as we all know is located between these two bridges and then there is the St. Boniface Basilica and many other important buildings. I hope that this House will take this seriously and as I say the matter is getting worse and now it is a grave and dangerous situation; something definitely will have to be done and if it's delayed too long will be a lot more costly. Therefore, I hope that this House will back the demand of the Mayor and the members of the Council of St. Boniface and strongly petition the government at Ottawa for the erection of this retaining wall that is so vitally needed to safeguard the Hospital, Basilica and as I said, other properties involved.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I beg please to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kildonan whereas the deaf and blind children of this province must, at present, attend special schools outside of Manitoba; and whereas there is inadequate provision for the

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)....education of crippled and retarded children; and whereas experience has demonstrated the value derived by handicapped children when they are afforded the opportunity of special education; therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government should give consideration to the advisability of expanding educational facilities for the deaf, blind, crippled and retarded children of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief although the subject is very important. The members of this House are quite familiar with the request I am asking. We have made similar requests many times but unfortunately they have borne disappointingly little fruit. Well perhaps, the honourable members may turn deaf ears to our appeals -- they've had a lot of practice. But they cannot ignore statistics and I have figures here that should make the honourable members sit up and take notice. All of us who have fine healthy children whom you love and are proud, and remember these are more than just figures out of a book. The represent children living, breathing children, much like our own, and they have parents not very different from ourselves. According to the figures I have obtained there may be -- they may be wrong but if they are then it's on the other side. I can almost say definitely that the figures I shall mention now are definitely if not more. There are 81 blind children in Manitoba; 1,407 crippled children; 2,047 retarded children; and 48 deaf children and many more who cannot be labelled deaf but whose hearing is impaired sufficiently to make life difficult for them. That is a total of 3,583 children. There are more than this number who are in need of help.

Mr. Speaker, we are failing these children! Please do not think I am overlooking the excellent work that is being done by voluntary organizations. The Canadian National Institute for the Blind, the Association for Retarded Children, the Society for Crippled Children, the Welfare Council of Greater Winnipeg, the Kinsmen, the Lions Club and many other fine organizations that are doing such splendid work for handicapped children. But the problem is too large and far too important to be left to charity and a few regrettably small government grants. These children, like normal children, should have the advantages of as much education as they can absorb. Because of their particular handicaps special facilities are required for their education. And in such facilities Manitoba is lacking.

The Honourable Member for Selkirk spoke the other day and I bless him for his speech, it helped me out a lot, about children with impaired hearing, and about how much they would benefit from the services of a trained speech therapist. I heartily endorse his words and I sincerely hope that the Honourable the Minister of Education pays heed to them. However, I believe that the honourable member should have gone a bit further and spoken of the children who have no hearing at all - the deaf children. These tragic little human beings who, through no fault of their own, are forced to live in a silent, lonely world. And I think the case of the deaf children is perhaps the saddest of all.

Usually the deaf child is perfectly normal in other respects. His intelligence may be just as high, or higher than that of his brothers and sisters. But what good does that intelligence do him or her if he is not taught how to make the most of it? It only tends to make him more painfully aware that he is "different" from other children. He sees them talking and laughing, but their actions are just so many puzzling gestures. He cannot understand why he is left out of their happy activities. Without training, he must learn to speak. And if he can neither speak nor hear, he cannot learn. He remains lost and confused, left out and lonely. And what do we do in Manitoba about these lonely, unhappy children? We ship them off to another province. We take them away from their parents -- away from the only love and understanding they know -- and send them to be looked after by total strangers. I simply cannot understand why this must be.

Please do not think that I am questioning the quality of training given at the School for the Deaf in Saskatoon. I am not, I am sure they do an excellent job. But that's not the point. To illustrate -- I should like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Health -- he's a doctor, he should know about these things. I should like to ask you, Sir, what happens when a child -- a child who is already confused and unhappy, is sent away from his parents to live among strangers? I'm not a child psychologist but in my opinion I believe that he would feel very neglected. The child cannot understand the parents are sending him away for his own good. He probably feels his parents don't want him any more. What else can he believe when

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)... he sees them only once a year, or perhaps once every six months? I am not trying to say that these children should be kept at home. I realize only too well that the parents are not capable of giving them the specialized training they deserve. The experts say, and I believe them, that a residential school, because of the atmosphere and the facilities it can provide, is best suited to their needs. But they also say, and I should quote direct from many books I accumulated of experts, which I don't intend to read tonight, except one or two quotations, they also say that, whenever possible, handicapped children should be educated in their own community. The handicapped child especially needs the companionship of other children. In addition, he needs the special love and attention that only his parents can give him. Seeing his parents and family often and knowing that they love him, gives the handicapped child a sense of security. This sense of security is absolutely necessary if the child is to learn. A regular teacher can tell you that an insecure child or a child with an inferiority complex is a difficult one to teach.

Just for the moment let us leave the child and now consider the parents. Isn't it tragedy enough that their child is handicapped? Must they be made to suffer additional heartbreak by having the child attend a school outside the province? I think those of us whom God has blessed with normal healthy children can only guess at the grief and pain in the hearts of those parents who have been less fortunate.

I would ask the Honourable Minister of Education to consider these facts: Manitoba's deaf children urgently need the educational facilities of a residential school; and they need the security of being with their parents. There is only one way they can have both -- to open such a school in Manitoba.

What about the other handicapped children? the blind? the crippled? and retarded? I feel very sure that if the Minister were to phone the Canadian National Institute for the Blind or the Crippled Children's Society, they would very soon tell him that the blind and crippled children badly need extra facilities, if they are to have the educational opportunities they deserve. And I'm equally sure that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface would be only too happy to provide him with the information about the educational needs of the retarded children in this province. Provincial and municipal grants cover less than half the cost of the Association for Retarded Children's present operation.

The Association would like very much to enlarge its educational services. But to do so they require more money than the Association can hope to get from private charity.

The Honourable Members across the floor sometimes accuse the members of this group of pretending to have a monopoly on humanitarian impulses. I invite them to prove that they are just as humane and sensible as we are, by supporting this resolution.

And may I say in closing that we have requested this for many years and I am sure the expense now is much greater than we would have a home right here. And the necessity of the parents to be close to their children, the retarded and crippled children, to those unfortunates, is supported by textbooks which I have obtained from the Minister's office. Surely to goodness, if you are studying this yourselves, I don't need to bring it in here and read it. But it says definitely that retarded children should be close to their parents.

I heard from personal experience -- a friend of mine had a child in one of the institutions in the province, a retarded child, and this retarded child who cannot speak and cannot hear, when the day comes when the parents had to meet her the child gets nervous, looks from the window, she knows by impulse that the parents are coming to see her and she is quite happy. That little happiness for an hour, or two, or three means a lot. So I respectfully would ask the government to give it consideration from the financial point of view, but particularly to what is best for the child.

MR. GEORGE M. JOHNSON (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Honourable Member for Osborne I will move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear your seconder.

MR. JOHNSON (Assiniboia): The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert-Plains, that whereas serious problems have arisen during the winter commercial fishing seasons on Lake Manitoba as a result of net seizures and prosecutions of licensed commercial fishermen by the Government of Manitoba, because of alleged undersized nets; and where as the fishermen have no guarantee of mesh size when they purchase nets and have no means of protecting themselves; therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of this House, the Government of Manitoba should give consideration to the advisability of immediately establishing a system of inspection and marking nets prior to their usage to protect the purchaser as to the legal size of the mesh.

Mr. Speaker presented the resolution.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, while the first preamble in my resolution refers only to Lake Manitoba, I would like to point out that this is an important question to anyone engaging in fishing anywhere in the Province of Manitoba, and I am sure that the Honourable the Minister of Health and Public Welfare will agree with me in that regard as well. I know he is interested in fishing problems too. This is actually a province-wide problem wherever, particularly, winter fishing operations are carried on. And when we consider the importance of the fishing industry to the Province of Manitoba I think that this resolution is one that should commend itself to the attention of this House.

We have to realize that, on the average, fishing has meant an income of something in the order of 3 1/2 million dollars per year over the past few years to Manitoba fishermen. That's on the value to them. When it comes to the market value it is usually something in the order of \$6,000,000. The winter fishing operations on the average employ something in the order of 2,500 people every year. This during the season when we do have unemployment problems, because of seasonal difficulties, and this is quite important. To a large part of the province it's a secondary source of income, which is essential to the people who are doing fishing because their other sources are not sufficient to carry them through, and they depend on this for their winter livelihood. And this difficulty has been growing year by year.

The basic problem seems to be that, as things now stand, the majority of the fishermen purchase their nets from the fish buyer; the fish buyer by and large is an employee of the larger fish companies. He is merely acting in some cases as an agent for them, but in most cases, I believe, as an employee. He sells the nets to the fishermen most of the time on credit because the fishermen haven't sufficient funds to purchase the quantities of net that they need in the fall to go out on their fishing operations. So they're purchased on credit by the fishermen, who is then as you might say "in hock" with the fish buyer. And the intention is that he will repay the fish buyer or the fish company, as the case may be, by the fish that he catches during the course of the year. Now, there seems to be in this regard, a, if not pressure, at least some strong desire on the part of the fish company to sell as small a net as possible so that whichever fisherman is in hock to them will catch as much fish as possible, and while this may not always be the case, it does seem when one looks at the results at least that this is what is happening, because if a fisherman can proceed to fish with a mesh even 1/4 inch less than the legal size then by and large it will mean that he will catch more fish than the other fishermen fishing alongside of him with a legal sized net. And it appears, as I say, from what has been happening that the fish companies do have an interest in selling smaller sized nets. In any case, that is what has been happening. As it goes on now, the nets come out from the various sources here in the City of Winnipeg to the fish buyer and there is absolutely no guarantee to the fishermen who purchases these nets that they are of legal size.

Now I know that the situation is complicated by the fact that we have different sized requirements on the various lakes. Lake Manitoba I think right now is at 3 3/4"; Lake Winnipeg I think for winter fishing is at 3"; Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Dauphin I believe are 4"; and while this does complicate it, it does seem to me that we could standardize it. The fishermen are not asking, and my resolution certainly should not be construed in that way, this is not a request by the fishermen to have a smaller sized net. They quite realize that it is in their own long-run interests and that the department has been working towards that end, and that the mesh size if anything be increased. I think Lake Winnipeg is a perfect example where the 3" mesh has worked to the detriment of the Lake Winnipeg fishermen, so this is not a request to lower the sizes. But when the fisherman comes to buy this net, and let's take the

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.)....case of Lake Manitoba, it will be tagged as a rule 3 3/4", but as a matter of fact that doesn't mean at all that it could be 3 3/4". It may be as much as a quarter inch either way and the fisherman purchases these on the expectation that they are a correct size, and under the manufacturer's statement that they are, but once he gets them out in the lake there is absolutely no guarantee to him that the inspectors from the department who come out to check the nets will not find them to be undersized because there is no check, it seems to me, at the time that the net goes out. There is no check here as far as can be found out in the case of the fish companies shipping them out; there is no check in the fish buyer's shop when he sells it to the fisherman. Now this means that a man can proceed to buy what he thinks is a legal sized net; and he can have it finished off and trimmed with cords and weights and floats; take it out in the lake; and the day after he has purchased it, it can turn out to be of illegal size.

Some of the fish buyers, in order to protect themselves and their fishermen, have asked the departmental officials the fishing inspectors, to come and measure the nets before they sell them. I know of one particular case who a year ago had to return his entire shipment of new nets. Although they were marked a certain size they were not of that size, and he returned them. Now had he not taken this precaution it is quite possible that he would have sold the nets; the fishermen would have bought them in good faith; and then they would have been stuck.

Now exactly what the solution is, is I think a more difficult problem. That I will concede. I've discussed it with many fishermen and have got a number of suggestions from them. It would seem, however, that something could be done in the way of tagging nets once they are purchased and finished by the fishermen, that is once the cords and weights and floats are put on them, because once that that is done the net can only be used in its intact form. It can't be very well sewn to other nets of smaller size. It has to be used that way once the cords are in.

Now I know for example the case of our customs people. If someone wants to go through the customs from Canada to the United States, and at a later point back into Canada with say a suitcase which he does not want to have opened -- he wants to carry it in bulk -- well they have tags at the various border crossings -- they will usually put a cord around the suitcase -- they have a special type of tag which is fitted on this cord and it is clamped. After that you cannot proceed to open that case without cutting the cord, then when you come to come through customs again you have to explain what has happened. Now it would appear that the same thing could be done with fishing nets, that once they are in the hands of the fishermen, that they could ask the fish inspector to come along and check the nets. If it is a satisfactory size at that time then they could proceed to have the net tagged by some sort of seal such as this one used by customs, then that would be the proof insofar as the fishermen is concerned that his net has been inspected; it has been approved; and he can proceed to use it.

Unless we can establish something of that sort this problem I'm sure will continue to arise because there is no proof today -- the fish inspector could come out and inspect a whole series of nets today and find because he checked certain meshes that it's in order, and he can go back tomorrow and there is no proof that he has inspected the net the day before. There is no means of identifying that particular net, and it can turn out that if he check another mesh that it becomes illegal. And in all cases it always falls back on the fishermen, because he is in the end user and he has no protection. He has no means of protecting himself and he is the man who takes the rap, and this can be very serious for him. It's not at all unusual. I have a number of cases that I am particularly aware of where fishermen have had to dispose of 50 nets -- 25 nets. When we consider that the price of these varies -- oh, for an unfinished net from \$8.00 to \$24.00 depending on what the material of the net is whether it is cotton or nylon. Then he has to seam them; put on the cords, weights and sinkers; and that is usually another \$5.00 or \$6.00. Well when you take that over 50 nets, it becomes a rather dangerous occupation to be involved in. So my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, is that the department give this matter consideration -- to establishing a system of marking the nets. Once they are in use -- I know they have to have protections in there against shrinkage; against other problems that can arise; but I'm sure that they can find a way around that. The new nylon nets are not supposed to shrink, and that with proper effort on this line that some means could be found of protecting the individual fisherman in this regard who at present is completely at the mercy of the fish companies and inspectors.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that my colleague the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose pointed out that although his resolution refers to Lake Manitoba that the body of it applies to other fishing waters in the province, and I don't think that he placed quite enough stress on the fact that a great many Manitobans depend either entirely or to a very large extent on our fishing industry. I don't think that we can over-emphasize the importance of the fishing industry, not only because of the numbers that are involved and dependent upon the industry, but also keep in mind the fact that the people that are dependent are finding it difficult to find any other source of livelihood, and I think that is very important -- and I am referring to our Indians and to our Metis in this regard.

Now along any of these lakes we will find reserves established. In fact most of our Reserves I would say were established adjacent to lakes simply because of the fact that they did contain fish and that there was a possibility for them to earn at least a partial living from this source. Now throughout the years we have established a good export trade in fish, and the way it was established was simply by making sure that the quality of our fish would compete with any other fish that came on the market, and in pickerel especially, I think we have received first place in the markets to our south who are the biggest purchasers of our output. But before we reached the stage where we were acknowledged to be exporters of some of the best quality fish available anywhere, it took a lot of research and it took a lot of practical knowledge to find out what the market wanted; how we could sustain the yield so that the market could rely on the supplies coming from this province; and we have a number of regulations set up to both assure the market of good quality of fish and at the same time to assure a continued supply of fish.

Now some of these regulations are such as seasons for example. In most of our lakes we have the summer season and we have the winter season. The lakes are even zoned as to what kind of fish can be caught in certain areas of these lakes, whether it's whitefish, pickerel, or whatever it may be. The most important, I would say, of the regulations is the size of the mesh that is permitted to be used. The other of course is poundage, the amount that each fisherman is allowed to take out under the licence that he holds, but I think that the most important factor of all to keep both our markets and to sustain the yield is the matter of mesh size of nets. It took quite a number of years before our government and the fishermen realized that if they took out an undersized fish they were not only reducing the quality of that fish insofar as the market was concerned, but they were also doing something to harm the continued productivity of any given body of water owing to the fact that the fish was immature when caught and was never given the chance to spawn and reproduce.

Now at one time, before redistribution, the people that fished in Lake Winnipegosis were almost entirely in my constituency. Since then this has been broken up into The Pas and the Ethelbert-Plains. But I've often had reason to meet these people, both at their own request and because I was interested in their welfare, and I'm quite satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that if they had some encouragement in this regard you wouldn't see any infractions of the Act at all because they fully realize that obedience insofar as this particular regulation is concerned means the continuation of that source of livelihood to them. And there is one other thing, a great number of them know that their future generations are going to be dependent on this source of livelihood too. And I think it's only the very, very few exceptions that would deliberately go out and use a net containing a smaller mesh than is permitted by law. Now the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose set out what he thought could be done with the nets in order to assure that once the fisherman has bought a net as a 4 1/4" mesh, or whatever it may be, that when he has put it in the water it's not going to contract and become a 4" net, and then have his nets pulled out by the inspectors and confiscated. Now these confiscations are very serious, Mr. Speaker. They can mean that a man can go in debt, not only for that particular season because he hasn't got the fishing gear to fish with, but sooner or later he will have to repay the value of these nets and I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that there are any number of fishermen that had to fish two, three and four years before he squared his account for the nets he lost because of confiscation. And confiscated they must be if we want to retain the value of a standard mesh.

Now we can imagine, Mr. Speaker, what would happen to a fisherman who in all honesty bought a net believing it to be of a certain mesh size. He goes and sets these nets and

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) after they have been set once or twice or three times as the case may be, an inspector comes in, pulls them out and measures them, and confiscates them. No matter how honest this particular fisherman may have been prior to that, no matter how closely he hewed the line insofar as government regulations were concerned, you can make sure that after a treatment of that nature his enthusiasm towards following the same path would be considerably lessened, and that is another reason why we should try to use every effort to find some means of giving the fisherman protection. But not only the fishermen. This again I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker. It isn't a matter of only protecting the fisherman in his investment. It's the protection of an industry which is important in this province, and unless we find some means whereby this can be done, and what the means are I'm sure I do not know at the moment because we previously have given this matter considerable study too, and in all fairness to the government now, Mr. Speaker, we didn't find a suitable solution and I know it is going to be difficult to find one, but every effort should be made. Like every other problem, solutions may not be here today but they'll be here tomorrow, and unless we assign ourselves to the task of finding a solution, then naturally it won't be found. And I do hope that this particular resolution will be adopted by the House. It's not being made in the spirit of criticism. We admit that we had this difficulty when we were sitting on the other side of the House. We admit that we tried to find a solution for it but we did not find one. And again I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that if a solution may not be available today it will be available tomorrow, providing that you keep hammering away at the problem before you. And I do hope that this matter will receive very serious and favourable consideration from the government and that the resolution be allowed to pass.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to speak on this resolution at this time, but I would like to ask the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains if he would permit a question. It's more one of enquiry, Mr. Speaker. I understand that there was some attempt in the past to look into this matter as this resolution stands and, as the former Attorney-General, I wondered if you could advise us whether there are complicated legal problems involved in the matter of the resolution?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Speaker, there are problems involved and the problems are one of jurisdiction insofar as looking after the nets coming in from other provinces and so forth and so on. I don't think there's any need going into that because the problems are there. They're admitted. I've admitted that there are problems but I still don't think that the ingenuity of man is such that there is a problem that he can't find an answer to, because certainly we've had some much harder problems than that to crack and I believe that the government, even in its short term of office, so far has had several pretty prickly problems and pretty hard problems and they've come up with -- well reasonably satisfactory answers.

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

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

Mr. Shewman presented Bill No. 28, an Act to incorporate the Bloomfield Hutterian Brethren, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. H. P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, this Bill is fairly well self-explanatory in that it does outline the advantages of incorporating the Hutterites. Firstly, I would suggest that you permit the colonies to hold lands and incorporate, instead of the individual. Secondly, the Provincial Secretary will be entitled to an annual Incorporate Return from each incorporated colony showing its balance sheet and land holdings. And thirdly, the Public will have a corporation to sue in case of need instead of a number of individuals comprising of their colonies. As I understand, the fourteen bills that stand in my name, they all have the same wording and are the same effect as Bill No. 28, Mr. Speaker, and I see nothing contentious in these bills and therefore I would recommend that they go before the Law Amendments Committee.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, before the member takes his seat, and I am asking the question in that way because I do not wish his reply to be considered closing the debate, for I am hoping to say something on one of these bills at a later stage. May I ask him a couple of questions, Mr. Speaker? I think he has probably already answered one of them, and that is, that I take it that with the exception of the names of individuals which appear in the second

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) ... paragraphs of the bills, that these bills are identical? Is that correct?

MR. SHEWMAN: Yes, I'd say yes to that.

MR. CAMPBELL: I gathered that that was the fact, Mr. Speaker, although I must confess that I have not read every one of them completely, but they appeared to me to be that way. Then I would ask the honourable member -- perhaps the Attorney-General would give consideration to this question as well -- if the wording of Section 3, which deals with the terms of an agreement that was made between the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and certain of the Hutterian Brethern of Manitoba, a copy of which is set out in Schedule A, if that language is sufficient to make it plain that the terms of that agreement are actually incorporated into and become a part of the Act when passed?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the honourable member a question? Did I understand him to say that it was expected that the balance sheet as well as the statement of real estate holdings would be submitted to the Provincial Secretary? I thought I heard him use those words. My understanding is that the usual corporation form would be used which does ask for the real estate holdings but not for the balance sheet. I thought that perhaps the honourable member might welcome it if I asked that question for clarification.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I might also direct a question to the honourable member who introduced this resolution. I had intended to speak on it but it's a little late this evening. My question would be, and I don't suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member, not being of the legal fraternity, may be answered, but I'd appreciate the answer at some time. Does the fact of the passing of this Bill in effect mean that the voluntary agreement referred to in the Bill, does the effect of the Bill give to that voluntary agreement the status of law and become a binding agreement? And I say I'm not expecting an answer of that tonight, Mr. Speaker, knowing that my honourable friend is not a solicitor, and even if he were I might get four answers.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, I know that it's quite frequently the practice here to vote for second reading for a bill to go to committee in order that various features may be discussed -- particular sections -- and I have one or two reservations of my own that I would like to know more about. I know that the Honourable Member for Morris may not have the information and probably a committee would be the place. First of all, I'm interested in this organization because it's not only apparently a religious organization but can engage in almost any business whatsoever. As such, being a religious organization, it will probably escape income tax. Secondly, I wonder about the rights of the individual -- how the membership is made up; how an individual can leave the corporation; and if he leaves the corporation can he take anything away with him as he can from a normal private corporation when he holds shares. And then, too, I think particularly wrong is section 6 which completely, apparently, ignores the rights of women. Now in itself, say if you were looking at it in the eyes of a business corporation this might not mean very much, but this is the complete community life. Our laws set up certain rights for women. They set up certain rights for individuals. I think these sort of bills would be asking us to do something which would not be right in the eyes of our law -- (Interjection) -- That may be so, but there you have the case of an adult individual joining that organization in the full capacity of mind, we hope. This is the case where people can be born into it or enter it through no fault of their own or no will of their own.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I had planned on saying something quite briefly on one of these bills, certainly not on them all, and I'd be quite prepared and of course I'm prepared to see them go to committee because I think that's the right place to discuss them in detail, but rather than attempt to do so at this time, and making it clear that I'm quite prepared to see the rest of them advance as far as I'm concerned because I wish to speak on only one of them, I would at this stage move the adjournment of the debate with regard to this one and I'm quite prepared to see the others go through.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you name a seconder?

MR. CAMPBELL: Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, might I ask as to whether or not I was recorded as speaking because I did not intend to, and as the debate has been adjourned I would like to speak on it.

MR. SPEAKER: As I understand it you asked a question.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you kindly.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 29. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. SHEWMAN: Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, could I ask the indulgence of the House to have these other two Bills stand? As I understand, they're all the same, and with the discussion from the Leader of the Opposition that he might be able to debate more of them

MR. ROBLIN: I would suggest that under the circumstances perhaps they should all stand until the debate on the first one is concluded and then they can all be put through, because in view of the similarity it might be considered desirable to have the debate here first before we pass any of them.

MR. CAMPBELL: That is satisfactory to me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 29. Stand.

Mr. Scarth presented Bill No. 42, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate St. Charles Country Club, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it that Bill No. 31 also stands. Second Reading of Bill No. 85. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Speaker, if we carry on with the second reading of this Bill it would take me beyond 11 o'clock to finish my remarks. Do you want me to carry on?

MR. SPEAKER: Carry on.

Mr. Groves presented Bill No. 85, an Act to incorporate The Association of Dental Technicians in Manitoba, for second reading.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Speaker, there are 31 technicians interested in this Bill. Many of the same have applied on previous occasions to this House for recognition under the name of 'Denturists'. The name of this group has been changed in this Bill for two reasons. Firstly, to comply with the name on a Charter which this group holds, of which the name is The Association of Dental Technicians in Manitoba; and secondly, to meet a rather strong objection from the dental profession that the name "denturist" would be confusing with the name "dentist", that by squeezing the letters together that the name "denturist" could appear on a sign to be the word "dentist". These technicians are not claiming, have never claimed, and do not intend to claim the right to practice dentistry. They do claim, however, that they ought to be licensed to repair, make, and fit artificial dentures. There have been isolated cases in the past of practice beyond these phases, but the technicians as a body condemn such practice and agree that any offender should be dealt with according to the law. They are prevented in their own Bill from practicing dentistry. These men are mechanics and craftsmen, not professional men, and they are doing work that is ordinarily considered menial by dentists.

In the matter of technicians wishing to deal directly with the public -- the matter of technicians wishing to deal directly with the public has arisen largely since the war, and there are three reasons for this. Firstly, that the technicians were unable to make a living on what they were paid by the dentists for their work; secondly,

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is it right for members to sit in the house with their heads covered?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but not to talk.

MR. ROBLIN: Does my honourable friend want to keep that hat on permanently?

MR. PAULLEY: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this honourable member intends to put it on at 11 o'clock on each evening when the Honourable the First Minister insists that we go beyond due propriety in this House.

MR. GROVES: The matter of technicians, Mr. Speaker, wishing to deal directly with the public has arisen largely since the war. I gave you the first reason, that was that these technicians were unable to make a living on what they were paid by dentists for the work which they did; secondly, public reaction against the high price of dentures and the length of time that they were required to wait for service; and thirdly, dentists in the army had allowed these men to work in the mouth.

Reference will probably be made during the course of this debate to this article which appeared in The Winnipeg Tribune last summer. This article deals with infractions of the law.

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) ... or going beyond the practice of a technician in connection with their work. The headline is "Dental Mechanics played by Lawyer for Dentists", and the article goes on to say, "The Manitoba Dental Association lashed out in court Tuesday at dental mechanics who undertake work which is beyond their competence", and mentioned two cases where injury and extra expense were alleged. The first case, and I'm not quoting now, Mr. Speaker, was that of a young woman who apparently went to a dental technician, had teeth extracted, and a plate made. And now to quote, "as a result of the extraction the gums bled to such an extent that the young woman got in touch with a qualified dentist who, through appropriate treatment, was able to stop the bleeding". The article then goes on to cite another case of a man who, and I quote -- Mr. Moffat, the crown prosecutor in this case said, "the dentures supplied were ill-fitting and the young man had to go to a qualified dentist to obtain proper dentures and treatment for his mouth and jaw. Fourteen teeth were extracted resulting in 14 large wounds approximately an inch deep without making proper provision for post-operative care". The reason I refer to this article, Mr. Speaker, is because the man referred to in this article, and I am sure all of us know who he is, is not a member of the association represented in this Bill, 'nor is he going to be. They don't want anything to do with this particular individual or the few like him. They do not wish that type of operator to be associated with them in their craft.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Does the honourable member call that a closed shop?

MR. GROVES: Well, we'll come to that later on. -- (Interjection) -- Just like the Law Society -- correct. My personal feelings in this matter, Mr. Speaker, can be summed up in the following excerpt from the acknowledgements that I have sent out to letters which I have received on this subject: "On the basis of the information that has come to us to date, I am going to support this legislation provided there are a number of safeguards established to protect the public. I would wish some assurance that as soon as this practice becomes legal the price would not be immediately increased so that the public would end up paying exactly the same as they do now to the dentist. The government must be satisfied, before licensing any of these technicians, that they are all qualified by education, training and experience, to do a job for the public and that they conduct their business in clean, healthful and sanitary conditions. I would wish to see steps taken now to implement a training school, a period of apprenticeship for each new candidate for this trade, from which he must graduate prior to being given a license to practice. Sufficient controls must be set up in the legislation to prevent these people from doing extractions, surgical work or treatment of diseases of the mouth".

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that these conditions that I laid down myself have been satisfied within the Bill itself. Now what does the Paynter report say about this subject? On page 29, the last paragraph. "This writer wishes to make it clear that he does not agree with the principle of licensing a service unless its training program and the performance of its work is under professional supervision and control. But once again the point to be learned from the present situation is that people could be trained in a reasonably short time to make prosthetic appliances for the public and to make them well. It is obvious that in spite of mistakes which may be made, sufficient of the Manitoba public are satisfied with the services they are getting from the so-called illicit practitioners, otherwise they could not remain in business or increase in number and prestige. Certainly the public would only benefit if regulations were adopted insisting that such practitioners be required to receive a minimum training prior to licensing and that they be required to work in close relation and under the supervision of qualified dentists." The only objection that the technicians have to the Paynter report and I emphasize, the only objection, is to the last six words which I read -- under the supervision of qualified dentists. Knowing the setup as it is now and how it developed over the years, I don't think that we can blame them but I do think and they agree that their craft should be closely supervised by the Department of Health and Welfare. Now dealing with the Act itself, I'm sure that all of you have read the Act and that you have noticed that it is in many respects entirely different from the Bill that has been presented by these people on previous occasions. First of all, in the preamble -- "and promoting the oral health of the public in co-operation with the Manitoba Dental Association and generally for the carrying out of the objects of

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) ... the Association." I would wish members, Mr. Speaker, to note that this organization seeks the co-operation of the dental profession. Section 2, subsection (d)

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I understood that a member was not allowed to read sections when he was giving second reading of a Bill. He deals with the general principles.

MR. SPEAKER: Just the principle of the Bill.

MR. GROVES: I beg your pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: You're only allowed to debate the principle of the Bill.

MR. GROVES: This particular aspect of the Bill then you will have to note deals only with the making of complete upper and complete lower dentures. The making of bridges, partial dentures and other such work is left entirely to the dentists. The Association, also amongst its aims and objects, seeks to encourage and extend the science of dental prosthesis in co-operation with the Manitoba Dental Association. Again they are seeking the co-operation of the Dental Association in making this work for the benefit of the public. It is also proposed in the Bill that courses of instruction be set up and it is the hope of this Association that these courses can be held in the Manitoba Dental College. It is also provided that all by-laws of the Association be subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. This I think is very important because the Department of Health has a very large part to play in making this Bill work. They can see to it that the abuses that many have feared are not permitted. Perhaps the most important part of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, are the prohibitions and I think that these bear special comment. You'll note in reading this Bill that no dental technician will be allowed to own or operate x-ray equipment; no dental technician will be allowed to own or operate ..

MR. HILLHOUSE: On a point of order Mr. Speaker, he's reading sections.

MR. GROVES: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'm not ..

MR. SPEAKER: There appears to be several principles so ..

MR. GROVES: I have a written sheet of notes that I'm referring to.

MR. HILLHOUSE: That's right in your Bill.

MR. GROVES: Not those words.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member stay as close to the principles as is possible to do so. I admit there's possibly more than one principle in the Bill.

MR. GROVES: Well the Bill provides, as I say, that no technician is allowed to own or operate x-ray equipment; no technician is allowed to own or operate tools or equipment ordinarily owned or used by a dentist for the extraction of teeth; nor is any technician allowed to treat any disease of the mouth. Every technician is required to keep his premises in a clean and sanitary condition to standards set by the Department of Health and Welfare. No license shall be issued by the Association until they have received from the Department of Welfare a certificate to the effect that the premises to be used for this purpose have complied with these standards. And the Minister of Health shall have the power to cancel the license of any person contravening these sections.

We have heard, Mr. Speaker, that these technicians are amongst other things, a bunch of outlaws; a bunch of fly by nights; unqualified persons; truck drivers; etc., making false teeth at their homes at night. I have made a survey of the persons whose names appear at the beginning of this Bill and have prepared the following analysis of my findings. There are 26 people included in this survey, of which 24 are married and two are single. They represent 729 years of residence in the Province, an average of 29 years per person; and the low, in calculating this average, is five years and the high is 47 years. -- (Interjection) -- I'm not through. I thought you were calling me to order.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, you're getting quite a long way away from principle. A man being married or single has not very much to do with dentistry.

MR. GROVES: Well those are still principles, Mr. Speaker. So they represent 729 years' residence in Manitoba, an average of 29 per technician, so that these aren't people that are coming into the province to practice at the expense of people that are already resident. They represent 461 years of experience in their craft; an average of 22 years per technician, with a low of five years and a high of 30 years. They represent a total of 239 years of experience working for dentists; an average of 12 years' experience working for dentists per member, with a low here of two years and a high of 30. Ten of these men had their basic training in this craft in the Army; 24 of them are at the present time making dentures as a full-time occupation. This survey

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) ... represents 221 years of practicing for the public; an average of 8 1/2 per technician, with a high of 20 and a low of three.

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this Bill that we mustn't forget the feelings of the public in this regard, and I would like to inform the members that in addition to personal letters that I have received urging support of this Bill, that I have received a number of resolutions from well known organizations. I would like to read those -- not the resolutions but the names of the organizations from whom they were received -- the Winnipeg and District Trades and Labour Council; the West End Memorial Pioneers Club; the Senior Citizens of West Kildonan; the Greater Winnipeg Transit Retired Employee's Association; Sub-district Council 104 of the United Packinghouse Workers of America; the Canadian National Railways Veteran's Association; the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Transport and General Workers; Manitoba District Council; and the Manitoba Farmers Union. As I said, I don't think that we can ignore the sentiments of the public on this matter and I would like to read some of the comments that are contained in the many letters which I have received from my constituents on this subject, and I think that these comments pretty well sum up the case on this matter as far as the general public is concerned. And I might say that I have received resolutions from no organization opposing the passage of this Bill nor have I received representation from any individual urging me not to support this Bill. Now here is some of the comments in some of these letters that I have received. "Giving the dentist all credit due him at drilling and extracting teeth, I believe he is fully qualified, but when it comes to making up dentures I believe that to be an art of its own and should be left entirely to a dental technician.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Is this still dealing with the principle Mr. Speaker.

MR. GROVES: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: I would inform the honourable member that there is some jurisdiction in the question of letters that are read in the House, and while they are supporting the Bill, they are not the member's own views on the subject and it might be well if you didn't read them. It doesn't add too much to his case I wouldn't think.

MR. GROVES: Manitoba has two types of technicians. On the one hand are the handful of laboratories which employ dental technicians to make dentures for dentists. The finished work is returned to the dentist and he in turn delivers it to his patient and assesses the fee. On the other hand are the technicians represented in this Bill who do the work directly for the public, presently contrary to the Dental Association Act, by taking impressions and performing the same work as that done by the laboratories and delivering the dentures at prices considerably below those charged by the dentists. Under this system the entire procedure is conducted under the care and supervision of one person and he is thus able to give specialized service to the public. It has been said that we are living in an age of specialization -- dental prosthesis has seen the emergence of the skilled dental technician. The public is aware of the satisfactory service rendered by these technicians and has had both sufficient time and quality to judge the merits of the matter. The verdict, I think, is very much in favour of continuing this service. The statement has been made on several occasions that the licensing of these technicians will reduce the income of the dentist and make the profession less attractive to newcomers. This is hardly a valid argument because the passing of legislation would merely regulate and validate a practice that is already in existence. The public has not been penalized to date for availing themselves of this service.

Much has been said in the matter of cancer of the oral cavities resulting from ill-fitting dentures, and I wish to point out that according to a written report received from the Manitoba Cancer Relief and Research Institute and the Division of Oral Pathology of the University of Minnesota, both dated in February of 1955 and both of which were presented to the Chairman of the Law Amendments Committee of this Legislature at that time, state that the incidence of mouth cancer is very low and that the cause of such cancer has not as yet been ascertained, and that ill-fitting dentures do not necessarily cause cancer since there have been cases of people having gum cancer who have never worn dentures, ill-fitting or otherwise. Furthermore, there have been many cases of persons obtaining ill-fitting dentures from the dentists, many of whom were later satisfactorily serviced by a technician. It is also a fact of vital significance that the demand for this service has come to a great extent from people in the lower groups, largely from rural areas that have either poor dental service or where dental service

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) ... is non-existent. It is respectfully submitted that if a substantial portion of the public desire this service from the technician, then failing definite proof that such service is detrimental to public health and welfare, such service ought to be legally available to the public. And surely if the public is satisfied with this service, this is one of the most important, if not the most important consideration. I will be pleased, Mr. Speaker, when closing the debate on this Bill to answer any questions that I can. I appeal to the House to send this Bill to committee where the Association and others interested in the provisions of this Bill may make their representations.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): In view of the late hour I'll move, seconded by the Minister of Education, that this debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, we now come to the order of government business which is -- however, in view of the time of the evening I think probably the House would be agreeable if we adjourned at this moment, so I will move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Man.
ASSINIBOIA	Geo. Wm. Johnson	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Robert Gordon Smellie	Russell, Man.
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	Beausejour, Man.
BURROWS	J. M. Hawryluk	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
CARILLON	Edmond Prefontaine	St. Pierre, Man.
CHURCHILL	J. E. Ingebrigtsen	Churchill, Man.
CYPRESS	Mrs. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 5
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q.C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Peter Wagner	Fisher Branch, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
KILDONAN	A. J. Reid	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 5
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Box 2, Group 517, R.R. 5
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 9
LA VERENDRYE	Stan Roberts	Niverville, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Walter Weir	Minnedosa, Man.
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Obie Baizley	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
PEMBINA	Hon. Maurice E. Ridley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	John Aaron Christianson	15 Dufferin W. Pgte la Prairie, Man.
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona; Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	W. B. Scarth, Q.C.	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Holmfield, Man.
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
ST. JOHN'S	David Orlikow	206 Ethelbert St., Winnipeg 10
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Wpg. 8.
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q.C.	Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	Lot 87 River Road, Lockport, Man.
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	A. H. Corbett	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	E. I. Dow	Boissevain, Man.
VIRDEN	Hon. John Thompson, Q.C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan	512A, Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1