

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, March 6, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable members please be seated.

Presenting Petitions

The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Simonne Boulet and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Brandon University Students' Union.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, could I also have the indulgence to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: . . . proposed Motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to develop the case with regard to dilatory practices by the government, so far as committees are concerned, with anything like the amount of time that some of the other members have devoted to it. I'm sure that the subject justifies a good bit of time. I would simply say in passing that maybe it would be a good plan for us in the House or the government to adopt that if they really do not intend these committees to do any work, then let's not appoint them. And I must say that not all of them have failed completely to do their work. One of them, I think, acted with expedition and was a very useful committee - the one on statute revision. It's true, we didn't have too much to do and the preparation that had been made by officers of the department and the House had left us very little except to discharge the responsibilities that belonged to the Chamber, to some degree, to pay some attention to the revision of statutes. But with some of these other committees I agree with the remarks that have been made. There certainly has not been the time taken that the importance of the subject warranted.

Now with regard to the one that is before us at the moment, Mr. Speaker, the matters addressed to the committee were personal property security, consumer protection, compensation for victims of crime, expropriation, and ombudsman. There may have been one or two more but those are the ones that come to my mind. I do not intend to devote any time at all to the first three of those but I do intend to make some brief remarks - and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, they will be brief - because there'll be a further opportunity to discuss these matters when they come before us, if indeed they do come before us, later on in this session; so my remarks can be brief at this time.

You'd expect me, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, to say something at least about the program, so far as the government is concerned, for an ombudsman, and along with other members of this group, and indeed this side of the House in general, we have been hoping that the government would institute a program of providing this province with such an officer. As one who pays a lot of attention to the logical and eloquent arguments that my honourable friend, the Attorney-General uses in the House, I can't help but be impressed with the change of position that he has shown because it is but a short time ago that he was explaining to us how completely unnecessary such an officer was in the Province of Manitoba, and it appears that now, although he will not be, I gather, the sponsor of the Bill itself, yet it fell to his committee, the one which he chaired, to be the one where the proposals were finally laid before the members of the House.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to deal with them at any length at this present time, but I would like to comment on a couple of the proposals that are made, and I would like to comment on a proposal that has been made by a source other than the government and is not contained in the proposals - that is, if it's contained, it is only by implication, in the proposals that were laid before the committee. I mention first and foremost an editorial that appeared in

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) the Winnipeg Free Press just a few days ago - I think it was on March 1st. That editorial dealt with the question of an Ombudsman for Manitoba. It's quite a lengthy one, I do not intend to read it, but I do wish to read one particular part well towards the end of the editorial. Here is the paragraph from the Free Press of that date: "The final point in setting up the office of a provincial ombudsman is the personality of the man who will occupy this post and thus lay the foundation of a future tradition." On this point, the Free Press said, on December 12, 1966: "The person so appointed should be a lawyer of repute, respected by the profession and the civil service and well versed in administrative rules. He should be a person of judicial capacity, but not encumbered by a bureaucratic mind that believes that the government is always right." There's quite a bit to the editorial preceding that quotation and some follows it but that's the point I wanted to comment on.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it to be necessary that this official be a lawyer. I think it is completely unnecessary. I am not -- (Interjection) -- No, I do not agree with the interjection of my honourable friend from St. Boniface. I don't think we should say that it should not be either, but I do not think - and I must be fair to the government and say that the proposals that have been laid before us do not place that restriction upon the appointment. But I think it would be a misconception, Mr. Speaker, if we took the position from the beginning that this important office should be filled by a person from any particular line of endeavour. I know, I know that there are many lawyers who could fill such a capacity with dignity -- yes, I'll even give the names of some of them. My colleague who finds it necessary to be absent this afternoon, my desk mate, would be admirably qualified; not because he's a lawyer, but because the kind of a man he is. But the provisions already laid down by the government of the Province of Manitoba would restrict my honourable friend (of course they'd restrict me too) but they would restrict my honourable friend, and I'll argue his case rather than my own, because it is assumed in the proposal that the government has laid before us, it's just taken as an assumption that anybody beyond 65 years of age does not possess these qualifications that are mentioned, I see that one of the government members on the other side nods his head and appears to agree that anybody beyond 65 years of age is not possessed of many qualifications, if I interpret correctly. -- (Interjection) -- I can return the compliment to my honourable friend and say that on a front bench that is certainly not distinguished in that regard, that my honourable friend stands out.

But, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, I can say that there are many who belong to the legal profession who would fill the position admirably but I think it is completely unnecessary that that should be made a qualification.

Now the various suggestions that have been laid down by the government are contained in Hansard, they are in the Hansard of day before yesterday and all members can peruse them at their leisure; I do not intend to take the time of the House to go into them in detail, but I would say that it seems to me that the points number 7, 8, 9 and 10 all need to be pretty carefully considered. Personally I would reserve my position on some or all of them as I did in the committee itself and all of us will have an opportunity to debate this question at greater length if and when the legislation comes forward. Meantime, I compliment the government on what appears to be a decision, though no firm statement I think has been made on it yet, but appears to be a decision to proceed with this legislation.

The temptation is even greater for me, Mr. Speaker, to dwell at length on the question of expropriation; but there again I shall resist that temptation, knowing full well that we will have the opportunity to debate it at a more appropriate time than on the motion to receive the committee report. So I shall content myself with very few remarks and begin by complimenting the government on the fact that I feel that the proposals that are now made are considerably better, a great improvement on the draft Act that was previously and originally referred to the committee. I think they are an improvement. I think that we can, as time goes on, suggest still further improvements, some of which I shall mention briefly at this time.

I think one of the things that we can agree with completely is that it is time that the Act was revised and consolidated. The present Act has been in force for a long time; it has had many amendments of substance, the amendments are spread over all of the intervening statutes since the last revision and it's certainly time that it was consolidated and a revision would be advisable in any case. I trust that we can complete the work this year so that the revised and consolidated Act can appear in the Revised Statutes.

One of the provisions that is being made is the one that my honourable friend the Minister

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) of Industry and Commerce and I have already been discussing in the House, because provision is being made, according to the draft regulations, or draft principles that have been submitted to this committee, provision is being made for the owner to re-purchase. I agree completely with that. Honourable members may remember that I have advocated it in the past. I would go a little further than either this Act or the Ontario Act does and give the former owner, provided the land had been expropriated, provided he had not wanted it taken from him, I would give him a preferred position, not only the first opportunity but a preferred position to buy. At one time I had taken the position that he should be allowed to buy at the price at which it was taken away from him, but I don't know, maybe that would be asking a little too much, but certainly I would place him in a preferred position.

Another thing, a new principle that is in this Act as differentiated from the draft Act that was submitted to the committee in the early stages is that compensation will be provided for to the owner where expropriation has been put into effect and later abandoned and I have also felt that that was a necessary provision as well.

Now the places where I think the present proposals are insufficient. One deals with interest, Mr. Speaker. I think that the interest figure that appeared in the draft Act is unrealistic, as it is in the present Act under existing conditions and I would prefer that the interest figure should not be left to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, as the proposal would envisage, but that it should be stated in the Act. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, I am a great believer in putting as many of the main features of any legislation into the Act as possible and not leaving them to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to provide by regulation. I know the arguments why it's not always possible to cover every detail in the Act but I think that conditions will not change sufficiently rapidly even in the fast moving money market that we have today that there'd be any hardship whatever in stating a realistic rate of interest in the Act. It seems to me that it should be related to what the government itself has to pay for money that it borrows or something of that kind.

One of the things that I would like to have seen in the Act, Mr. Speaker, that I do not observe among these principles is a pre-hearing before expropriation. I am aware that there are arguments, and ones that are validly used, against that provision but as I read the Ontario Act it incorporates a pre-hearing, and I think this is beneficial. I think it's useful. Why shouldn't we, Mr. Speaker, why shouldn't we when the state or other expropriating authority is moving in to take from a private individual, property that that individual wishes to keep, why shouldn't it be fair in the public interest that a pre-hearing should be held and the opportunity to be given to the expropriating authority to state its case and to the one or ones who object to that proposal going ahead, to propose alternative measures or to raise objections to the particular proposal itself and the implications that it has regarding certain problems. I think this is sound.

Mr. Speaker, it probably will astonish the members of this House who have not been keeping closely in touch with this expropriation procedure to realize the way expropriations in general have grown as the economy has progressed in the way it has, as more and more land is required for roads and for water courses and for parks and for other recreation spots, and for, of course, in the urban areas, for streets and lanes, building sites, parking lots and so on, to the extent that the civil liberties of the population are being prejudiced, in my opinion, by the number, the multiplicity of authorities that can move in and take a person's property without even his knowledge, sometimes: Chief Justice or former Chief Justice McRuer who made an exhaustive study of this question reported that in the Province of Ontario there are more than 8,000 expropriating authorities, more than 8,000, Mr. Speaker, with the lack of uniformity that a situation of that kind is almost bound to incur, I must say that this is one of the other things where I give credit to the government for the proposals of this Act, is that at least this will establish a uniform procedure. I think that is good and I hope that by discussion in this House that we can not only establish a uniform procedure but that we can have that uniform procedure just as nearly perfect as possible so that we try to place the individual in as good a position as the expropriating authority. Former Chief Justice McRuer's study indicates that in the province of Quebec the number of Acts of the Legislature that allow expropriation are more than 300 and he uses the term of the number of authorities that can expropriate, he uses the term "innumerable". Well now 8,000 seem to me to be a tremendous number in the province of Ontario, but in Quebec apparently it is innumerable, I would hope that we here can look at this expropriation act when it comes before us with the end in view of recognizing how

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) widespread it has already become in the Province of Manitoba, how much more there is going to be of it in the future, and try and get uniform and fair programs so that the owner, who at the present time, Mr. Speaker, has no immunity at all in the eyes of the expropriating authority, give him the protection that I think he is so definitely entitled to.

And then Mr. Speaker, having referred to this Act that the Honourable the Attorney-General with that great mind of his, has found it necessary to change his thinking in one regard then I have to make the embarrassing admission, Mr. Speaker, that on a particular matter, I have altered my mind. Well now, my honourable friend the Attorney-General recognizes that that wasn't nearly as great a strain as in his case, but I have come to a different conclusion to what I had held before in regard to an important matter, and just at the time that I came to the conclusion that the government was right in an important provision in their draft Act, then they came to the conclusion that they were going to change that to what I had been advocating.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me be the first to assure you that they did not change it because I was advocating it. That's right. I know that that is true, because I had argued at length, and I use the term advisedly, I had argued at length in this House vociferously that the draft Act that had been proposed by the now Minister of Transportation, when he was Attorney-General, left a great deal to be desired and I had recommended many changes in that Act, and yet, it came back before the House the year later, and not one jot or tittle had been changed in that Act, not one, in spite of the urgent and fervent plea that I had made for changes, which have now been made, Mr. Speaker, so I can't take any credit for the change at all. But I am concerned over the fact that just at the time that having studied the McRuer Report, having studied the report of the Ontario Bar Committee, or whatever particular group it was that made the study in Ontario, having studied the debates in the House of Commons which are quite current, I had arrived at the conclusion that I was wrong the time before and I had decided that the government was right in providing for a special tribunal to hear these expropriation cases rather than taking them to the courts. And I find that Ontario is following that practice in their new Act. I find that the thinking of the federal members who have spoken on this question representing both of the major parties in the House of Commons, seem to favour that proposal; and yet I find that the government has departed from it.

Now I would be the last to council a program that was going to be overly costly to the Province of Manitoba and I am aware, although I have not re-read my remarks of that time, but I'm aware that I used the argument that with the many judges that we had in the three spheres of judicial action here in Manitoba, that surely we had enough people on the public payroll to do this job, and I recognize the validity of an argument of that kind; but I have had to think of the other side of the cost and I am concerned now particularly with the cost to the individual of court action. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that keeps people from protecting their rights in this question of expropriation is the great cost of court action, and regardless of the fact that we are already paying many judges whose services should be available, I think it would be well worthwhile to have this other tribunal who would tend to become sort of specialists in this kind of work, who would have, I think, a more uniform procedure, and who would be able to do it, to conduct the investigations under less formal circumstances and uninhibited by the rules that the Court appear to prefer to conduct their hearings or arbitrations under and that in the result that the taxpayer will pay some extra money for this other special tribunal would in fact save a lot of money by not having to go through the court processes and would, in my opinion, perhaps get better consideration than he has been getting up to date.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish that the principles that have been enunciated in the program laid before the committee adopted the proposal that most of the people whom I have recently read on this subject agree with, and that is that the legal and appraisal expenses of owners who wish to arbitrate or take other court action should be paid up to a reasonable amount. I agree with that. I think we should try to persuade the government to incorporate that provision in their Act, and I know that it is at least mentioned in the program. And then I think that another thing that is covered in the Ontario Act that should be considered is that all appraisal reports and other information in the possession of the expropriating authority should be made available to the owner, so that he has the information that has been gathered at public expense, available to him also in presenting his case for a fair settlement. That has not been done. It has not been the practice in the past and I think it should be incorporated.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize for speaking at such great length at this time when it's simply

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) on the question of the reception of the report but I did wish to put my position on these two matters briefly before the House. I recognize that my honourable friend the Attorney-General in presenting the report makes the report to say that the recommendations were not unanimous, he gives us some leeway on that, and I wanted to make some of my reservations public in this way.

The Honourable the Member for St. John's has already pointed out that on the second day of our most recent sitting that we worked rather late in the day. We had no insurmountable difficulties in writing this report but we did have some slight differences of opinion. I think it represents a certain amount of compromise, Mr. Speaker, and I am not holding that against it. But I have reservations. I am sorry to have to tell you that I'll likely be speaking at still greater length when the legislation itself comes forward; but I make no apology for that because I consider this to be one of the most important matters that's facing the Province of Manitoba today.

When it came recently before the House of Commons, the Honourable the Minister of Justice said in October of 1968 that he expected to have a new Act before the House of Commons before Christmas. I have been trying to keep in touch with the situation down there; so far as the Library is aware here, it has not yet been introduced. I notice that the Honourable Member for Red Deer who is now a member of the Official Opposition in Ottawa, made the remark that the various ministers of Justice had been promising for seven years that he knew of, to bring a revised Expropriation before the House and it had not appeared yet. But in the discussion that took place last October in the House of Commons, the private member who moved a resolution regarding the setting up of a committee on expropriation, the Honourable Member for Red Deer who supported him, the Honourable Member for Calgary North I think it is, Eldon Williams, and others who spoke including the Minister of Justice, all said that the Expropriation Act of Canada was antiquated, that it was unfair, that it was out-dated and they laid down some principles that should be incorporated. And that is the situation here, too, Mr. Speaker, so that I can at least say with complete sincerity that I welcome the fact that the government has provided here some suggested principles that I believe to be a great improvement over the draft act originally introduced, but that I think we still have some amending to do in the House in order to make this as nearly perfect an expropriation act as we can get it. I do suggest to all honourable members that this is a question that is going to be of greater importance as time goes on so we should address ourselves seriously to it.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I would beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of motion.

Introduction of bills

I would like to, before we go on to the Orders of the Day say to the House that we had several schools represented with students. There are one or two left and I would like to run through the names of the schools and certainly welcome those that are left on behalf of the members. We did have or still have 23 students of Grade XI standing from the Rosenort Collegiate. These students were or are under the direction of Mr. Bjarnason. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris. We also had or have 10 students of Grade IX standing, from the Charleswood Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Bailey. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Attorney-General. We also had or have 40 students of Grade V standing from the Ruth Hooker school. These students are under the direction of Miss Macklin and Miss Girardin. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Selkirk. There are 14 students of Grade X standing from the Dryden High School. These students are under the direction of Miss Neilson and Mrs. Kenny. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome those of you that are left here today.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. One of the daily newspapers today has a fairly complete report on the TED Commission. This report has not been tabled in this House as yet. Can the Minister explain why it has been given outside of this House?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the newspaper but I know that it contains some material from confidential working papers of the TED Commission. I am advised by the Chairman that no papers have been made public; that the report is in the process of being completed. It is not completed. I regret very much that a speculative story based on working papers and not the final report has been published. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is a purely speculative report. The working papers were available to members of the Advisory Committee and of course the consultants who were involved.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question. This is definitely then purely on working papers and not on a portion of the report. Is that definite?

MR. SPIVAK: May I just repeat, Mr. Speaker. This is my understanding. I have not read the material but I have been advised by the Chairman that they relate to material from confidential working papers but they are not the report.

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

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): . . . in view of the answer of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. He makes reference to confidential papers. May I ask my honourable friend whether or not the confidentiality of the report and these papers have been breached; if so, by whom, and whether or not it is the intention of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce to cause a complete investigation into the breach of confidentiality in respect of the commission?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I've already spoken with the Chairman and I advised him that I would ask that an investigation be made. I may point out that there are some 400 members of various advisory - 400 private citizens, members of the advisory committees of the TED commission who have been working at some length on various aspects. They have been working with consultants, various material has been prepared for them. This is the nature of the confidential material. The report will be drawn from their conclusions together with the members of the TED Committee.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted one more then. Will the House be informed as to those who are guilty of a breach of confidentiality, and I again ask my honourable friend what disciplinary measure will be taken if deemed advisable in the light of the revelation on those who breached confidentiality?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, as I suggested, the investigation will be made and I will make a report to the House upon its completion.

MR. MOLGAT: Is the Minister in a position to inform the House when the House will get the report.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated the report; I have been assured by the Chairman it is now in the process of being written. It will be tabled in the House as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. Since he has probably now had time to study the report about the doctors in Thompson opting out, I wonder whether the Minister has any comments about this threat to the people of Thompson that they're going to be put on a C. O. D. basis and possibly denied medical services?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I have read the same story. I don't know if this in fact will be the case. I have no way of knowing at this stage. I would simply say that, and I'm not trying to defend the profession, the Act is before you - a doctor can opt out. The particular references in the story I'm not prepared to comment on at this time except to say that the doctor concerned is a very competent well-known medical doctor who's spent his whole life in the north country and other than that at this time without further information I'm not prepared to say anything further.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If it is true that patients are going to be expected to pay on the spot bills of \$10.00 or less would the Minister investigate. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I question the advisability of that question in view of what the Minister said a moment ago, that he wasn't prepared to give an opinion at this particular time - a further opinion. I wonder if - I question the advisability of putting that question at this particular time.

MR. DOERN: . . . on that point. If it is true -- (Interjection) -- will the Minister

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) investigate this situation?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Public Services.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Government Services)(Cypress): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to table the Manitoba Civil Service Superannuation Fund 29th Annual Report for the year ended December 31, 1967.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Health and Welfare. Regarding the same point, I wanted to ask him, even though the doctors opt out of the Medicare Plan, can they still bill the Medical Services for services to a patient providing they don't charge more than 85 per cent of the fee? -- (Interjection) -- No, they can bill directly to the Medicare Services, can they not, even if they're out of the plan?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the Act as passed in this Legislature by my honourable friend, a physician may elect to opt out or may elect to receive all his benefits from the corporation directly or he may elect to deal with his patient, in which case, as the brochure says, the corporation pays the money directly to the patient who settles with her physician, or his physician.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: A question to the same Honourable Minister. Is it the intention of the government to undertake any programs for the provision of either public clinics or the recruiting of doctors to areas where doctors opt out?

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the feelings of the House in this particular connection but I did hear the Minister say yesterday as I am sure the honourable members did, that he intended to give a full statement shortly on this particular subject of Medicare.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to you, and while I appreciate, too, as Leader of this Party the undertaking of the Honourable Minister, people within this province are worried about the implications of Medicare. We have had from the government from time to time assurances that some process will take place soon, eventually and in due course, and I suggest that the questions - in all due respect to you my honourable friend - that the questions being raised are pertinent, timely, and require answers not only from the Honourable Minister of Health, Welfare, Social Services and Corrections, et al, - and Housing - but the government as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must assure the House with the best of intentions that I have no reason whatsoever to ask honourable members to refrain from discussing this subject, but I am really basing my opinion on the Minister's replies which to this point is fair enough. So I leave it now in the hands of the House.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe with the greatest of respect that the question

....

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster may continue.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the question was unrelated to the other questions and I'll repeat it. Is the Minister making any plan for either the provision of public clinics or the recruitment of doctors to areas where all the doctors concerned have opted out of the Medicare Plan?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, that's a speculative question. We'll have to wait and see what happens. In the meantime you have an incentive program to doctors to settle in rural Manitoba. We have had it for some time. We have a very highly subsidized program in The Pas and Churchill, in the north; we have a loan program to assist doctors to settle in rural Manitoba; we have a very articulate profession in medicine in this province - probably enjoy a level of care equal to any province in our Dominion and other jurisdictions - and in fairness you are suggesting, are we going to go to further public clinics. We have to wait and see what the situation is with respect to "opt in", "opt out". We're negotiating with the profession. The National Minister of Health and Welfare has been working with our university people and with our department in making arrangements for certain treatment services in the north to give more stability to it, which I'd be happy to try and outline a little more fully as the debates proceed. But we are concerned this year. The Public Health Services will be extended to pretty well all parts of the province and you will be hearing more about the integration of lab and X-ray services throughout our province incorporated into this new program and as soon as

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.): I get a chance to make an over-all statement and table some material here, I'll be happy to go on further.

I am the first to recognize that there are questions in the minds of, if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, of all the honourable members. They have been most fair, all of you, and the people of Manitoba. This is a mammoth program. I don't think anyone anticipates until you get into the administrative detail of it just how many thousands of little questions come up. I know you have them, but basically we are working desperately toward the wrapping up of the insured benefits, but generally speaking, what has come out to date in the press is quite accurate, it is the HCX type of program, you know what the premiums are, you know it's compulsory and universally available across the province, everyone will be getting joint hospital-medical cards issued about the middle of the month, the billings will be going out this month. At this particular point some rather intricate negotiations are still showing up with respect to working with the medical profession and certain aspects of the Insured Services Program which I hope will benefit all Manitobans. We're getting excellent co-operation at this point the corporation report to me. Now we're going to hear a lot of on the "opt in", "opt out" matter, but basically I think maybe we can end up with a good scheme. We're dedicated to making this plan work, give it all the grease we can.

As a matter of fact, while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pass out if I may to each Party in the House, and I'll give the Member for Rhineland - I'll consider him a Party on this occasion - give him, to each group, a list of all the -- these are copies of all the letters that have gone out to municipalities, the letters that have gone out to the -- some letters have gone out to the medical profession, and letters to municipal agents and so on. I'd like each of you to have one of these. These are public documents which have gone out and will just give you some indication of some of the material that has gone forward. There are four copies here. You can have those, and I'll be making a statement. I was hoping to make it on the Speech from the Throne, but if honourable friends feel it should proceed that I'm prepared to make a contribution now.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on this very important subject, I'd like to direct another question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare without the other adjectives at this particular time. Is he aware of the fact that there are the same fears and apprehension of the opting out of doctors in the City of Brandon as prevails in Thompson?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I almost feel like saying to the Leader of the NDP: "Put thy hand in mine, I will lead you through these difficulties". However

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that I suggest to my honourable friend, if he'd come along hand in hand with me he wouldn't have the problems that he's created for himself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the following reports: A copy of an nil return under the Trade Practices Inquiry Act for the calendar year 1968. There are eight copies of these with the Clerk of the House. A report of the Comptroller-General and a statement of assets and liabilities, profit and loss accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968 re the Liquor Control Commission. A report covering the operation and enforcement of liquor laws in Manitoba for the calendar year 1968. Embodied in this report on Page 20 is the statement of general administrative and prosecution expenses for the fiscal year ending March 31, '68. 56 copies of this report are in the hands of the Clerk for distribution to members of the House. I would also like to lay on the table of the House the 45th Annual Report of the Liquor Control Commission of Manitoba for the fiscal year April 1, '67 to March 31, '68. Copies of this report have already been distributed to members of the House by mail.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. In view of a certain concern and confusion on the part of the public, does the government intend to follow a suggestion made by the Leader of the New Democratic Party and publish a list of those doctors who are going to operate within the plan or outside of the plan -- when it is known?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I take that question as advisement. We won't know possibly until April 1st.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.): . . . In view of the possibilities of flooding in the Red River Valley this year, are there any special steps being taken to get the movement of grain, out of that area in particular, proceeded with more quickly?

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture)(Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable member's question, I might give the House just some indication of a meeting that was held this morning in my office where we had representation from the Canadian Wheat Board, from the Board of Grain Commissioners, from the Manitoba Pool Elevators, United Grain Growers, Patterson, Federal, Pioneer Grain, from the CP and CN Railways, from the Water Control Branch and from Agriculture, and out of that meeting the decision was made that we first must assess the Red River Valley, that is, the particular area that was directly affected by the 1966 flood. Indications are from the flood control people that the problem could be somewhere along the parallel of the 1966 flood. Mr. Frank Muirhead from our department and the Director of Extensions Services was appointed as the key man. A representative from all these people represented in the meeting this morning were established as key persons within their particular areas and directions were given to Mr. Muirhead to proceed to contact the municipalities, our own extension service, and to make a crash - if you want to put it that way - assessment as to what the problems might be in the Red River Valley in respect of stored grain. We couldn't set an exact date when this survey would be finished, but hopefully within two weeks'time we'll have an assessment of what the problems are insofar as stored grain is concerned.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. It has been brought to my attention that what appears to be a ridiculous problem exists in some areas in the Red River Valley, and that's the question of grain doors for cars, that the car loadings have been held up because of shortage of grain doors. Has that been brought to the attention of the Minister?

MR. WATT: No. Mr. Speaker, and there was considerable discussion this morning with the railway people and there was no mention of shortage of car doors at that time. I am not aware of it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister would check it because I've been assured that this is one of the problems delaying movement at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question. . . . Does the government intend to accept the recommendations of the Toronto consultant, Mr. Fullerton, that the Manitoba Development Fund seek cash on the private money market instead of being funded solely by public money?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, that matter is being considered.

MR. GUTTORMSON: A subsequent question. Does the government endorse the recommendations that the MDF should examine the possibilities of giving more aid to service industries since they provide increased employment?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the same reply.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I'd like to direct to the Attorney-General. Does the government plan to confirm the appointment of the present temporary chairman of the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission?

MR. LYON: An announcement in that regard will be made in due course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Is it the intention of the government to appoint a separate chairman of the Liquor Licensing Board instead of having two responsibilities - one for the Licensing Board and the Liquor Control Commission?

MR. LYON: If there is any change in policy in that regard, Mr. Speaker, it will be announced.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Finance -- I believe it would be him. Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation creating a full-fledged Auditor-General or does the reference in the Throne Speech indicate only that the auditing functions are to be removed from the Comptroller-General and placed under a separate person to be known as the Provincial Auditor?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge): . . . will be discussed in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, just for a moment I would like

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.): to ask a question, I'm not sure, to ask of the Provincial Secretary or possibly the Minister of Agriculture, concerning, in the event of a flood, I understand that if this flood should come after the first of April that the EMO is quite much involved in this matter and that after March 31st most of the funds will be cut off. Is some provision being made that the local EMO organization can still keep operating?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I might answer that question and assure my honourable friend that whatever emergent situation arises and the need for EMO action, funds will be available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it correct that the government has informed the rural Fairs that the grants will be reduced this year?

MR. WATT: No, this is not correct.

MR. GUTTORMSON: There is no change in the grant structure for Fairs this year, from last year?

MR. WATT: There could be a change in the grant structure.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Are you suggesting there are — Mr. Speaker, are they going up or are they going down or are they remaining the same? — (Interjections)—

Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by one Fair that they have been notified by the department that the grants will be reduced this year. Now, does the Minister say this is not correct?

MR. WATT: I said there could be a change in the grant structure.

MR. GUTTORMSON: You say they are not lower than last year?

MR. WATT: They will be coming up in my estimates and my honourable friend will . . .

MR. GUTTORMSON: Sorry, I didn't hear you.

MR. WATT: I said the grant structure will be coming up in my estimates.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Has he had an opportunity to get any information regarding the tendering methods of . . .

MR. JOHNSON: As soon as I've had a response or reply from the department I'll be in touch with the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture. While he did not reveal any specific programs for the Red River Valley farmers in the event of a flood, can the House rest assured that any policy that is developed for the Red River will apply to all flooded areas of the Province of Manitoba? —(Interjection) — I can't hear him. — (Interjection) — Yes, I have — if that was a question for me I'm thinking of the area around Gladstone which I am certain will be flooded.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Will he be tabling a report from the Minimum Wage Board this Session?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour)(Flin Flon): No, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK (St. John): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member, could this matter stand? I believe it will stand on the Order Paper in its present position?

MR. SPEAKER: On the next item, I, too, would ask the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand.

Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Member for Logan, THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. The number of suicides in the jail at The Pas since the 1st of January 1969.
2. The number of suicides in the jail at The Pas during the year 1968.
3. The number of suicides in all provincial jails of Manitoba since the 1st of January 1969.
4. The number of suicides in all provincial jails of Manitoba (and here I would make a

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.): slight change) during the year 1968 - to make it conform with number 2.

5. The number of suicides in all provincial jails of Manitoba during the ten year period dating from the 1st of January 1958, up to and including the first two months of 1969.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate (fifth day) of the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rock Lake and the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto; and the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I would like to - at the outset, congratulate you on your good health and continuing as such in this high office in this Assembly and also congratulate the duly appointed Minister of Agriculture since our last session. I wish you both well in your endeavours in this session.

In referring to the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, it makes reference to the establishment of a Provincial-Municipal finance structural committee, and I would like to refer back in the past ten years that during my term of office in this House we have had two committees who have made recommendations in regards to municipal and provincial finances, the one which was set up by the municipalities of Manitoba, called the Fisher Commission and then the other commission established by the government of the day, called the Michener Commission, both made many recommendations and most of these were concurred in by municipal people but the final results were negligible, and to me the establishment of another committee along the same line is somewhat - I would class it as window-dressing and more delays than some positive actions. I think the House is quite capable itself to set up these recommendations and agree and get some positive action in regards to municipalities.

Over the years it has been requested by municipalities through their organizations, through the government, to please define the responsibilities of municipalities, define the obligations that they were prepared to undertake, and so far we don't seem to be making much headway. Consultation by the government on measures of mutual interest with municipalities was on a basis that I think if it was continued to the ultimate degree, would make a better relationship to the workings of the provincial legislation and municipal legislation, and recent moves of this government of increasing property taxes has been announced by the government without any consultation. When the unitary divisions systems were established a mill rate was established, and before it had hardly been working a year or two, an increase in the mill rates for education purposes was announced by the government, and the one that has caused the most concern within the province, was the tremendous increase on commercial properties. On this type of tax, we have found that municipalities to try and justify the retention of businesses in the smaller places have withdrawn their business tax so that the heavy load has not been continued on the business property. And when you consider that this province has been trying - and I'll give them credit for the fact that publicity has been given to try and decentralize businesses in Manitoba, they've been using the slogan "to make Manitoba grow" - but really, Mr. Speaker, how can you expect this to happen in Manitoba from a commercial viewpoint when they're faced with this tremendous increase in school tax and no, no suggestion that it won't be continued on. The incentive for these small business commercial places to establish is gone.

Then the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare mentioned another little point here under the Orders of the Day was the collection of premiums by municipalities on Medicare. This could be another added burden of taxes to the property owner in Manitoba. It's true that there was a consultation of the municipalities brought in around about February 19th, in which the plan was developed. It's true on February 20th or 19th, a letter was written to all municipalities outlining a scheme of collections. But it does not go far enough, in my opinion, when you consider that under the Manitoba Hospital Commission scheme, all municipalities guaranteed all accounts but they got a three percent collection fee. Now in most cases this fee of revenue coming into the municipality took care of the delinquent accounts, but now all of a sudden they have doubled the amount - oh, it's more than doubled, from 84 to 204 - that the municipality must guarantee to the Manitoba Medical Insurance Corporation, but the return of revenue is only a matter of 27 cents per account, and if you add this up it becomes a long way short of three percent, and the concern was expressed by these municipal people that this could be another added tax that we are responsible for the delinquent accounts. But

(MR. DOW cont'd.): in doing this, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the procedure that is now being used, or will be used, I should say. In addition to municipalities collecting the premiums for this type of care, there's going to be an appointment of agents throughout the province, be they small stores, be they whatever, post offices, what have you, and at the end of three months, or six months, the Manitoba Medical Insurance Corporation will bill the municipalities for the delinquents.

Now in looking at the procedure before it was entirely controlled by the municipalities. They had knowledge of the properties that they could charge the bill to, and they developed and promoted most of their endeavour on trying to collect what would be the delinquent or the transient. Now they are not going to have this opportunity until such time, three, six months later.

I'm sure the Minister has had the letter from the President of the Manitoba Urban Association asking him -- maybe I had better approach this in another way. In the letter that the Honourable Minister produced today to the leaders - I have a copy of it - he says down the middle of page two of the letter: "An additional measure of significance to the municipalities in an arrangement under which the government is offering some financial assistance to them in respect to non-receivable premiums paid by municipalities on behalf of the residents" Now, this does not go far enough in my opinion. I agree with the President of the Manitoba Urban Association who states that he would like the Minister to guarantee to the municipalities of Manitoba that they will not have to levy on their tax roll to pay this amount of money. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that our taxes are high enough on real property now without accepting this kind of a procedure that -- well, even the municipalities at the present time just can't levy for it and they're going to be sitting maybe with nothing but maybe with quite a burden, and I would like the Minister if he would give the assurance to the municipalities that there will be no added taxes for the collection of these premiums. I agree that it is a good place to carry them along, that the municipalities are the best place to carry them, but I don't think we should burden the municipalities, cities, towns and villages with this figure of the premiums that are not paid by individuals. Surely it can be very well understood to any of us, even though you have had no municipal experience. As a matter of fact, in the monetary condition we are now in I predict it will be a very very heavy amount of money that will be unpaid on the premiums to municipalities and I would think this would be one thing the Minister could readily do and give the assurances to the municipalities along this line.

I am not going to mention at this time, Mr. Speaker, very much about what I consider the unfairness of assessment on account of the fact that I do have a resolution before the House which I will express my views on at that time; only to say this, that we do have an amendment to the Municipal Act, a new Act coming up, and I do think that we should change our system in regard to appeals on assessments. To some of us we know that some years ago when you finished with the Court of Revision of an assessment, you had the right to go then, if you were not satisfied, to the County Court and appeal your assessment. Some few years ago this was taken away and was given into the hand -- and it's almost an impossible position to get an appeal unless you have a stated case. This is disturbing to the taxpayer and I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that consideration be given that when the new bill comes in that the assessments, after they leave the Court of Revision, the taxpayer should be able to go to the County Court and the other courts of Manitoba to let his appeal be heard. I think this would be fair and I think it would give a better stability in your tax role and I think the taxpayer would be better satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, I did not notice in the Speech from the Throne much in revision of the administration of justice in our province and whether we have a peculiar situation in the southwest part of Manitoba in regard to the overall picture I am not prepared to say, but I do know that in the southwest portion of Manitoba the administration of justice has a lot to be desired to make it better. Some years ago the boundaries of the judicial districts in Manitoba were changed and the western judicial district which takes in the city of Brandon and north to the Duck Mountains was set up. The area south of Brandon is serviced with a part-time magistrate and is dependent upon the crown prosecutor from Brandon, and I would like to relate a few cases to illustrate my concern. And here again, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be construed that I'm criticizing the decisions of magistrates or the police officer or the attorney-general or the Department of Justice, but I would like to point out that the part-time magistrate in southwestern Manitoba holds court once a month, regardless of the number of cases that are

(MR. DOW cont'd.): on the docket and he sets up at only three places in all the southwest part of Manitoba where courts are held. Regardless of where the accused is resident of, they have to appear at one of these three places and as an example of the load, on February 5, 1969 there were 67 adult cases set up in the court at Killarney, in one day -- not guilty pleas heard in Killarney and not where alleged offenses have happened, and people from say Deloraine have to go to Killarney to be heard and the procedure on this particular day which I went down to observe, was as follows: The court was ordered to commence at 10:30 in the morning. Juvenile cases were heard first, all original pleas and guilty pleas held second, and contested cases heard last; 5 p. m. came along before they started this type of contested case. The lawyers the clients, the witnesses had to sit around all day and at no time did they know when their case would be called, no appointments were set up for any of the contested cases. This certainly is a bad situation when you stop to consider that on this particular day, all the police of the southwest area are concentrated in one town. This is not good, it's not necessary, but it's a fact. It sets up no police protection in any other place but the full force in the one community. I think this kind of administration of justice dispensed leaves a lot to be desired.

And might I state some cases, Mr. Speaker, without giving any names: There was a large theft of turkeys, last Hallowe'en-- (Interjection) -- that's a bad day I know, I guess you and I did that, too, but nevertheless this was a real large - it wasn't one turkey, there was a lot of them. The pleas were dealt with on February 5th. Hallowe'en, the end of October -- February 5th. Another case - an alleged offense during deer season last fall, the game warden terminated the accused's license by tearing it up. He confiscated his rifles, the charge was not laid until January and the defense lawyer asked it to be transferred from one place to another because he thought he might get quicker action and it did come up on February 19th. The accused was acquitted and the Crown then says, "we don't think the charge should have been laid." I can see, Mr. Chairman, six years ago the lawyers of this particular area brought this to the Attorney-General's Department and it was agreed that some changes should be made at that time, but the Ministers changed portfolios and nothing was done, and because of the lack of crown counsel and magistrate's time -- this is an example after a plea is on a trial -- it is discovered that the charge has been improperly laid under the wrong section and the accused is told to wait until the police officers are allowed to type up and swear out new information and lay the charge again.

This is caused, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that the docket is so heavy, the crown prosecutor is so overloaded that he doesn't see these charges until he comes to court. This I think is another injustice. Cases where offenses are incurred in Souris say, under the Souris police jurisdiction, they have made it returnable in Brandon and after the insistence of a game warden this was returned to Brandon without the knowledge of the police magistrate in Souris. So if you think, Sir, that I have been exaggerating some of these cases it can be easily checked by talking to the lawyers and the police in this area, and my suggestion at this time is that the government, the Attorney-General's Department should give full consideration to a full-time Magistrate and Crown Prosecutor to take care of the infractions and offenses in the southwestern portion of the judicial district, and in doing this, we would get more court sittings in the whole area and the cases could be held closer to the area in which the offense is committed. I might also add for your information, Mr. Speaker, that the Crown Attorney in Brandon is swamped now to a point that he himself is asking for more help in the administration of his duty within the Brandon area and north of Brandon.

Mr. Speaker, I now come to another point I wish to bring to the attention of this House. It's a subject I know that you have heard me before on, the International Peace Garden, situated in the Turtle Mountain constituency which I represent and is considered -- when you consider Tourism as one of the largest businesses in the province and the International Peace Garden has expanded in attraction through the years, from one year to another, getting bigger and bigger each year, to last year, by actual count, there was 238,000 visitors to the International Peace Garden. One of the largest single attractions for tourism in the Province of Manitoba, situated as it is in the Turtle Mountains and on the International Boundary, and managed by, I would say, a gratuitous Board of Directors made up of incumbents from both sides of the line. And briefly, Mr. Speaker, established in this International Peace Garden -- and I hope you don't think I'm bragging -- is the largest music camp, art, ballet, what-have-you school for high school students in North America, bar none; attracting last year in less than a two month period, 2,500 high school students from all over North America. Recently,

(MR. DOW cont'd) . . . within the last year or two, the Canadian Legion have established a track, field and football school for high school students. Last year 400 in number. Last session of the State of North Dakota a Bill was presented to that legislature of \$75,000 for a two year period, of which that money goes to the Peace Garden \$37,500.00.

I am bringing this to the attention of this Assembly and suggest that our contribution of \$15,000 per year, which it has been, is well recognized, well received and gladly accepted, but as we become bigger and as we become a tourist point in Manitoba — and when I say this, when you get this amount of tourists coming over the American line into Canada, it's got to rub off in the rest of Manitoba. There are no towns adjacent to these Peace Gardens; once they get in on the highways they are in Manitoba, and this must produce a lot of revenue to Manitoba when you consider we can produce this number of people coming from all over the United States and Canada into a central point in Manitoba. When I suggest to you that the \$15,000 that we are receiving, we are very grateful to you, but we would like more money, because our No. 1 priority in this Garden is maintenance and we are dependent entirely on freewill offerings from the Government of Manitoba, North Dakota, Federal of United States and Federal of Canada, plus many, many, well-known organizations throughout Manitoba. But as we get bigger, our costs get greater, and to give full benefit of the fact that we want to keep this Garden as it is, one of the prime attractions to the public, we need this money.

I could inform you of some of the plans that we have in the Peace Garden. Just recently presented to the U. S. Congress a bill of \$975,000 for capital expenditure in the International Peace Garden. The reports we have is it's being well received and will be passed likely this year. We also have a commitment from our Federal Government of Canada that they are going to match dollars once this bill is passed. This bill and money when passed will improve our capital expenditure of buildings — and this is to be what they call a Peace Tower which is going to cost \$1 million. Another attraction for tourism in Manitoba. So I just briefly mention this, Mr. Speaker, to give you some idea that year by year monies of large amounts are being spent -- it's a place you don't have to pay to get into it's a place that's attracting tourists from all over North America, even to the United Kingdom and Europe, we have cars registered from those places — and we think to do a good job not only for the Peace Garden but I maintain the Directors of this organization are doing a good job for Manitoba and the expenditure of money to create tourism is in my opinion one of the prime objects we should concern ourselves with and I would plead, Mr. Speaker, that consideration be given by this Assembly to increase our grant for 1969. Thank you Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak this Session — (Interjection) -- It gets less every year. Mr. Speaker, I do want to first of all congratulate you on your stewardship and continued leadership of this Assembly and to wish you well in the coming year and to assure you of our desire that you continue in this capacity for some time.

Also, I would like to congratulate the mover of the Message from His Honour, the Member from Rock Lake, and the seconder, the Member for Roblin. They are typical of that vigorous breed that sits representing the people of Manitoba and we are all impressed with the message which they delivered in their respective roles.

I would like, of course, first of all on this occasion, as the previous speaker has done, to draw attention at least in part in my address to the constituency which I represent, one in which over the past 10 years under the — especially 10 or 12 years, has realized a quality of life unknown to the pioneers of that area, many of them who are still resident in the area continue to remark to me as to the very real increase in the quality of their daily living, how it has improved, what a difference roads have made, what a difference the assistance which this Legislature, or legislation which has come from this Legislature has assisted them in their daily living, such as our senior citizens in our homes for the aged and senior citizens residences throughout that area; the schools have improved, we have the highest attendance in our public school system than we've ever had; the parks, the small wayside parks throughout the constituency are drawing more tourists each year. They even have more and better doctors, Mr. Speaker, in the last few years because of the, I think, probably the greatest, in my humble opinion, the greatest thing that has been done in this province has been the introduction of modern sewage and water facilities throughout the larger number of towns throughout our province which served as a base on which the people gained new confidence in their communities. This

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . in turn of course has attracted industry and people can build better homes and seem to invest in more and better housing.

Of course the one thing that has always been probably the greatest problem to the people of my constituency has been the matter of the management of Lake Winnipeg, and the fishing industry, and I look forward to the operations of the Fish Marketing Board, which legislation I understand will come before us at this session and which has been approved at the federal level. Hopefully, this will bring a more rational approach to the regulation of that great lake, one which I think should lead to less need for policing and more emphasis on the quality, size of fish, and so on. But this is going to take some time and it is going to take some understanding I'm sure on behalf of all those who will find this possibly a marked change in their operations.

I want to echo the congratulations expressed by the mover and seconder to the Speech from the Throne and to the message from His Honour on his performance at the recent federal-provincial conference in Ottawa. My constituents have gone out of their way to express their satisfaction with the government's position with respect to the constitution and have identified our Leader as a forceful voice from the west. His demands for a more co-operative attitude towards the provinces was well justified at this time in the area, for example, of health services alone.

I might record in this regard it was my privilege to attend on behalf of this province, the November 4th conference of the Health and Finance Ministers in Ottawa, one which I found a very unhappy type of conference and one which I hope will not be repeated and one in which I must say candidly I had the greatest sympathy for the Minister of National Health at that time. This conference was preceded with much publicity accusing the provinces as it were of over-spending in the hospital field; we were bad boys and we came together to be spanked and we came a little bit ruffled with our hair up and sat down to hear some bad news. I think it wasn't so much what was done probably, but how it was done and how it was handled and it's something which none of the provinces found very tasteful. I believe that we came down to talk about hospital costs and like the other provinces we were able to put on the table document after document going back to 1959 and the Willard Report, the study of our nursing homes, various studies we have carried out re personnel and facilities in this province, searching for answers, searching for possible incentives to keep down costs and we recited these to our federal counterparts, who frankly had no rebuttal. They had done no research. This has resulted, I am pleased to say, in the establishment of about several task forces who are now busily engaged with representatives from this province in the study of the several areas which lead to the development of hospital costs.

I might say that the next thing we heard was that our health grants were to be cut back, that Medicare was a fact and although two provinces were in, although two provinces there said under no circumstances - New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island said under no circumstances, at any time, could they afford Medicare, medical care program. Other provinces - we were all rather disturbed, especially the smaller provinces were with respect to the cutback in health grants which calls for a phasing out of hospital construction grants by 1970 and a gradual withdrawal from those traditional grants that had been in operation since 1948. This at a time when provinces are facing increasing fiscal responsibilities and a time when we're imposing probably the biggest health program in the history of our country. At the same time when we have had various assurances that the Health Resources Fund of \$500 million was sacrosanct, it had been announced by the then Prime Minister of Canada, and we were under the firm understanding that we would receive our proportionate share each year over a period of five years, we were asked to place our program with the Federal Government, a five year program for the orderly development of those facilities which would ensure the maintenance of our personnel in both medicine and nursing and para-medical areas. We filed these at their request. We now heard that we had assurances of these funds for a two-year period beyond which we had no assurance. This upset the provinces and at this time we still have no assurances beyond a two year period. This is of the gravest concern to Manitoba who have involved university people, staff people, the government, the voluntary boards of our hospitals and the medical centre areas especially, and the St. Boniface Hospital, over the past two years in a most comprehensive plan. However, we are going to have to move forward in this area and hope for the best with respect to the federal government's reconsideration -- hope that they will reconsider this in the light of the provinces' demands.

We also heard on that occasion, the day we were in Ottawa, that it was a fact that in launching this program on a per capita basis of Medicare in Canada that Ottawa would definitely

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) be pulling out of this program in 1973, in response to questions in the House on that day, and that they would be replacing it with fiscal equivalents. The Minister of Finance can inform you that we brought this most forcibly to the attention of the Ministers concerned, Finance and Health, and told them that it was incredible to Manitobans that we would be assured of any less support after 1973 than we are at this time, because the fiscal equivalent, Mr. Speaker, as you know, could mean much less than our 50 percent contribution. As a matter of fact, the program will not be covering 50 percent even at its initial stages as of now. This was a matter of deep concern to all of us and we are hoping the Federal Government will give us the necessary assurances as time goes on.

The social development tax of course was also represented as paying half the cost of medicare. Our people in Manitoba were told that this tax would represent a half of their -- would now get it back in the subsidy of the medical premiums under the uniform terms and conditions under their Act. This was stated by the Finance Minister publicly and gave us provinces little consideration.

It might be of interest to the House that when I was there on November 4th I asked what it would likely cost when all the provinces of Canada were into medicare. I was told \$643 million for all of Canada. The other day the figure is \$994 million, so it is getting pretty close to Mitchell Sharp's prediction of a year or two ago. It started out, the Prime Minister of Canada said in 1965 in introducing medicare that the federal per capita grant would probably be in the neighbourhood of \$26.00 per capita; they are now acknowledging well over 45 to 50 dollars per capita.

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask a question of my honourable friend? What is it costing the individual now in total contributions in respect of medicare?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, that argument is made . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I'm not arguing my friend, I'm . . .

MR. JOHNSON: The Federal Minister claims somewhere around \$800 million. He claims that in selling his program, but I'm just saying that I thought, under these uniform terms and conditions, I think all we requested was more flexibility in examining plans that we thought may best fit Manitobans at this time and of course our Manitoba proposal as an alternative was rejected.

Mr. Speaker, also of interest, and I do want to spend a brief moment stating -- I would like to comment on more of it at the time of estimates of course, but during the past several months we've placed Manitoba's position before the Task Force on Housing which the Honourable Mr. Hellyer held in Winnipeg. Of course the presence of the federal government here in this Task Force clearly acknowledged its responsibility in the field of housing in Canada and we are looking forward to some positive recommendations. In Manitoba we will have taken some small but important steps during the last several months which we'll hope to outline to you in a little more detail later on.

I might report to the House that the Task Force, the Minister, found our Elderly Persons Housing program in Manitoba to be an excellent program. This happy partnership with sponsoring groups has created more housing of this type probably than any province in Canada on the per capita basis, and it has really caught on, as it were, and I think comments were made on that at the most recent meeting with the Minister in charge. As a matter of fact, you heard the other day of the huge Lions Manor expansion right here on Sherbrook and Portage which is the fantastic kind of development which that simple program, started in 1959, has initiated, and we're hoping that they will find ways and means of improving this program in due course.

In the field of corrections, Mr. Speaker, this vast field for examination today in the light of modern attitudes, I must say that I'm impressed with the excellent people who are associated in this field, and I'm sure most members of the House are aware of the increasing numbers of people discharged to work activity in rehabilitation camps, which I think is an exciting thing in Manitoba in this area of general concern.

I would like however, Mr. Speaker, in the 40 minutes allotted to me to make a statement re medicare, necessarily in capsule form. There are simply a multitude of administrative and other arrangements which will evolve clearly, hopefully, over the coming weeks and I will do my best during this time to inform the House of any major developments as the House progresses.

The government believes, Mr. Speaker, that it is in the best interests of the people of Manitoba to introduce in April 1st the Manitoba Medical Plan which meets the criteria of the

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) Medical Care Act of Canada. We believe that our Plan is the best one possible under the circumstances, and we are determined that it will work.

The task of developing and administering the Plan is the responsibility, as you know, of the Manitoba Medical Services insurance corporation, whose board is composed of five citizen and two doctor members. During the past two years the corporation has carried out extensive studies and discussions in the health services insurance field, culminating in a series of policy recommendations which this Government has adopted.

The Government has approved the Corporations' recommended schedule of benefits. These benefits are similar in scope to the HCX Plan of the Manitoba Medical Service, providing comprehensive coverage of a full range of services by doctors in hospitals, at the patient's home, and in the physicians' offices.

The Corporation recommended that serious consideration be given to declaring eye refractions by optometrists and chiropractic services as insured benefits starting on July 1st, 1969. I might say this was because of the machinery problem, technical and otherwise, and they gave us this target date. The comprehensive Medical Care Act of Canada requires our Plan to insure eye refractions carried out by ophthalmologists, who are qualified medical practitioners. In Manitoba many routine eye examinations are carried out by optometrists, particularly in rural areas. This Government has therefore recognized the need to insure eye refractions by optometrists in order that all Manitobans will be able to avail themselves of this insured service. That is for the refractions, I believe.

Over the years representations have been made to the Government by organized labour, municipalities, and such organizations as the Canadian Legion, calling for the inclusion of chiropractic services in an insurance plan. Chiropractic services are already included in the treatments authorized by the Compensation Board, an agency of the Manitoba Government.

In view of the particular circumstances in our Province, the Government intends to request an amendment to the Manitoba Medical Services Insurance Act in order to accommodate the inclusion of certain optometric and chiropractic benefits. The amendment will include changing the name of the Act to the Manitoba Health Services Insurance Act.

After studying fee structures across Canada and discussions with the profession, the Corporation has recommended the establishment of a schedule of payments to doctors which, with minor exceptions, I am advised, will approximate 85 percent of the 1967 schedule of fees established by the Manitoba Medical Association.

The Corporation has advised the Government that payments to doctors according to the recommended schedule will without doubt equal those provided under similar insurance plans in other Canadian provinces, and will be fair and reasonable.

On the basis of the recommended schedule of benefits, the Corporation has advised that the overall incurred costs of the plan for the first year will be \$55 million.

In developing the Manitoba Medical Plan, the Corporation has made every effort to integrate it with the province's total health and social services program in such a way that it is to our maximum advantage both financially and in terms of service. Manitoba will take advantage of every cost-sharing opportunity, and federal contributions to the incurred costs of the first full year are estimated at \$26 million. The Government will also be pressing for federal sharing of the costs of optometric and chiropractic services. Close co-ordination with the Manitoba Hospital Commission and the public and mental health divisions of the Department of Health and Social Services is being maintained in order that the Manitoba Medical Plan will contribute to the development of a rational, economic, and efficient balance of services and accommodation in the entire provincial health care field.

In order to finance the Province's share of the cost of the Plan, which will be estimated at \$29 million in the current 1969-70, the Government has approved the Corporation's recommendation for the establishment of monthly premiums of \$4.90 for single persons and \$9.80 for families. This premium system follows the tradition established by the voluntary medical insurance scheme and the hospital insurance plan in Manitoba.

At the same time, the Government is well aware of the need to assist people living on low incomes. As in the past, all recipients of Social Allowances and other public assistance will not have to pay the medical premiums. In addition, all those who are now exempt from payment of hospital premiums will automatically be exempt from the payment of medical premiums. Persons over 65 years of age with incomes of less than \$1,620 for singles and \$2,940 for couples, as determined by the Old Age Assistance Board, may qualify for such exemption.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)

In the interests of administrative economy and convenience to the public, the Corporation has arranged to have the Manitoba Hospital Commission carry out the medical premium collection program in conjunction with hospital premium collections.

Both premiums will be deducted from salaries or wages by employers. Self-employed and unemployed people will receive only one bill for both premiums, and may pay it to their municipality, to designated agents, or to the Corporation directly. The Corporation advised that in view of the size of the combined premiums, citizens should be able to pay on a monthly basis. Special arrangements can be made at municipal offices for those self-employed or unemployed persons who wish to pay quarterly, half-yearly or annual premiums in advance. This variety of payment procedures has been established as a convenience to the public.

The government is most appreciative of the role played by the municipalities over the last eleven years in the collection of hospital premiums. The municipal guarantee of premium payment has ensured continuity of services to the individual and an adequate effort at the local level to collect unpaid premiums. As municipalities are now required to guarantee both the hospital and medical premiums - I would point out to the members that this is in Section 31 of the Act as passed two years ago in this House - as they're now required to guarantee both the hospital and medical premiums, new arrangements have been made for administrative grants to assist them in discharging their responsibilities for collections and registration. In addition, to ensure that municipalities are not burdened excessively through the legislative requirement to pay those premiums, the Government is introducing a measure to reimburse them for a substantial portion of the cost of unpaid premiums. The amount of the outstanding premiums paid by municipalities, both medical and hospital, will be added to the social allowances paid by the municipalities, and will thus qualify under The Social Allowances Act for the recoveries from the province equalling 40 percent of the total, or 80 percent of the amount in excess of one mill of the equalized assessment of the municipality, whichever is the greater.

The municipalities, I would point out, will also receive the financial benefit from the introduction of the Plan, namely they'll no longer have to contribute to their share of the cost of the lab and X-ray units, which become insured services under this program. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the municipal arrangements, I can't emphasize too strongly to the House how important this has been, and I'll be bringing an amendment for your consideration shortly because under the Hospital scheme a municipality may pay the premiums, and if you recall, we arranged a guarantee arrangement which for 11 years has served this province well. With the co-operation of municipalities we divided up our respective responsibilities and those who couldn't pay, whether they're province or municipal responsibilities, they paid for theirs and we paid for ours, and under this arrangement, by guaranteeing these premiums, Manitobans were assured that they -- the municipalities were assured they'd get no bill. And I think it's significant that in this 11 years no Manitoban has had a hospital bill, because if you're out of the province for a month or so this is paid through your employer automatically, especially at the municipal level. A fellow could go down, be held down in the States and holiday longer than he might otherwise have been, and this has been paid by the municipality, so instead of a bill there's the premium benefits.

Now we also had to, and I think in fairness, meet the municipalities with the larger premium as pointed out by the Member from Turtle Mountain, and our people advised me, the accountants, etc. -- the Corporation advised in the first instance that many municipal people didn't want to be bothered with people coming into the office monthly. This was simply a convenience to the public to ask existing hydro and telephone agents to carry the function of collecting the monthly premiums. These agents cannot collect arrears or take payments in advance, just the monthly premiums - that's the Hydro and telephone outlets - you have to go to the municipality for the rest.

We have an arrangement worked out which is much more simple than the previous arrangement under the Hospital Plan, whereby every three months the municipalities will be given a list made up from the computer which shows those people in their municipality who have not paid their premiums, and that's a municipal responsibility.

He can add it to his social allowance reimbursement, so they're guaranteed the 40 percent reimbursement. It's up to 80 percent in those municipalities - some of our "have not" municipalities that had a very large indigent load - but there's still some incentive, I would point out to the Member from Turtle Mountain, for the municipality and our people working

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) ... together with our field staff at the local level to collect that premium, and they have been able to get up to 80 percent reimbursement. Every three months these sheets are reconciled and the municipalities are paid 20 cents per premium payer over the whole municipality plus whatever 7 cents per month premiums they collect as an administrative grant. I met with the municipal people, and from the several examples that went around the table, the municipal people at that meeting did not indicate it wasn't unfair. We're trying to assist them. We need them; we don't want them to get bills. We think this can be an excellent arrangement for our people.

We also agreed at that meeting that I would review this with them in six month's time, because we also find that because of these various arrangements the experts tell me that it's anticipated that any municipalities net financial position will be comparable to that existing prior to the introduction of the Manitoba Medical Plan. In other words, even with the combined premiums, a municipality should not be worse off, and I think it would be best to allow some incentive at the local level for the municipality, and ourselves, or for the individual for that matter, who is able to pay his premium and yet guarantee the people from unconscionable-- or a medical bill.

In order to process the claims of the Plan, the Corporation is making arrangements with the Manitoba Medical Service to make full use of its staff and experience, and the procedure will ensure continuity in the pattern of health services insurance for both public and doctors, and will save the Corporation the expense of developing an entirely new administrative organization. I know it'll please the Member from Lakeside that at this point in making this arrangement we haven't added 150-odd civil servants, but these are first-class people over there who are well trained in their work and it was very necessary to utilize these folk. The Corporation intends to buy the Manitoba Medical Service building at Polo Park and expand it to accommodate the Manitoba Hospital Commission staff, and many of the common services which will be required by both of these programs can then be integrated in such a way that the administrative costs in the program can be kept at a minimum.

The benefits, Mr. Speaker, of the Plan are universal, and we believe they are sufficient to ensure that all people, regardless of income, will be able to obtain the health services they need. The costs of the Plan have been established at a level which this Government believes is within the people's ability to pay. Furthermore, doctors are free to operate outside the Plan. If patients choose doctors who operate outside the Plan, these patients are able to secure the same benefits to meet their costs as if the doctors were under the Plan.

Hopefully a large proportion will elect to participate under the program - medical men. The government is convinced that the Plan is the best possible for all concerned under present circumstances, and we're looking forward to April 1st as a new era in the provision of health services to Manitobans.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I'm getting older now and I have one word of caution. In the introduction of this service to the residents of Manitoba - it's a mammoth scheme - may I emphasize we all have a responsibility not to abuse this Plan. As Canadians we spend 4.8 percent of our gross national product on health services, an increase from 2.9 percent in ten years. We are at the upper limit of our ability to pay it, to provide and maintain the standard of care we have achieved, and we believe only by efficient administration, only by doctor and patient recognizing the need for a judicious utilization of this scheme, will it be a continuing instrument for good in this community. It requires the understanding and support of the medical profession and they are concerned. I am sure that they can maintain the standards and give the service. The success really depends on the understanding of all of us.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, we feel it's the best possible Plan under the uniform terms and conditions as laid down in the Medical Act of Canada, which is the law of the land, and I ask that we all accept it as such and work together to make it a viable force in the health of Manitobans. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a couple of questions.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, my friend.

MR. PAULLEY: Joviality reigns supreme. My first question is in connection with the optometric and chiropractic services. Has a fee schedule been arrived at between these two groups of professionals?

MR. JOHNSON: The Corporation are negotiating as far as I know. They have met these

(MR. JOHNSON Cont'd) . . . groups and are aware of the costs. I think they have anticipated their costs in the Plan they gave me, but they felt the machinery couldn't be — the mammoth task of getting in the basic, so-called basic program, shareable with Ottawa. It really came down to technology in handling this within the system that caused a delay of three months. They told me they just couldn't get it in before that date and they have been in touch with these people.

MR. PAULLEY: Am I correct, Mr. Speaker, in surmising that the premium has been based without full knowledge as to what the cost will be insofar as these two services are concerned?

MR. JOHNSON: They included the estimate of the costs in their estimates to the government.

MR. PAULLEY: My other question to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, he mentioned in the latter part of his discourse that the new organization will be taking over the physical assets of MMS, the buildings and the likes of that. I've heard the figure banded around of half a million dollars or more, speculatively. Will the recovery of this amount of money accrue to the premium payers into MMS which operated as a non-profit corporation, as I understand it, similar to what Blue Cross did at the time that the assets of the former Blue Cross were disposed of? There was a Bill before the House awarding to certain organizations and agencies of a charitable nature the assets that had been accrued through Blue Cross which was, as I understand it, similarly operated to MMS, non-profit.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend goes a long way around the question, and I'll probably go longer still — (Interjection) — No, I can't tell you. The Corporation have finalized an agreement as to the price with respect to the purchase of that facility. I can honestly say the agreement hasn't been signed by the government corporation at this particular point because of a couple of details. However, as I understand it, this is quite a different ball game than when the Blue Cross money of 1.2 million — if you recall, the wind-up on that went to the development of our cancer research facility in the heart of Winnipeg. The Manitoba Medical Service was a non-profit corporation sponsored by the doctors in Manitoba. Many of us took 40 percent pro ration for many years in order to build that building and develop its facility — and I'm not defending the profession — I just say that this they felt belonged to them and that I understand is the case.

MR. FROESE: There is a question that I would like to ask the Honourable Minister in connection with his statement. He mentioned that the Federal Government was phasing out in the Hospital Construction Grants Program. Could he give us a few more details on this and at what rate this is going to be applied?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, since 1948 the Federal Government has given approximately 4.5 million in health grants to the Province of Manitoba; 1.3 million of that over the last ten years has been hospital construction grants which were given on the basis of \$2,000 a bed. I think they started out at 1,548, they went to 2,000 a bed, so they're really paying between 10 and 12 percent of present day hospital costs, and you had to apply for them each year — you know, as part of your cost — so on a \$25,000 bed they were paying two through this. But this 1.3 million per year was calculated into our long term projections under the Health Resources Fund and Developing Facilities in Hospitals in the province, and they have told us that they are withdrawing completely from this field. Having created and helped us get into the universal hospitalization in Canada, they now feel, I guess, one way of keeping the cost down is to quit giving us money to build the beds.

MR. BARKMAN: Another question. The Honourable Minister mentioned that under Section 31 it was permissible — and permission to cover the way collections like I think the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain mentioned. Now does this mean that perhaps while negotiations are still going on with the President of the Urban Association that this will not be considered?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I have the letter from the President of the Urban Association, the letter he wrote to you. He raised that matter at the meeting with the other members of the Advisory Board. I told him at that time that we could only tell him the government policy; namely, that this included a guarantee of 40 percent, that I felt there should be some incentive in there for both of us to continue to attempt to collect the premium from the person who was delinquent or was not able to pay, if that's the case. I think what happened in practice, quite frankly, is that — as a municipal man you know there are certain premiums that you feel you

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) ... can collect, where people can pay and you'll go after them and you will ask our field staff to assist you in obtaining that payment. In the other case, you may feel you should just add this to your -- that the municipality should pay it. In this case you can now get reimbursement. You see under the Act -- I am trying to say the municipalities are responsible for these delinquent premiums, and we came up with what we thought was a sensible administrative formula to assist them in discharging their duties, and it's our intent to pay sufficient administrative grants that's fair and reasonable to them for this purpose. And generally at that meeting - while certainly I couldn't ask the advisory board to give me a resolution endorsing government policy - I wanted them to know that it was a program to try and assist them, and over the next six months as this operates we can see what the holes are and have a meeting with them at that time.

..... continued on next page

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I wish to congratulate you and express my pleasure at finding you in the Speaker's chair for another year, but at that point, Mr. Speaker, my pleasure ends, because listening to the Throne Speech, listening to the debates of the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech, reading the reports presented to us to this date, this year, it makes me wonder, Mr. Speaker, just how sincere the government's concern about the welfare of the people of Manitoba really is.

I think it's unfortunate that in dealing with the business of the House in any one year we can only go on a basis of comparing the estimates of one year with the estimates of the previous year, because the most recent audited account that we have is that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968. There is another fiscal year that is approaching its end and we haven't the audited statements for that year, because the public accounts that we receive do show quite a different story from that which the government tells us in the course of presenting its estimates.

On checking through the accounts, Mr. Speaker, there are many questions that come to mind that I would like the government to answer. It's rather interesting that the government estimated the revenue from mining royalties at 3.8 million for that year and in fact received only 2.2 million. Now that's a decrease of 1.6 million - a decrease of what - better than a third, practically half. Now surely, surely, Mr. Speaker, the government must have known what it could possibly expect to receive last year, and if it didn't know, then it indicates some breakdown or some lack of efficiency or breakdown in communication between the government and the mining industry of the Province of Manitoba.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, there is indicated therein an estimated amount of \$10 million as capital recovery for education costs of which the province received only \$3.1 million, which indicates -- now this again, I think the government should explain to us why did the province receive only \$3 million and not ten. Is it because the province did not proceed with some program which it had hoped to proceed with, which it had indicated to the people of Manitoba in its estimates that it would proceed with, or what is the reason for it. These decreases in revenue, Mr. Speaker, reflected themselves in a decrease in the expenditures in three most vital areas - in the Education Department, Health and Welfare. In Education the government's estimate was that it proposed to spend \$120 million; it spent only \$109. In other words, the people received only 90 percent of the Education program which the government promised. Similarly in Health, instead of spending \$85.4 million as the government anticipated to spend that year, it spent only \$72.8 million, and so on down the line.

A more recent incident which occurred which makes me wonder even a bit more about the sincerity of the government - well, it raises doubt in my mind as to whether the government is in fact telling us the whole story or not. Now it's true - I asked the First Minister a few days ago why is the Arts Council not listed as one of these bodies responsible to report to this Legislature. The First Minister took my question as notice. I repeated the question again the following day that this House sat. At that time the First Minister's reply was that my question had a familiar ring and he is certain that the Minister in charge took notice of it. I asked the same question the third time, and at that time the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs answered my question, and his answer was that the reason why there was no report from the Arts Council was because there is no Arts Council. Now I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, perhaps there are other bodies which were to have been set up by Manitoba legislation which were not set up and hence do not report and we know nothing of them. Who knows buried somewhere within the revised Statutes of Manitoba, buried somewhere within the annals of the Statutes of Manitoba, there might be other boards and commissions and councils established from which we do not hear because we may not be aware of their existence, because after all, who has the time to read the thousands of pages of legislation that is contained therein.

Another matter that is of greater concern to me and that is the one related to the question which I put to the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs on two or three occasions, asking him whether he intends to appear on behalf of the people of Manitoba before the Milk Control Board when the dairies will be making application for an increase in the price of milk. He thought about it for awhile and his answer was that he will not appear, and if I may just take a minute of your time, I would like to refresh the memory of the members of this House as to what his reasons were. He says, and I quote from Hansard, "We find that the Milk Control Board is charged with the responsibility in the establishment of prices, in looking at the producer interests as well as the consumer interests in establishment of these prices,

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) and we feel that it would be wrong for a department of government to appear before such a Board, who is charged with establishing fair and equitable prices, to plead a case on behalf of one of the particular interests involved," -- on behalf of one of the particular interests involved.

This is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, because time and time again this government has pleaded the case on behalf of some particular interest involved. Did not this government plead the case on behalf of the doctors prior to the introduction of a medicare plan which we are about to receive in three weeks time? Did not this government, Mr. Speaker, plead on behalf of big business and industry whenever we have suggested the establishment of a more equitable form of taxation by way of the adoption of the Carter Commission reports, and this government stood up on its feet and pleaded the case on behalf of big business saying that if we do that we would drive away big business; we would chase them out of the province. On behalf of that small group of people, Mr. Speaker, this government feels quite comfortable in its own conscience to plead their case, but on behalf of one million people in the Province of Manitoba; on behalf of all the people of the Province of Manitoba, who in fact are consumers, the Honourable Minister's reply is that he does not deem it wise to appear on behalf of a special interest group.

Now perhaps, Mr. Speaker, there are two reasons why the Honourable Minister has adopted this attitude.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (The Pas): Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes.

MR. CARROLL: I am just wondering if there isn't really quite a difference in the analogy put forward. One is that you appear on behalf of an interest group, and the other is where a government appears before one of its own boards who is already charged with protecting consumer interests. Is there not a difference in the analogy that has been brought forward?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the reason why the Honourable Minister is in his present state of mind is because it is difficult for him in his own mind to determine what his exact role and function is. You no doubt know, Mr. Speaker, that the title of his office is the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Now these are two very strange bed-fellows put together, I would suggest, and -- (Interjection) -- I doubt it very much, and further, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is no Act at the moment giving the job description of his department, that may be another reason why the Honourable Minister is at a loss as to what his position should be on any particular matter, what stand he should take, what course of action he should follow; and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the very very near future the government would see fit to present a Bill before this House outlining the responsibility and the duties of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

But getting back to the matter of the price of milk, Mr. Speaker, which is a very important commodity, a vital commodity, we are not discussing an increase in the price of caviar, the price of chewing gum, or champagne; we are discussing the price of a commodity consumed by every individual in this province. We are discussing the price of a commodity which is perhaps consumed even to a greater extent or larger quantity by those in the lower income brackets for this reason, Mr. Speaker -- young children have a greater need for milk, young children of young families who perhaps have not yet reached their full earning potential; milk - a commodity consumed by the elderly, the invalid, the ill, who are in no position to earn an income. In other words, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about a two cent increase, two cent per quart increase in the price of milk, what we are talking about is an increase in the cost of living cost ranging from eight to ten or twelve cents a day per family, an increase of 35 to 40 dollars per year which, on the basis of the average wage, as reported by this government, amounts to pretty near one half week's wage, and the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker, does not see fit to get himself involved in that particular matter.

But I would also like to suggest to Mr. Minister that he should get involved in this matter for another reason because there is absolutely no justification to make a case for an increase in the price of milk. If the Honourable Minister would consult the Dominion Bureau of Statistics reported dealing with the milk and the dairy industry in the Province of Manitoba, in the Dominion of Canada, he will find that the price of milk to the dairy, the price of milk paid by the dairy to the producers has not increased significantly; in fact, it shows a slight decrease. The October, 1967, price of milk to the producer was \$3.46 per hundredweight, a year later in October of 1968 it dropped to \$3.45, so the price of milk to the producer cannot be a reason

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) to warrant an increase in the price of milk. Let's take a look at the dairies operating expense. The most recent Dominion Bureau of Statistics report goes back a couple of years - the 1966 report - but comparing it with 1965 there is no evidence of any trend in costs that would warrant an increase in the price of milk. The salaries - the total salaries, Mr. Speaker, paid in the dairy industry were four percent lower in 1966 than they were in 1965. I suppose there are two main reasons for it: one, increased automation, the operation of the dairy; and secondly, an increase in the sale of milk by supermarkets rather than the direct home delivery which accounted for a large portion of the milk sales in past years.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that there is no increase in the cost of the operation of the dairies; there is no increase in the cost of delivering the milk to the consumer; and I fail to see any justification in an increase of the price of milk. In fact I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Consumer Affairs should call an investigation into the operation of the dairies in Manitoba before the dairies are allowed to proceed before the Milk Control Board with their application, and I would also suggest to the Minister that if he doesn't feel qualified to appear on behalf of the people of Manitoba before the Milk Control Board, then the New Democratic Party feels qualified and we would gladly appear. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am giving you notice now that I will appear before the Milk Control Board when it makes its application for an increase.

The other matter, Mr. Speaker, which disturbs me even more, on February 19th I wrote a letter to His Worship the Mayor of Winnipeg. It dealt with the matter in which I feel the Province of Manitoba should be interested and involved in, and my letter to the Mayor read as follows: "I note that serious consideration is being given and, to a degree, action has been taken by the city to encourage and promote the renovation of the downtown area north of Portage Avenue. I am certain that you appreciate that urban renewal means more than the demolition of blighted areas and building new structures thereon. It calls for the consideration of factors such as location, community demands for various services, accessibility, enhancement of the city's appearance, transportation routes, to mention only a few. The City of Winnipeg has long enjoyed a reputation of being a transportation and distribution centre. No doubt its role as such will increase in future years. Perhaps at one time it was most functional to have the Canadian Pacific Railway yards located at their present site, but I have grave doubts that this is true today, both from the city's and the railway's point of view. I would therefore urge you to enter into negotiations with all concerned parties for a plan which would make Winnipeg the transportation capital of Canada and enable the city to enjoy the most efficient land use as is planned, and in fact done in many cities. The Canadian Pacific Railway, as other businesses, is ever mindful of running a most efficient operation. It may well be that the existing location of the yards doesn't lend itself to maximum modernization and that some other site may be more suitable for today's method of serving the public; or, on the other hand, perhaps all or a portion of the existing site could be used jointly. There is a responsibility resting on the City of Winnipeg and transportation services to provide the people with transportation facilities not only efficient but which best fit into the overall plan of the city."

I forwarded a copy of this letter, Mr. Speaker, to the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the Metro Council

MR. SPEAKER: I regret to inform the honourable members that there appears to me to be far too much private conversation going on while the Honourable Member from Burrows has the floor. I wonder if we might not pay respect to the fact that he has the floor and keep it that way. If there must be discussion, please keep it in undertones.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I sent a copy of this letter to our First Minister on February 19th. We are now into the second week of March and to this date I have had no reply from the First Minister. I sent him this letter, together with a covering letter, which read as follows: "Enclosed herewith is a copy of a letter sent by me to His Worship the Mayor. I do believe that this matter is much greater than one of mere local concern and your government ought to be party to what may follow."

I have a letter, a reply from the Canadian Pacific Railway. This is in reply to a letter which I sent to Mr. Sinclair enclosing a copy of this letter to the Mayor. "I acknowledge your letter of February 19th to which was attached a copy of a letter addressed to His Worship Mayor Juba of Winnipeg concerning making Winnipeg the transportation capital of Canada. Throughout the years Canadian Pacific has given much thought to ways and means of increasing its

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) efficiency and providing better service to our customers, not only at Winnipeg but throughout its system, and much has been accomplished. Canadian Pacific would welcome the opportunity to enter into any discussion which might improve its operations and land use, and for this purpose it is suggested contact be made with our Vice-President, Mr. Keith Campbell, Winnipeg, who has jurisdiction over our Prairie Region." Upon receipt of this letter I had written to Mr. Campbell in Winnipeg and I am awaiting his reply.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, here we are in the City of Winnipeg with about a section of land dividing the city in half, or separating it into two distinct areas, making access from one area to the other difficult, impossible at times, extremely expensive to maintain. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, hearing reports of a debate in the City Council about the cost of replacing the existing Arlington Bridge, which is running into -- it is anticipated it will run into many millions of dollars. If we look to the other cities, if we look at Saskatoon, in which this was done and completed, the railway yards were taken out of the downtown area and the land formerly occupied by the yards and the station is now a shopping area.

A city larger than Saskatoon to the east of us - Toronto - is planning exactly the same thing. On December 20th of last year the City of Toronto announced that it proposes to remove the existing yards along the lakeshore that involves an area of 190 acres, and build office buildings, a convention centre thereon, housing units. It is anticipated that the development of this 190 acre area in the City of Toronto will generate an additional \$40 million taxes a year -- \$40 million annually on a 190 acre site. And in Toronto, Mr. Speaker, the three levels of government have joined hands in developing this project. I'm reading from a report in the December 20th issue of the Globe and Mail - the Toronto Globe and Mail: "Full co-operation of all levels of government was promised yesterday to complete the billion dollar centre to link downtown Toronto with the waterfront. It will be the largest single downtown redevelopment project ever undertaken in North America." And farther down the article: "Premier John Robarts told business and government representatives that the province will support the undertaking. 'It will have a profound effect on the life of Toronto,' he said."

Now this is the type of thing that this government, Mr. Speaker, ought to be inspiring, the type of activity it ought to be inspiring, the type of activity that it ought to give leadership to, which it has failed to do. A company involved in this matter that I'm bringing up is indicating interest. Our government, what it did with the letter I don't know, but I have no reply to it to this day. And this, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, would be one of the greatest contributions to the people of Winnipeg that this government could make, to initiate negotiations and discussions with the CPR for possible relocation or joint use of some or all of the property, perhaps moving a portion of the yards - I don't know - but obviously the CPR is willing to discuss this matter. The City of Winnipeg is interested but the Manitoba Government is not. It has totally and absolutely ignored the matter completely.

Now in that area I'm just guessing - I don't know what the acreage is - but I would estimate it must be at least 600 acres taken up by the CPR right-of-way extending from the Red River over to Keewatin Street, because in that area - that area is what, about three or four miles in length? - and the right-of-way varies I suppose from an eighth of a mile up to about a quarter of a mile in places, in others perhaps even a bit more. We're crying about shortage of space; we're crying about need for housing; we're crying about need for low cost housing in the near vicinity to the downtown area, because a person who goes to live or seeks accommodation in a low cost housing unit invariably also -- it's of necessity that he be reasonably close to his place of employment, to shopping centres and so forth. There, Mr. Speaker, would be an ideal location for those things and for many more - for a convention centre, for an exhibition centre, for -- the City of Winnipeg is talking about community colleges, and no doubt the community college concept will expand and there will be need for space for that type of facility. There is the land for it. Now is the time to start negotiations, start discussions with the CPR. We're not going to accomplish this overnight, Mr. Speaker. It will be a long time before, if we succeed, before all that land is available for the city's use, but to encourage the City of Winnipeg, to encourage the Metro Council, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this government do consider the most efficient land use in the City of Winnipeg and do contact the federal government because this is a large project which should involve it, and it's this government, Mr. Speaker, that should take the initiative and give the City Council the necessary assistance and encouragement to proceed with this project and hopefully, in the years to come, make the City of Winnipeg into a truly beautiful city and make it a real transportation capital of the Province of Manitoba.

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, when one takes part in a debate at this late stage much has been said that I would like to say, so I think it would sound quite repetitious but I will try and find some new ground and hope that I will not be repeating too much what has been said before.

It is once again my pleasure to congratulate you on your return as ruler of this Assembly and on the manner in which you conduct the business of this House in your capacity as Speaker.

It is also as well my pleasure to congratulate the mover and the seconder to the Speech from the Throne. I believe they have made very good speeches and I congratulate them on them.

It is also my pleasure to congratulate the new Minister of Agriculture. I admire the way he has taken his new position so seriously. He is very conscientious and tries to answer all the questions in this House, and I think this is very much appreciated on this side of the House.

Getting back to the Throne Speech itself, Mr Speaker, I was pleased to hear that the Government promises to do so many things for the people of Manitoba. It would seem that our province is in for a period of tremendous activity in all phases of human endeavour, but after examining the Speech much more closely, much of that elation disappears very quickly and the feeling becomes a great disappointment. However, many Manitobans should welcome some of the points that were mentioned in the Throne Speech and I would like to mention - and I would be remiss if I didn't - that many of these points have been raised by the members of the Opposition. For the last two years we have requested many of the things that the government has finally decided to put in the Throne Speech.

Not only is this government -- I feel it's bankrupt in the field of ideas, but it seems to me that the government is not sure of its own convictions because the way the government proceeded to be in and out of medicare. It was in, it was out, back in on April 1st. This indecision, Mr. Speaker, has cost Manitobans some \$18 million as was mentioned by my Leader a couple of days ago. The Royal Commission on Medicare, when it was making its report, indicated and said that after 40 years of private medicare schemes in Canada, less than 50 percent of the people had any coverage at all. Because of the health care only a few at the top income scale can emerge from serious financial -- and be seriously crippled financially. I know many of the members here in the House, and many of the people, sometimes do not like compulsion, but I think it's time that we recognized that it is part of the democratic process to make collective decisions for the common good to achieve the desirable goal. Is it not true that in many areas, long ago, we had legislation on the books that we promote good health by having sewer systems, pure water supply, pasteurization of milk, and education. Can this not be called compulsion? Can anyone say we should not be doing these things because it is compulsory? Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that in today's Tribune, after my name it was mentioned the New Democratic Party, and I wish to advise the House that I have not switched parties as yet, and the Tribune was in error in printing those remarks behind me.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the government handled medicare almost in the same manner that it has handled the committees of this House during the recess since the last session. I also am concerned about the present medicare plan because it fails to take into account the wide gap which exists in incomes and everyone is charged with the same premium regardless of ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, this government also shows lack of concern for the people in the section of the Throne Speech dealing with South Indian Lake. The Nelson River investigation report indicated that one Indian community is to be resettled, but now we learn from recent hearings that this proposed diversion will not only affect South Indian Lake but also the communities of Pukatawagan, Granville Lake, Laurie River, Nelson House, and part of Thompson and Churchill. Mr. Speaker, I feel the human factor in all these communities must be taken into consideration before a license is granted to flood the South Indian Lake. I feel that alternate proposals must be considered as well.

I would like to mention something about condominium legislation and housing. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege to introduce condominium legislation into this House some two or three years ago, and repeated last year, and I'm glad that the government accepted my proposal and introduced the condominium legislation, because the first condominium development

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) is now taking place in my constituency, which is quite a large development, and I am very happy about this because I feel that many people in the lower income group will be able to buy some of these homes which they were not able to do before. On the other hand, I could just as well criticize the government and the Minister for not showing some leadership in bringing in this legislation some years ago. It seems that we have to wait until the other provinces such as Alberta, B. C. or Ontario have made great progress in this field and then we, as usual, like to follow the leader, or follow what the other provinces are doing.

In California, Mr. Speaker, in two years 30,000 units - row type condominiums - have been built. This is a very popular type of home ownership. It's accepted throughout the North American continent. It's been in use in most of the countries in Europe. In South America 80 percent of all commercial buildings are condominium type. I think this is the field that we have to expand. I can be somewhat critical of the government in the field of housing. A large proportion of homes today, five out of seven last year, were built with government finances or mortgaged by CMHC. The average CMHC borrower needs an income of approximately \$8,000; the average family in Canada earns approximately \$5,900. This clearly indicates, Mr. Speaker, that CMHC loans were for above average income families while lower levels have to live in crowded and dilapidated homes. Needless to say, failure to keep pace with the requirements is creating shortage of houses in different parts of Manitoba. Canada has prided itself on being a nation of home owners but it is quickly becoming a nation of renters.

The housing industry is hampered by shortage of money and interest rates at an all-time high. The 5 percent provincial sales tax and the 12 percent federal tax on building materials contributed to the highest increase in the cost of housing in Manitoba and made it impossible for many of the people in this province to be able to buy homes. We are told in a Metro report on urban renewal that half the families in Winnipeg are living in substandard homes. There are 5,000 dwellings in Greater Winnipeg that are in such bad condition they should be removed. I feel the best assistance this government can give to the people is to remove the five percent sales tax on building materials. Last year, Mr. Speaker, I presented a resolution to this House asking the government to remove the 5 percent sales tax and to request the federal government to remove the 12 percent federal sales tax. I regret that the government did not see fit to vote on this resolution or accept it, but vote against it.

I feel that this government has a dismal record in regard to low cost public housing as is indicated in the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Speaker, if we compare this to what some of the other provinces are doing, one would wonder and say that this government is standing still as far as the public housing is concerned. In Ontario, under their Home Ownership Made Easy plan, last year the government built some 14,000 public homes, had 10,000 units on the go, had sold 1,200 lots and had 6,000 lots available for next year. This program in Ontario has been accepted quite favorably and has been a great asset to many people in the low income groups. Buyers under this plan, Mr. Speaker, have the choice of renting the land on which they build or they have the choice of buying the land five years later, or at any time they wish at a pre-determined price, at the time of getting into or signing their agreement, what the lot is worth. The government in Manitoba has done very little, Mr. Speaker, in this field.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to turn to a very important item which concerns many of my constituents in St. James-Assiniboia. The collegiates and junior high schools in the west end of the new city will find themselves seriously overcrowded when the fall school term rolls around in September. Last year I presented a petition from Assiniboia parents because 1,000 children in the Crestview School had to attend staggered classes. I feel since the Department of Education has assumed complete financial responsibility for school buildings under the new Foundation Program, the blame should be placed squarely on the government. I know during the last session the Minister tried hard to convince me that it wasn't the government's fault or the Minister's, it was the population explosion that we were enjoying in Assiniboia. He almost had me convinced and I didn't raise this too much in the House last year, but, Mr. Speaker, we have the same problem now in the City of St. James where we had no population explosion. There wasn't a great construction program in the City of St. James and the same thing happened in the Bannatyne School. And why wasn't the Bruce Junior High ready? This is the question I would like to pose to the government or the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. It's a serious problem and many of the people are quite concerned about this. I would just like to quote because last year I couldn't just determine whose fault it was, whether

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) it was the trustees - a lot of people feel the trustees are to blame, the trustees feel it's the government, and you can't get to the bottom of this.

Mr. Speaker, this is a letter from the St. James School Board to the Minister and I would just like to quote. "It is the feeling of the St. James School Division that serious, indeed unnecessary delays are being experienced in the development of this school and that the elected representatives are being frustrated in their attempts to serve the people in the community. Perhaps the most bitter facet of this situation is that this board is now the butt of very strong criticism for inadequate planning and tardiness of action. We do not feel that this criticism is justified by facts, but since shifting the blame to someone else only compounds the ill feeling as well as inaction, we are seeking to take positive steps to obtain results. Not only do we experience delays before receiving replies but also the prescribed plan of action required by the Building Projects Committee precludes our taking further preparatory steps until they approve. The result is that seven months after the St. James Board completed its survey and was convinced of the need, we were forced to tell a delegation that we have only prepared sketch plans which are now labelled unsatisfactory. Sir, the situation is critical and will undermine faith in the government at all levels. May we have your assistance in clearing channels so that some of the electoral confidence we have enjoyed may continue. We will be pleased to meet with you at your convenience to discuss this matter further if you consider it necessary." This was from the Chairman of the St. James School Board to the Minister of Education.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like an answer from the government where is the delay, why do we have staggered classes, and from all indications if we don't have better planning I think that this is going to be a much more serious problem in the whole of Greater Winnipeg. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if education is the No. 1 priority of this government which they always have professed that it is, and I wonder what is the delay, the reason for this mess. This merely demonstrates inefficiency of this government.

Mr. Speaker, St. James-Assiniboia will have a population of approximately 80,000 people by 1970. The present vocational facilities are limited in scope and capacity. If facilities were available, studies and surveys indicate that at least 25 percent of the students in this area would enroll in vocational classes. I believe the demand warrants such a project.

MR. SPEAKER: I must interrupt the honourable gentleman from Assiniboia. He may of course carry on at 8 o'clock. It is now 5.30 and I am leaving the Chair to return again at 8 o'clock this evening.