

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

10:00 o'clock Friday, March 31, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The petition of the Fidelity Trust Company praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Fidelity Trust.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 101, an Act to incorporate Atkinson Centre.

MR. WILLIAM HOMER HAMILTON (Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to announce a new champion in Manitoba. The Youth Bowling Council have been holding their bowling tournament in Toronto, as some of you may be aware, and there were three young ladies from Carman who were fortunate enough to catch a place. They came back last night via CNR and Miss Peggy Soutar, 13 years of age, is the Dominion Bantam Singles Champion and Miss Sandy May McEachern and Miss Beverly Williams placed 5th in the Doubles Bantam. I think these three young ladies have made a lot of honour for the Province of Manitoba and the town of Carman.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to table some material that I should have tabled before this but it got misplaced, the terms of reference of the Council of Higher Learning and correspondence re requests from the Council of Higher Learning regarding the distribution of the monies from the School Lands Grants Fund, a request to the Council of Higher Learning to examine the role of community colleges, and correspondence with respect to Brandon College becoming a university along with a copy of the Order-in-Council establishing same. I just thought that this copy should be distributed to members opposite. I'll lay enough copies on the table of the House for members who may be interested.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Are there any copies of correspondence there from the Council of Higher Learning to the Minister regarding the establishment of United College as a university?

MR. JOHNSON: Negotiations are still proceeding with respect to United College and constituent colleges on campus, Mr. Speaker, and I am not prepared to table that correspondence at this particular time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, would it not be wise, in view of the fact that there has been correspondence though, to give us what there has been at least to date?

MR. JOHNSON: I hope to be able to make a full statement before too long, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): I just wanted to thank the Honourable Minister. I had asked him for this information and I appreciate the tabling of it.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question, I believe to the Minister of Public Works. On the few occasions that I have had to use the members' telephones, I notice that they are usually stuffy and hot, and I was wondering - perhaps due to the nature of the calls that I receive - I was wondering whether the Minister can investigate the possibility, as these have been used for years and I think some long and important calls are placed through there, whether or not he could investigate the possibility of more proper ventilation for those booths because I think they are rather out of date.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): I'll be glad to look into it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): This is a question addressed to the Minister of Education. On the question that my leader asked about the United College, would this statement that the Minister talked about, will this be made during this session?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, I believe I will be able to do so before too long.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. I am advised that the picture of one of the previous speakers, Val Bachynsky, has been taken down because it was damaged by vandals and possibly other pictures. Is this correct, and if it is so, do you plan to restore the pictures so they can be replaced in the different rooms?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am sure if it was damaged, we will do our best to restore it. I was not aware that it was and it will be properly looked after.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The reason I posed the question, is it not true that the picture has been removed and put away?

MR. McLEAN: Well I can't answer yes or no, that is I can only say I am not familiar with -- what the honourable member says at this moment is the first I have heard of it.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education, perhaps more in his professional capacity rather than his political. Yesterday it was mentioned that the sales tax may cause some irritation. Could he tell us whether medical science has come up with any medication that could be used to some extent to relieve this discomfort caused by sales tax.

MR. JOHNSON: We have the material in the constituency of Gimli that removes irritation.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, in replying to a question given to me by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie regarding Swan River as to when we first knew about the difficulties there, the department was first notified of irregularities in expenditures for the local improvements in the town of Swan River in the auditor's report of 1964. Immediately the department wrote Swan River regarding this audit report as to what they intended to do. The assistant secretary-treasurer in reply said the matter would be given attention at the August meeting and it was understood that the Council of Swan River was trying to resolve its problems. Council apparently did not resolve its difficulties and this was reported in the audit of 1965. Council was again asked as to what action they had taken and what action they were contemplating in these matters and the secretary replied, and I quote from his letter, "The content of your letter is being attended to and I am sure can be completed before the next audit," and therefore the council were given the opportunity to correct these irregularities.

The audit of June, 1966, disclosed that nothing had been done in respect to irregular local improvements. Council was notified that these items referred to by the auditor must be attended to immediately. The auditor furnished us with an interim report in November of 1966 which stated, "Many transactions have been entered into without properly completing the legal requirements for recovering the monies expended." The Council of Swan River was therefore called into the department in November of 1966, and because of the apparent inability of the Council to straighten out the affairs of the town, I directed the Municipal Board to investigate into the affairs of Swan River, and upon reaching this decision I called the Council of Swan River into my office and told them of my decision.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to table for the House the First Annual Report of the Horse Racing Commission.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education. Two or three days ago there was a news item stating that one of the officers of the Department of Education is on a teacher recruitment campaign, if I understood the report correctly, travelling overseas and having intentions of going to the United States to recruit teachers. Could the Honourable Minister explain just exactly what the Department's role is in this recruitment campaign. Are they, in effect, acting on behalf of school boards in the process of hiring teachers or what, and just to what extent can the department negotiate with teachers outside the boundaries of Manitoba?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, for the past year or more now we have had a full-time Director of Teacher Recruitment who has primarily beamed his efforts within the Province of Manitoba at the high school level and so on, and in recruiting many adults that wished to come back to school and re-enter the academic stream and go into teaching. In addition to that, we were impressed with the enquiries that we made overseas through the immigration services, the government, and our Mr. Lee accompanied the group to England to just see what the situation was last spring and found many many people interested in coming to Canada and immigrating to Canada - very well qualified teachers. He was then in contact with the trustee associations and boards and people who had specific requests, to enable him to take a number of contracts back to England and complete arrangements on the spot.

This was done in concert with the trustees, the school boards of the province, and we also had many enquiries from the northern United States re teaching opportunities in Manitoba and are pursuing these. As my honourable friend is well aware, as we are improving our teacher standards we have to staff our schools, and in addition to our force here we felt it advisable to

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd) take advantage of the fact that these people are available. They are well trained and the program seems to be snowballing a little bit and I trust that further people will be coming to our province.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand the Honourable Minister correctly then that the department's officers are seeking applicants for certain specific positions, that it's not just a matter of accumulating a pool of available teachers and then attempting to farm them out to wherever vacancies may occur at some future date?

MR. JOHNSON: We try to be as specific as we can in this matter.

MR. DOERN: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. A few days ago an official of your department declared that British teachers were better trained than Canadian or Manitoba teachers. Is this the official view of the department?

MR. JOHNSON: No, but I would say a person through the secondary system with three years of professional training probably is well qualified, probably better qualified all around than a one year teacher trainee.

MR. DOERN: The distinction that was made was in terms of number of years rather than the actual program within a year's training.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think our people after one year are as well trained as anyone anywhere.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Health. In consideration of the statement that he gave the House earlier this week that no legislation in respect to the dentists or the denturists would be brought forward at this Session of the Legislature, can the denturists rest assured that they can operate without being subject to the strong arm of the law until such legislation is introduced and brought in?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, they are still subject to the Dental Association Act and will have to obey the law as per that Act.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has tabled the First Report of the Horse Racing Commission. Is there legislation coming forward at this Session on the matter of horse racing and the length of days and so on?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, we will come to that bridge when we cross to it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Leader of the House. We have been receiving somewhat more Bills recently. They've been very slow in coming but the process is quickening, and this is normally an indication that my friends think the Session is ending. Has he many more Bills to present to the House?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): I would imagine, just in round figures and I wouldn't want to be held to this number - but I would imagine approximately 10.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, does one of those include a Bill regarding horse racing?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

The boards, commissions and agencies to which Mr. Campbell MacLean, Q.C. has been appointed as a member, or to which he or his firm's services have been retained in the professional capacity as of March 1, 1967 showing:

1. Date of appointment to each.
2. Responsibilities and duties and time involved.
3. Salaries, retainers or commissions paid for each board, commission or agency in the preceding year.
4. Method of payment (i.e. by the hour, day, week, month or year in each case).

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

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information relative to the recent request for bids by Manitoba Hydro for construction at the Kettle Rapids site where McNamara Corporation Limited was "forgiven a \$7 million error":

1. copies of all tenders submitted by all firms who bid on the contract;
2. copies of all correspondence between Manitoba Hydro, Ministers, branches or

(MR. GUTTORMSON, cont'd) departments of the Manitoba Government, and all contractors who bid on that contract, relative to that contract;

3. a memorandum indicating where, in the McNamara bid, the \$7 million error occurred.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise not to take any objection to the Order with the exception of one or two points that I would like to mention. First of all, in the first part of the Order for Return I think we would decline, as it were, to accept the words "where McNamara Corporation Limited was forgiven a \$7 million error." That's, shall we say, editorial comment which I'm sure doesn't add anything to the request, and I would want to make it quite clear that insofar as the Manitoba Hydro is concerned they don't acknowledge those words.

I'm wondering whether under Item No. 1, it would be sufficient to meet the request of the Honourable the Member for St. George if a copy of each of the tenders were left with the Clerk of the House for a period of two weeks rather than the reproduction of them in the normal way. This poses an enormous task because of the amount of material that's associated with it in the form of charts and presumably maps and so on, and I would ask whether that would meet the requirements of the case.

Insofar as correspondence is concerned, there would of course be the usual reservation as to any privileged correspondence - I'm not aware that there is any, but if there is any - and then I'm assuming that the correspondence - and we have no objection to making copies in the regular way - that we're talking about correspondence from the date on which the bids or tenders were opened forward, that is to the present time.

With respect to No. 3, I think we would have to decline that. In my opinion, the matters to which No. 3 is directed will be disclosed presumably in the copies of the correspondence and would not need any elaboration on the part of Manitoba Hydro.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have asked the honourable the member with respect to No. 1 whether the proposal I made would be satisfactory; No. 2 is satisfactory and I've just given my understanding of what is required; and we would decline No. 3.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to No. 1, I would hope that these contracts would be made available at all times, that is -- he says to leave it with the Clerk of the House for two weeks. I certainly think this is inadequate, but if he would leave it with him and we'd have access to it at any time, then I would be prepared to go along with the request made by the Minister, but I would certainly object to the two-week limit which he is suggesting. I think that we should be able to look at this contract at any time, whether it's a week from today or a year from today. We're prepared to go along with his request not to reproduce copies if he will allow them to be available to us at all times. I think this is reasonable.

With respect to No. 3, I feel that the Minister certainly should provide this information. This contract and the decision that has been made is causing considerable concern in many quarters and certainly we are entitled to know the basis of the decision and why this decision was made, why this contract was changed, and we would like to know where the error was made so that we can see the basis of why it was made, and to refuse it would appear to me to be withholding information that should be public.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Return and the information that is asked for, I don't think the two weeks is satisfactory because I'm sure other groups on this side of the House would want to take a look at it and the two weeks that is presently before us will be very busy times indeed. We've got a number of Bills on the Order Paper and more Bills coming forward which will have to be studied, and therefore I certainly would like to also look into this material that will be made available and I think it should be for a longer period, or give us the copies.

MR. McLEAN: I'm assuming, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not permitted to speak further in this matter.

MR. GUTTORMSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether -- he's asked me how I react to certain suggestions and I have no way of knowing whether he's going along or not.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, on the point, I think this is a very vital concern, and as far as we are concerned here we would be prepared to give leave, if necessary, for the Honourable the Provincial Secretary - or the Minister of Public Utilities to re-enter the debate. I think it is very important.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, with leave, I just make this comment. I think that if it was

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) the wish to have the documents referred to in Item No. 1 available at all times, then I would ask the Hydro to reproduce them because the documents that I had suggested might be left with the Clerk of the House are documents which have to be returned within a reasonable time, and so if that suggestion is not satisfactory then the course of action is quite clear, and that is to reproduce them and file them in the regular way, although I would warn all concerned that that will take some little time.

With respect to Item No. 3, I would perhaps just remind the Honourable Member for St. George that the Chairman of the Hydro Board made a statement on the first occasion of meeting with the Committee on Resources and Public Utilities and the statement was given to the members - I mean reproduced and given to the members - and also a formal statement on the second occasion, both of which, between them, indicate the course of proceedings and I believe coupled with the correspondence that will be tabled would not require any further elaboration on the part of Manitoba Hydro.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, speaking by leave, surely this is a matter -- according to the Minister of Public Works this is a big document which is going to take some time to reproduce, and surely it isn't unfair for us to ask that he point out where this error was made. I was present when the Chairman of the Hydro made the statement at the committee meetings, on both occasions, and all we're asking is that he point out where this error was made on the bid submitted by McNamara. I feel regret that the Minister would feel it necessary to prevent us from having this information so that we would have a clearer understanding of what went on.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. LYON: I don't rise on this point, Mr. Speaker -- perhaps maybe to obviate what my honourable friend was going to say. I believe there was - I'm speaking now on the procedure of the House, Mr. Speaker - I believe there was some understanding from my colleague the Provincial Treasurer that this matter would not appear - the Sales Tax Bill No. 56 would not appear this morning. We thought there was a 48 hour delay; subsequently we found out that the item does appear this morning. My honourable friends opposite, I believe, were under the impression, as we were initially, that it would not be up until Monday. Now I would enquire from them before we call the item, or before the item is brought forward at all, as to whether or not they would be prepared to consider calling the item because we realize that this was not as we thought it would be. No one was trying to deceive anyone, it was just a question of not knowing when it would appear, so if we might have some indication as to whether or not they would be willing to have the item called this morning to see if we could make any progress, we'll try to suit their convenience.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I had specifically asked yesterday after the passing of the Bill when it would be coming up to Committee and the Minister indicated to me that it would not be in his estimation for 48 hours, and subsequently in a private conversation with the Leader of the House, I discussed with him the procedure as to what other Bills we were to deal with and in particular mentioned Bill No. 38, The Liquor Control Act, which I felt should be sent to committee at an early date if we could because there will undoubtedly be representations there. It was my understanding that we would not be proceeding with the Sales Tax Bill this morning and I think that would be the preferable course.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to speak on the point, I'm sorry I misled my honourable friend but I did so just out of ignorance. It just somehow or another popped into my head that there was a 48-hour period before it got back on the Order Paper but that obviously doesn't apply to this class of transaction, so it's entirely acceptable to me, Mr. Speaker, to allow time for preparation for the committee stage.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, we go along with the suggestion of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, let's leave it until Monday. We have a lot of work in second readings and other work, I am sure.

MR. LYON: Then, Mr. Speaker, we would ask you, Sir, to call Bill 38 and all of the subsequent second readings that appear thereafter, and of course we give notice to the House that at this time we will be calling Bill No. 56, the committee stage of Bill No. 56 on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates . . .

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, before you put the question on that,

(MR. HILLHOUSE, cont'd) I wonder if I could appeal to the Honourable Provincial Treasurer to furnish us with drafts or copies of the regulations under Bill No. 56 by Monday, because I feel that a study of this Act is absolutely impossible unless you have the regulations before you and I think it would facilitate the advancement of the Act through Committee of the Whole if each member of this House was furnished with a draft of these regulations. I have read some of these sections and quite frankly - maybe I'm not very intelligent - but it's pretty hard to visualize the full intent of some of these sections and I think it would be of great assistance to us if we have the regulations before us. Now I know the Minister has said that he hasn't got his regulations yet, but surely he must have a draft of the regulations that he does intend to submit to us.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to say so, there is nothing that I can present to the House that could be termed "regulations" or even draft regulations. We have working papers that will eventually lead to regulations. Now I undertake to provide as much information as I possibly can with the aid of whatever notes I have, but I'm sorry I'm not able to comply with the request to table a document, because once that became public it would be regarded as the regulations and we would be committed on a document that has not yet been authorized. So I'll do my best to provide information; I want to; but I'm sorry I can't table a document.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Could you furnish us with copies of the working papers that you have?

MR. EVANS: My honourable friend knows better than that too.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): I would suggest that the honourable members save their applause till I'm finished.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this Bill, I do so with quite a bit of concern, not thinking so much of myself and the members in the House today, but thinking of our future generations. All the letters and petitions that I have received have been against any changes in our present liquor laws. I have yet to receive one that says the laws should be changed.

It has been mentioned in this House that advertising - any type of advertising - has quite an influence. In fact I believe it has a large influence on our youngsters who are pre-school age. I have a grandson, he's just rising six in July, and I think that he could do Juliette and Bob Goulet and some of these chaps that are singing over Channel 12 out of a job at Molson's Canadian, if you could only hear him sing this ditty that they sing over TV on Channel 12. So I think that advertising -- we don't know just what effect the advertising will have on our future generations and I am opposed to any outlet as far as advertising is concerned. Advertising does cost a good many million dollars, and it has been mentioned in the House here that small papers will suffer unless we allow this advertising. There's a certain amount of truth in that because the breweries are advertising through that medium, but I believe quite seriously that in allowing advertising over the TV that these small papers will lose out to the TV channels and the larger daily papers. That's where these people that are advertising will be placing their advertising.

In MacLean's report of March, 1967, there was an article that I think we should give some consideration to, and I quote from this report: "How Much do Canadians Drink? In the year ending March 31, 1965, we spent more than \$1 billion on some 301,400,000,000 gallons of alcohol beverage." Now, Mr. Speaker, that's more than 15 gallons for every man, woman and child in the country, and if we take Manitoba for instance, Manitoba has 4.8 percent of the population of the Dominion of Canada and it drinks exactly or precisely 4.8 percent of all the liquor consumed. Now I think we are holding our own as far as drinking liquor is concerned and we're fairly well at the bottom of the list as far as alcohol consumption is concerned, and I think it's our duty to try to keep it that way.

Now we are extending the hours to consume liquor in the beverage rooms, beer parlours and such like, and all the letters and petitions I have received are opposed to that. Now someone has mentioned the name Bob Edwards during the course of the debates here and I remember sometime of reading an article written by Bob Edwards and I'll quote what he said in this article. He said, "A \$5.00 bottle of whisky makes a man feel like a millionaire and why be broke?" Well now, I think if we want to do anything to help - and I think we should and I'm a bit disappointed that there isn't a recommendation coming before us to this effect - I think that what we should be doing, we should be cutting out all treating of any alcohol beverages regardless of whether it's in a beer parlour, beverage room or any lounge or anything like that. I think that's one thing that we should

(MR. SHEWMAN, cont'd) do and I think we would be helping our fellow-man a lot by seeing that there was no treating, because my experience has been and I have --(Interjection)-- pardon? No, I've made a practice of not spending my money that way unless I had to, but my experience has been that you walk into a beer parlour with someone for a social beer or go into a lounge to have a social drink and there's bound to be one or two in there that will come around and say, "Well, just have one on me." Have one on me. Have one on me. And it goes on and on this way until finally you're digging in your pocket too and it's expensive. I know it is very expensive, and I think if we cut out the treating that we wouldn't have as many intoxicated people leave the beer parlours that are leaving it today.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to oppose the amendments to this bill and I do so for another reason. We read in the Tribune of the 18th, 1967, that Winnipeg Juvenile Court handled 27 percent more cases in 1966 than it did in 1965, and I am told that that is because of excessive drinking in a good many cases, not entirely by the juveniles but on account of broken homes and such like where there isn't the right care being given these juveniles on account of liquor. We are told that there were 5,184 cases compared with 4,055 in 1965, which is a substantial increase on account of liquor infractions. I think that we should give this serious consideration and I for one am voting against any further liquor outlets.

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

MR. EDWARD L. DOW (Turtle Mountain): I rise to suggest that I am going to vote against this extension of The Liquor Control Act. I feel that through the studies that have been made over the years, and I am one that can remember prior to, I can remember as a youngster the closing of the bars, I can remember the opening of the bootleg industry, the prohibition, and the coming into effect of the present Liquor Control Act. We have in Manitoba, in my opinion, a Liquor Control Act that is second to none in the North American Continent, and I would think that if we continue to open this up to a point that we're making it so easy to have liquor at every opportunity, we might as well throw the Act out and go wide-open and we could very easily walk ourselves into a position that we could come back to the days of prohibition, and this is one thing I don't think the people of Manitoba would agree to, but we might be forced into it.

I've had many communications, and particularly I've had three very strong petitions of quite large numbers of people who are not against our Liquor Control Act as it is at the present time, but they are very definitely against the opening up of advertising in this respect, that they feel with the televisions being used as they are, with our educators more and more bringing the television into being as a means of education, that we are doing a disservice to our younger people, and they are taking a very wide view, in my opinion, that they wish to emphasize very clearly that they are against the use of advertising.

Personally, I can see no advantage at all of extended hours in regards to the service of liquor. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the time that we have allocated by law in Manitoba is sufficient and I am not a teetotaler --(Interjection)-- that's right, and I have seen some of the faults of long lengthy hours. I would go along with the fact of amendments made to the Act possibly the same as Ontario, the serving of liquor at regular meal hours. I could get my thinking to agree to that, but I am against, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we should walk ourselves into a wider, freer use of liquor service in Manitoba. The public will go so far and they will do the same. If we continue and don't keep it in the degree of moderation that I think we have now, we can go the other way and we can be back into a state, I would say, of the chaotic confusion in the years of the early 1920's. Therefore, I am going to vote against the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: There are two or three points that I'd like to mention in connection with this Bill, Mr. Speaker. One that I feel we've lost track of, which was brought out by the Honourable Member from Selkirk when he reminded the House that it ought not be the function of Legislature to legislate people's morals, and I think that this is something that we should bear in mind. It's true that there is need for a government to exercise certain controls to ensure the safety of the public, but we ought to be very careful that we do not go too far in legislation of this type and that we do not go beyond the point that is necessary to do that and no more with which a Legislature is charged to do.

Now, I fully agree with the comments made by some that excessive consumption of alcohol does lead to a multitude of problems, but I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that it has been proven by anyone that liquor is, or excessive consumption of liquor is the effective cause of many of the

(MR. HANUSCHAK, cont'd) social problems that do arise. True, liquor is a factor involved in there, but it becomes the old question of which came first, the chicken or the egg. In other words, is it excessive consumption or abuse of liquor that leads to broken homes that leads to criminality that leads to various other forms of undesirable social behaviour or is it something else, and because of that pattern of behaviour found within the individual that that individual then may be prone to excessively consume liquor and this in turn aggravates the problem.

I do not feel, Mr. Speaker -- or rather I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the roots of some of the problems that we are faced with today lie within an area other than excessive consumption of alcohol, and those of us who feel that by limiting, or at least not extending the hours during which liquor is available for sale and consumption, that these problems would thereby be minimized. I would suggest to them that they give some thought and consideration to the causes of the problems themselves and to dealing with the people faced with these problems. I think our time would be far better spent if we would give some consideration to setting up an agency or expanding the services presently offered by various agencies dealing with people in broken homes, juvenile delinquents, people discharged from penitentiaries and so forth, a more vigorous rehabilitative program for them. There is where I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the solution to this problem lies, not in limiting the hours of sale of liquor. After all, we are not concerned here with providing for the abuse of liquor, we are concerned with the use of liquor; and if any abuse does result, there is legislation written into the Act to deal with that, and if any abuse results which cannot be dealt with under the provisions of the Act then the government should take such further steps and measures to deal with that which it may not be presently doing.

While dealing with the matter of advertising, this does concern me to this extent, not only liquor advertising but advertising in general, that we are now living in an age wherein advertising or the impact of advertising is thrust upon the individual at any time of the day with or without his consent. Somebody mentioned you can turn the TV channel off if you do not wish to watch advertising, but really, Mr. Speaker, let's be practical about it, the viewer of a television station has no control over who the sponsor of a program is that he wishes to watch, nor has he any control over advertisers on radio programs, and surely this is not a practical suggestion that was put forth here by one or two members in the House.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that when this Bill does reach the Committee stage that some consideration be given to imposing some controls on advertising, perhaps controls in addition to those presently imposed by the Board of Broadcast Governors. My suggestion would be, Mr. Speaker, that we do give consideration to levying a tax, if we wish to call it that, on the cost of advertising, and the proceeds from which be directed towards the alcohol education program that the government conducts. I am sure that a system could be worked out for keeping control of this, on the money spent on advertising on newspaper, radio, television, and this money could be used to expand the alcohol education program.

We do have one at the present time but I do not feel that it is extensive or broad enough. I am thinking of the program that is presently conducted in the public school system. In the seven or eight years that I have been in teaching I can recall a man from the Alcohol Education Department visiting the school that I was in on two or three occasions. He spent an hour per class. Well I feel that this is a subject that requires far more time than that, and no doubt the amount of time that he is capable of devoting to any class is limited by the amount of money that is available. This would provide an additional source of funds for that purpose; and secondly, it may cause the advertisers or the manufacturers of liquor to give second thought as to the amount they would care to spend on advertising, and the extra amount that would be spent would certainly be put to good use, Mr. Speaker, and do the very type of thing that those of us in this House would wish done.

In closing, therefore, I would say that I will support the Bill insofar as the extension of hours are concerned because I personally do not feel that there is any relationship between the extension of hours and any undesirable social behaviour. I do not feel that it can be corrected by restricting the hours, no more than we can correct the misuse of ammunition by preventing or limiting it or abolishing its sale, but insofar as advertising is concerned, I do feel that some consideration should be given to imposing some controls, checks or controls upon it, and I would hope that the government would consider the suggestion that I have made.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (St. Vital): I don't feel a great compulsion, Mr. Speaker, to speak on this, but I think it's probably wise to make our positions clear on this for the benefit of our constituents. I had some reservations about the Bill when it came in, mainly with

(MR. HANUSCHAK, cont'd) reference to the advertising portion of it. I think that probably it reflected fairly accurately the concern that existed in my own constituency, but there are several things - and they have been pointed out upon occasion here - several things about the advertising that probably should be emphasized. I think one is that the control that is put on TV advertising by the Board of Broadcast Governors is much more to our liking than the advertising we are getting particularly from the United States, and if I have any reservation it is about the advertising we are getting coming into Canada from the United States rather than what we are likely to get in Canada alone. I think if we are going to put restrictions on it, our efforts would be better directed towards seeing what can be done about the calibre of advertising that we do get by television from the United States.

The other reservation that I do have about the advertising portion is billboard advertising. I feel that billboard advertising is stationery; it does not affect anybody outside our province. We can't say this about our newspapers and other news media. This is one of the strong arguments now, the fact that most of our publications coming into our homes do have advertising in them, and to bar the local publications from having this doesn't make an entirely reasonable argument in the eyes of many and in my own opinion as well. So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I would like to see this go to committee. I have some reservations about the particular aspects of the advertising, but by and large I'll support the Bill.

MR. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the Honourable Member from St. Vital in the remarks which he has placed before us here this morning. I stand here with quite a lengthy list of protests from Roblin constituency which is a fair indication that the people in my constituency do not support this Bill as it stands before us in its present form. However, I do think that as a new legislator that it is my duty to support this Bill on second reading and bring it to the committee stage where I dare say amendments will be attached that possibly will make this Bill palatable.

There is a section I think that we cannot overlook dealing with the making of home-made beer and wine, which by the federal statute is quite in order, but by our provincial statute it is not in order. I dare say that this can be properly passed through the committee if it's amended properly.

So I have nothing else, Mr. Speaker, except that I think the House should pass the Bill in second reading and let us take it to committee and it will be properly amended and I think we will come out with a fair Bill legislated properly.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if I will be closing the debate, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the debate be now adjourned.

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

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members?

A MEMBER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYON: I believe the next item of business is Bill 65, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Attorney-General. Bill No. 65. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate on second reading concerning Bill 65, I would like to acknowledge the comments of the Honourable Members from St. John's, Selkirk and Inkster who spoke on this Bill, and in my first remarks I would like to refer to what the Honourable Member for St. John's mentioned when he asked why the Metropolitan Winnipeg amendments were being introduced as a government measure.

The honourable member will recall that the original Metropolitan Winnipeg Act was introduced as a government Bill at the 1960 session and during 1961 and 1962 the amendments to The Metropolitan Act were moved by private members. In 1962 the government created the Metropolitan Winnipeg Review Commission and the Chairman of that Commission urged the then Minister of Municipal Affairs to adopt a policy that future amendments to the Metro Act be introduced as government legislation. The then Minister adopted that policy and since 1962 the main amendments to the Metro Act have been brought in as government legislation. Now this policy has commended itself favourably to us and as Minister I intend to continue this procedure, and so, Mr. Speaker, I introduced the proposed amendments which are before the House for consideration.

Now I would like to also comment on the remarks of the Honourable Member for St. John's and I am rather sorry he isn't in his seat --(Interjection) - he's here - oh, I recognize him now in another seat, but I did appreciate his remarks and that is why I would wish for him

(MRS. FORBES, cont'd) to be present and I'm glad he is here. I'd like to comment on his remarks regarding planning and zoning appeals. The Honourable Member for St. John's states that if there is an appeal from a Metro decision on zoning and planning, then that appeal should go to an elective body rather than an appointed body. Probably I shouldn't have said he states, he suggests that it should go to an elective body rather than an appointed body.

Well, may I say that I'm in favour of an appeal, Mr. Speaker, from any Metro decision on zoning and planning since consideration of individual rights and their limitations may be involved, and I'm also in favour of it going to an elected appeal body rather than --I'm in favour of it going to an appointed appeal body rather than an elected appeal body for two or three reasons. An elected appeal body would be required to be in continuous session if appeals were going to be dealt with in an orderly fashion. If the appeal for instance was to this Legislature then we would have to be in continuous session year round or else in between sessions - if there is an in between to this session. These appeals may pile up and therefore they couldn't be taken care of in an orderly fashion. Besides, an elected body would lose some degree of continuity through change in membership, and we noted a change in membership in this elected body this last time. Granted, appointments to an appointed body may be changed too, but so far this hasn't been the history of the Municipal Board and so I see really no reason for a change in this policy. Also I think thirdly, we must recognize that planning and zoning matters are becoming more complex and require examination by a board that has experience in such matters.

He also suggested that we maybe should have some separate type of appeal board for Metro, and may I point out to him that the establishment of a separate type of appeal board for metro matters could lead to divergent planning principles and precedents, since planning appeals for the rest of Manitoba would come under the Municipal Board, which would be pursuant to The Planning Act, and I feel that the differences between urban and rural planning are those of degree as well as of kind, and I think that one appeal body seems to be preferable for planning in Manitoba. Besides, Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the honourable member that an appeal, if any should be to this Assembly, I'm certain that he'll agree with me that it would be unusual for a legislative body to administer and hear appeals dealing with legislation that it had itself enacted. It appears that the honourable member doesn't disagree primarily with the decisions of the Municipal Boards but he feels that some other elected body should make these decisions. But I think for consideration of experience, continuity and uniformity, that I'm in favour of continuing the present system.

I would also like to give assurance to the Honourable Member for St. John's over his concern regarding co-ordination between Metro and the Boundaries Commission. He mentioned three specific points: first, boundaries, second, planning and zoning; and third, finances. He's concerned with problems which might arise if these three areas were permitted to go in separate directions with regard to the overall metro planning. Now as you know, Mr. Speaker, the Boundaries Commission thus far has concentrated primarily on education problems as outlined in their terms of reference, and I can assure the honourable member that when the Commission begins to study the boundaries of Metro with a view to making recommendations, I'm sure it will explore fully all considerations relative to boundaries including such things as planning and finance. It would be fruitless to ignore these matters in any recommended boundary change in my opinion, and as yet I don't see any need for creating a formal authority to establish a liaison such as the Honourable Member for St. John's requests.

However, he's a former member of the Metro Council and I certainly give his viewpoints very serious consideration, and I must say to him that I value his experienced opinion. I want to thank him for those comments and I feel sure that the Boundaries Commission will establish proper liaison with the municipal authorities and with metro authorities when municipal and metro boundaries are under consideration. I've noted with concern his remarks and I'll pass them on to members of the Boundaries Commission and I know that we'll all keep them in mind as this work proceeds.

Now the Honourable Member for Selkirk has stated that serious thought and consideration will have to be given by this House to an evolving system of taxation in the metropolitan area which would bring about greater equality to all the area municipalities within the metropolitan area. Now I believe that some of my comments to the Honourable Member for St. John's covers the point raised here by the Honourable Member for Selkirk - and I note too that he doesn't happen to be in his seat but I'm sure he'll read my remarks - and it's my sincere hope that the Boundaries Commission will consider the planning and economic and financial problems of the metropolitan area when this Commission begins its intensive study of the

(MRS. FORBES, cont'd)metropolitan boundaries.

Now I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Selkirk for pointing out to me a deficiency in the legislation respecting municipal and metro elections. I asked my department to examine the matter that the honourable member raised and I'm advised that an amendment of this nature, the nature that he suggested, would be desirable, and so we will be able to give this matter consideration when it comes to committee stage and I want to thank him for reminding me of this.

Now the Honourable Member for Inkster has raised two basic questions regarding this Bill, particularly as to the question of planning, and he raises the question of speculation in land through re-zoning activity and he suggests that the profits obtained in this fashion should accrue to the community. I've given this great consideration and I note that it's well worth considering, but he does not deal with the question of losses which could also result from re-zoning and whether the community should reimburse an individual who suffers loss in this way. However, I'd like to suggest to the honourable member that we'll all have to broaden the scope of our consideration of zoning and consider it as a part of overall planning.

Again, this House, Mr. Speaker, is very fortunate in having the advice of an experienced former Metro Councillor and I regard his comments very highly. I think perhaps his concern is a wee bit misdirected in this particular instance in view of the fact of the metropolitan development plan and the implications it will have, and I suggest that it's reasonable to expect that in the near future Metro will be in a position to support its statement of policy, for that really is what the development plan is, a statement of policy on their part, and through the necessary by-laws which they will enact, I'm certain the honourable member will agree that we will be able to come to some clear-cut decisions here and that it should be all considered as a part of overall planning and development. If, as he suggests, that spot zoning has presented problems in metro, the emergence of by-laws which will in my mind supply the bricks to support this superstructure of the development plan, this should place Metro in a position to take a firm look at zoning and all zoning changes.

Certainly there will always be legitimate instances where re-zoning is required, and this responsibility rests with Metro and it should remain there. Those persons who are elected to Metro and who accept responsibilities of public office, Mr Speaker, will have to face this question of zoning changes. I believe that the development plan will provide a significant tool for Metro to use in its growth and its development and that there must be an opportunity for Metro to develop this plan. In addition, the policy statement will support overall growth and change, including such matters as the location of Metro services and the provision for industrial and commercial and residential expansion. I don't want the Honourable Member for Inkster to feel that I don't value his comments or his discussions, but I feel that Metro is in a state of evolution and we should not attempt really to prejudge - and I'm sure he isn't - we shouldn't attempt to prejudge the Metro Council as it attempts to lay the foundation for the development of Metropolitan Winnipeg. I'm confident that the councillors will consider the matters that were raised by the Honourable Member for Inkster in their proper perspective as a vital part of overall planning for growth.

I'd like to thank the honourable member for his comments along with the member for St. John's and Selkirk. I learn a lot as I go along and I certainly appreciate the experience that you have, your interest and your viewpoints. I can assure you that I'll keep it in mind and we'll be watching with interest the progress that the corporation is making in the establishment of its development plan and in the growth and the expansion of this, our metropolitan area. I'll be pleased to keep the honourable members' comments in mind as Metro Council discusses with us planning, economic and financial problems which will arise.

So, with these few comments, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to see this Bill go to committee and I'm sure that we will have further comments there and all of it, I'm quite sure, will help to build a better area in Metropolitan Winnipeg.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister permit a few questions?

MRS. FORBES: If I can answer them.

MR. CHERNIACK: Dealing with appeals from Metro, she spoke about the responsibility of the elective persons on Metro and yet feels that there should be an appeal from that, and my first question is, is an appeal from an elective body, responsible to the electorate, proper to go to this appointed body of the Municipal board, and I think she's already answered that by saying it is proper in spite of their elective position. And then carrying it forward into the question of decisions being made by elected persons, does she not consider that she is both

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) elected and has some security of tenure in her position over the whole year and not just during sessions? Would it not then be acceptable, if there has to be an appeal from Metro, that it should go to the Minister who is responsible for the people?

MRS. FORBES: The honourable member has posed quite a question to me. He's suggesting that I'm here all year and that I should sit as the person who hears these appeals. At this point, I don't know whether I should answer his question or take it under consideration, because I'm just thinking of all the duties that you do have as Minister of Municipal Affairs and Urban Development and I rather think that if all these appeals came to me I would be a very busy person and probably not be able to do anything else but listen to them.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . point, if I may, Mr. Speaker, is that the Act had the concept originally that the Minister did have the appeal authority or the final authority, and yet now the Act provides that she passes over this authority to the Municipal Board. Could she not consult with the Board and have the Board hear the appeals and make recommendations but still retain the ultimate responsibility in the hands of the elected person, who is the Minister of the Crown in that department?

MRS. FORBES: . . . thought. I'll give it consideration.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I appreciate that and I won't pursue it. The other question is in relation to the Boundaries Commission. She's sure that it will explore the questions of planning and finance when it deals with the boundaries. My question is, does the Boundaries Commission have any authority in determining or fixing the planning of Metro Corporation or to deal with financing? Since I'm assuming the answer is "no", and that it could only deal with boundaries as it relates to other people's jurisdictions, is there any other body which has the final authority to co-ordinate and settle in a forceful manner the decisions of all three?

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for giving consideration to our remarks. I note that she didn't say anything about police or fire. Since she said something about everything else, I assume that she forgot these two items. Perhaps my reminding her will evoke an answer.

MR. LYON: I think we're in the problem here that after the speech is concluded the Minister may, if she wishes, answer questions. I don't know that she should necessarily be asked to extend upon her speech, however, because we are getting into the committee stage where all these matters can be dealt with.

MR. GREEN: In this particular case, Mr. Speaker, we were speaking to the principle of the Bill and I agree that the Minister need not answer. I'm just asking her whether or not she forgot. If she forgot, perhaps she would like to answer.

MRS. FORBES: I did forget that aspect, but we will be in committee and probably we could answer those at that time.

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 68 - am I correct? The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Bill is one of the most important bills that we have had in front of us at this Session and I think this will be far-reaching and this is something that we'll be left with for a long time. Therefore, I believe that the debate that takes place on this Bill should be constructive and responsible. I would like to ask -- and I'm sure that many of the Members of this House would like to ask the Member from Lakeside to deliver the same speech that he did yesterday on another subject here at this time. I think it would be most appropriate and if he doesn't, if he feels that he shouldn't repeat this Bill, I hope that he will be speaking on this because I certainly agree with a lot of the things that he said, and even those that don't agree with him, I think feel that this is something that we should look at.

Now I was more disappointed - I didn't like the speech of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party while he was debating this. I thought that it was mostly negative and political, a big part of it anyway. Mind you it might be popular, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think that it'll achieve too much for the citizens. I'm referring mostly to accusations - I guess I can call them accusations - that come too often from him and from his group that nobody in this House except the members of the New Democratic Party are interested in the health of the citizens of our province. Now I don't believe that this is right. I know that this isn't right, that only the members of one Party are interested in the sick and the poor or any of these groups. This is certainly false. We might differ in what we believe is the important part, in

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) the methods of changing this. We might be just as sincere, one as the other, and there might be some members less hypocritical than others, if that's possible, but I think that this is not something that will be divided by parties and this Party is interested in the poor or the labour or anything like this and the others aren't. I don't think that this is it at all. And to say publicly in this House that some of the others are not interested and include whole groups in this, and even go further and to say and make the statement in this House that some members and one member is interested because he might profit by the suffering of others, I think that this is a most cruel, false and irresponsible accusation, especially when the member referred to probably saw more suffering caused by health than any members in this House when he had one of his loved ones die in his arms after suffering for many months. I think that this is quite wrong. Now maybe the Leader of the NDP didn't mean this, but if he doesn't mean this I don't think he should use this debate to further his political doctrines.

Now some of the speakers, the one member that I have in mind mostly, the Honourable Member for Inkster who I feel is quite sincere, quite strong - I don't agree with him in many of his doctrines - but I feel that he certainly, as the Honourable Member for Lakeside said yesterday, he's most sincere but he doesn't like the idea -- he's a little touchy when we talk about socialism. Well, when we talk about socialism I think when members - I think it was the Minister of Labour and others talked about socialism - we're talking about what I said now that they feel that only socialism can cope with certain problems. Now it is easy, it is easy to stay on the right side especially when you've never formed a government of this country, and the New Democratic Party has never formed any government because they feel that -- it's not the Social Credit, but we if we include the Social Credit Party in there, it's been for a few years in one province, and it's easy. This is what I call irresponsibility, to ask for everything, that the government should do everything, provide all the costs of education for everybody; all the costs of health for everybody; the medical. They even have a resolution now to put the government in the baby-sitting agency; minimum wages; pension and everything. They always talk about ability-to-pay. This group talks about the ability-to-pay principle. I believe in this, but let's remember the ability to-pay of the country and the province also. This is an important thing --(Interjection)-- You'll find out when we debate this.

Now we have I think a pretty wonderful country and I don't believe that free enterprise has caused these wars as we heard yesterday. I could say that communism caused a lot of wars also; I could say a lot of things. I think that the labour force or any of these people are better off here in Canada than in some of these socialist countries or communist countries. I'm sure of this. I'm not ashamed of living in this country at all and we've never had a socialist government.--(Interjection)-- Well, maybe then it'll be time to move, I don't know. Well that's possible, but the point that I'm trying to make is this, that nobody has a monopoly on these human qualities of compassion. All the members of this House, or at least members from all the parties are certainly interested to fight poverty and to help the labour force. This is what we're trying to do and we are not afraid.

I've heard people from different parties talk about big businesses when there's something wrong. I'd be the first one to fight this big businesses or professionals or any of these things. I don't think that you can go anywhere -- a Party can get anywhere if you start by treating a group as a special group, and I think that this is why at times we're talking about socialism, something the Member from Inkster doesn't like, because we feel that this group seem to be interested - and I say "seem to be interested" - I don't think it is to the advantage of any country to make a god out of Hoffa and Beck and those people. I think that they have --(Interjection)-- well, we discussed this a few years ago and one of the members from the NDP Party fought for these people, that there was nothing wrong with them, and they tried to get these unions and these people here in Canada and I don't think this is right. These people are not necessarily helping the worker. I think there are abuses in unions - and I'm not afraid to say it - I think these are abuses in professionals and in big business.

This is the difference between this Party and the other parties here, that we do admit that there's abuses. We don't think that anybody should be treated any differently than the others or that there should be any privileged class. The laws are for everybody and I think that the sooner we realize that everything is not all black when you are on one side of the fence. There are some very good people in management; there are some very good people in labour; there are some very good professionals; and there are some bad ones in all these groups also.

I believe in free enterprise as the Honourable the Member for Lakeside said yesterday, but I'm not afraid to bring in social reform. I think that this is probably what they mean by

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) middle of the road. I'm not afraid. If I voted, I voted -- to the surprise of the members of NDP, I voted for the question of ambulances not long ago. I voted for this. Well, this was supposed to be against my doctrine, against what I believe in. No, it isn't. I think if we could leave these things to free enterprise it's better. When it can't be done and if you've got to safeguard the interests of the people and so on, well then it's the time for the government to take over; then though. This is what I believe in. I do believe in social reforms; yes.

Mind you, the members of the NDP Party, or the New Democratic Party can change this and interpret this the way they wish, but this is my -- I'll tell you straight, you can change it around if you wish later on. This is what I believe on this question of Medicare: I believe that the most important thing of all is to see that all the people of Manitoba are provided with adequate medical care for every citizen. This is the first thing that's important --(Interjection) -- We agree. But remember that I said this.

And then I think it is the duty of the government that they make it possible to give everyone the opportunity to receive this help, to get this opportunity, and if they can't do it financially that's where the government comes in and this is being done now. Well we don't agree on this and I'm certainly entitled to my opinion. I think that if we get the medical care and then give the people the opportunity to take advantage of this, if you figure that this is wrong, well it's wrong, and I also feel that no one should suffer because of the too high medical bills. I think there's something that should be done about this.

Now I think that we have to recognize that the situation here as far as medical care in this province is good. There's room for improvement; there's always room for improvement. But I think that it is good and we should agree with this, and I don't want to just give a back-handed compliment to the doctors. I think that we owe them an awful big debt here in this province and it is unfortunate that they don't want apparently -- I saw a letter that they feel that they shouldn't take part in this debate. I think that it is most important that we find out what they think because they're the people that are important in this thing. We think enough of them; we have enough confidence in them to go to them when we need their help, and I think they have the duty, and I think they're wrong in not coming to us and explaining their views on this because they are a very important part. Without them we will not have any medical care.

As I say, the first question is that I feel we should have sufficient doctors. Now since they've had this compulsory plan in England they have lost a lot of doctors and unquestionably the situation is bad. I'll just quote here: "The U.S. News and World report states that between 300 and 400 doctors annually are immigrating from Britain to Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the U.S. and that the number of doctors operating under the National Health Service is actually declining while the population is increasing steadily. That means fewer doctors to care for more people under a system that is already overloaded." Well are we going to suffer from this? This is the question that I leave with you. Are we going to suffer, or will the doctors, instead of coming from England to Canada and all these places, will they forget about Canada? This is something that I would like to know, because as I said, and the members agree, that the important thing is to see, to provide, --(Interjection)--Maybe they did; maybe they did. We'll see. This is what I say. You're not embarrassing me by saying this; this is what I want to know, because I want the same thing that you do, maybe not in the same way, and if your way is the best way, if it's the only way, I will go along with it; I have said this before. But I don't think that we need compulsion. I don't believe that it's the duty of a government to come in and do everything -- do everything for every individual. I don't think this is right. This is leading us toward Communism -- oh yes, it is leading us toward Communism. This is true Communism, and what is the proof? Is it better for the labour force, for the poor, to live in Communist countries than it is to live here in Canada? --(Interjection)--I think this is very much on the subject. So I don't think that we should misrepresent these things.

Maybe what I'm saying now will be misrepresented later on, but my point is this. It's so important and this is something that will stay for so long and we know, we worked -- I agree that we were not ready for this hospitalization and we're suffering now. We are suffering - I'm talking about financially - we're in great trouble, and this is not just the fault of the Minister. This is society. We took something that we weren't ready for and I think it might be an idea to finish this. What about the mentally ill? They are not accepted in the plan. And we have compulsion in there; we have compulsion, but what about the people that cannot

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)....get a bed and so on. I think that we should get this thing straightened out before we go in this Medicare. I believe this, and I should say that I am speaking for myself, not necessarily for any party. I am speaking for myself.

We have this hospitalization and we are talking about maybe being forced to cut down on the standard of service and so on. We might be - because of lack of funds; because it is costing so much money. So we're going to leave this, we're going to go backward in this to take something else. I am not too sure that this is right. I feel that we have good care. I haven't heard of anybody here in Manitoba that has been refused any care, doctor care. I haven't heard of anybody. We are taking care of the poor people unless they want it themselves. Now we will need many more doctors - it will be a compulsory plan. It will be a compulsory plan and I think that we have to accept -- I think that Manitoba will have to accept it because of the way it is set up. I'm not criticising the Minister at all; I think it is unfortunate, because I certainly am not in favour of this compulsory plan. I think that we have --(Interjection)-- I might decide to vote against it or I might decide to vote for it, but you'll have to wait and see. I think I am entitled to say just as much as you did.

I agree with the Minister that this is forced on us now, and if we are going to take anything from Ottawa at all we have to accept the compulsory plan. I think that we have to accept it and there is nothing else we can do. I don't think you are too serious when you say that I'm going to vote against it.

Can you answer, can the members say that when this compulsory plan is going we'll have all the doctors that we want? Are you ready to take this responsibility? Or are we going to go back later on in the following years and pile all this trouble on the Minister, blame him for it, blame any government that is in office at the time? I think that we should think of this right now.

I saw an editorial in the Tribune of March 23rd and I'd like to quote from it, because I think it's very good, and I think we should say more things like that and we should stop and think. Now I'll quote from this article: "Millions of dollars are wasted every year both because they are directed to the wrong source and because they support a bureaucratic hodge podge. (2) Thousands of families are still living in aching poverty because the money that could provide their children at least with decent opportunities is being channelled in the wrong direction. (3) The billions of dollars spent on welfare of every form in Canada each year are not accomplishing the purpose they could. All this points to the necessity of restoring the concept of need to Canada's welfare programs. Family allowance payments, for example, are scandalously low when measured against the need of a good number of families. At the same time the allowances are ridiculous when measured against the affluence of many other families."

I believe in that. I believe in that. I have had examples of some people that we should do an awful lot more for certain people. I'm against - and I don't mind saying it - I'm against the free loaders that we have in society and I think that the Socialist doctrine encourages this. I think that we have a duty - not only a right, a duty in this country to take care of our under-privileged people, our children and orphans and widows and these people. I think that we have people, who through no fault of theirs cannot take care of themselves. But I don't think that we should -- I'm not in favour of all these other problems that we force everybody to get in against their better judgment, against their wish, and it's costing an awful lot more money and there's an awful lot more money wasted.

I say that our hospitalization plan is in danger here; I think that we need so many more beds and there are some people that cannot get in the hospitals now. We have this compulsory plan, we have this compulsory plan that was pretty well imposed on us at the time, and I still believe - and as I say I am speaking for myself - I still believe that we don't need to have this compulsory plan. We did need that in the hospital and we certainly don't need it in Medicare, and I for one, I know that this will be twisted against me and they'll say I am against this plan and so on, but I certainly would like to see us finish what we started to do in the field of hospitalization before we start on this. I certainly feel that we do, because I don't think that we are suffering here because of lack of medical care, but I think we are suffering because our hospitalization is costing us too much money, and I think that Ottawa could very well have provided the funds to include the mentally ill patients, for one thing, in here. This is something that hasn't been done - from the Federal Government anyway.

Now the main thing that I reproach the government on this bill is, I think that this government should have learned a lesson. I think the government was wrong in saying that they would be ready to go alone. I think this is impossible and I certainly don't -- I'm not

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . chastising them for not starting this plan without the help of Ottawa. We know it's impossible here in Manitoba. --(Interjection)-- I don't know about Saskatchewan. I never studied Saskatchewan too much. My responsibility lies here in Manitoba and there are so many other works to be done. As I said before, the people of Manitoba are receiving good medical care. There is room for improvement but they are receiving good medical care, and if you are talking about priorities I think that we should watch our list of priorities and I will say again that we need to look at, when we are talking about ability to pay, it's not only for the individual, there is ability to pay but through the taxes too, and there is ability to pay for the province. You cannot just squeeze money from rocks or stones and I think that this is a thing that we have to remember, the nation and the province when we're talking about ability to pay, not only just an individual, especially when it seems that it doesn't concern us we're always getting the money from the same people.

What about the people, if we have a compulsory plan, the people up north maybe where there is no doctor? What's going to happen there? With this compulsory plan they'll be forced to pay. Talking about the Bill now, I would ask the Minister to answer a few questions when he closes the debate. I wonder if it is the intention of the government to have a merger with the Manitoba Hospital Commission, to have this Manitoba Medical Services Insurance Corporation. I think that it would be advantageous in certain ways for the collection of premiums and so on, through the computers that they have, but I hope that the administration, the policies and so on, will not come under the same board. If it is the intention I hope that the government will have another look at this because I think it would be quite difficult, put us in quite a situation if the doctors had to compete with the hospitals for the money involved and the same board had to take care of the policies. I think you are going to have an awful lot of trouble if this is the situation.

Now there is something I would want to know about why the monies received from the Federal Government is not turned immediately to this board, but I think my honourable friend from Turtle Mountain will elaborate a little more on this.

The government has talked about utilization fees - I think I saw that in the Bill somewhere --and I don't see why there are any utilization fees at all, and I think that this might be -- I mentioned this at the time of the debate on the hospitals and I think that this might be something that we might have a look at also. In the information that we received the Minister was talking about the patient will be covered "for in-patients at general and extended treatment hospitals and at the patient's home or physician's office, but there is no mention of the personal care hospital, such as Tache Hospital, St. Josephs and so on. I wonder if this is an oversight or if this will be corrected or if there is a reason for this at all.

Of course we have no idea at all what the amount of premiums are. I wonder if the Minister can at least give us some indication of what that will be. The choice of doctors to accept the patient - this is left to the doctors, and I like the principle of at least having this freedom but -- maybe I'm worried for nothing; maybe this is covered somewhere else, but I would hope that under certain conditions there won't be a question. Mind you I don't think there are too many doctors, if any, would let this happen but I hope that in any emergencies the doctors would take care of the patient. I think that this is an important thing also.

Then there are penalties for people that are abusing this and I think that maybe there should be penalties spelled out for the doctors who are abusing this also. I think this is an important thing. I don't want this to be taken as an insult to the doctors. As I said before, it's not the doctors but there are some people in every walk of life, there are some honest and dishonest people, and it only takes one or two to hurt the rest of the profession and I think that it should avert some accusation and some lack of confidence on the part of the public that in the past some doctors have padded bills and so on, and I think that this is something that should be looked at. I don't see anything on this at all.

Well Mr. Speaker, I don't think that I want to add much more than this. I will certainly vote for this bill because -- I don't think this is funny at all. I think that it is the only way that we can get this money from Ottawa. I would much prefer -- I believe in a democratic form of government. The people that decided have decided this way, but I'll not just get on the band wagon. I don't like this compulsory part of it at all. I don't think that it was necessary. I agree, in other words, with the government of Manitoba on this a hundred percent. I think that we have good services and I think that we were taking good care of the people of Manitoba and I think that there are other things that should have come out. But if this is the only way, if this is the only way that we have it, as I mentioned -- I don't think this is comical at all but the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....Leader of the NDP seems to think that it is. He got up in the House last time and he started to talk about everybody, that there was only his party that was interested and that the others were going to profit by the suffering of others. Well this is fine.

I don't like the compulsory part; I don't think it was needed; and I say that we're going to have an awful lot of trouble and I feel sorry for the Minister of Health on this. But if this is the only way we can have it we should get busy and make sure that we get as many doctors as possible here because without the doctors this plan cannot be put into effect; it will not be a fair -- you'll have again the question of contract and a contract is a two-way deal. You're forcing the people to get into it and then when the time comes you might not be able to give them the services that they have contracted for. So I think that we have quite a job in front of us and I think that we should realize this, first of all, and we should be very constructive in our remarks because this is something that will stay with the people of Manitoba for a long time. This is not a thing that you can, like politics, that'll be here today and gone tomorrow, and I think that we've noticed that with the troubles that we've had with this hospitalization since its been placed...

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member permit a couple of questions?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: If I understood him correctly to say that the principle in this Bill will lead to Communism, does he still say that he's going to vote in favour of the Bill?

MR. DESJARDINS: I did not say that the principle of this Bill was leading to Communism. I'm talking about the way that you people have talked, that there's only one party and Socialism is the only way, the answer to everything, and that free enterprise leads to war, and I think you know very well what I had in mind.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well there's a second question, Mr. Speaker. If the honourable member believes that there ought to be penalties for abuse by doctors, does he recognize that this will mean that there would have to be certain controls and checks on what the doctors are doing as far as usage is concerned, and is he prepared to institute such controls?

MR. DESJARDINS: The only thing - I think I was clear on that also - I said that if this is abused by any group, if there's any, in other words a doctor, that is submitting two bills or bills for work not done, that they should be dealt with. I've never believed that we should have any privileged class and I told you that before.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well that's a crime anyway, isn't it?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, maybe it's a crime that we should be ready to catch and make sure, that is if -- this is all I'm saying, to make sure that the people know that there will be protection in this because, well I believe, it is my belief that most of the doctors are very honest people but I pretty well can say that I know that this has been abused in the past, and I want to make sure that we make this as tough as possible to do.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Would the honourable member submit to a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Sure.

MR. DOERN: Do I gather from your comments, then, that you do not agree with the Federal Government - the Liberal Government - which asks in general for a universal plan?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well do you want me to make my speech again? I don't know what you gather from my comments. It's up to you - Read it in Hansard.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to first of all suggest to the member for St. Boniface who just spoke that I don't think that anybody in this party has ever suggested that there's a lack of sincerity on the part of other groups in the House. We have on occasion spoken of our own view on how things should be, and we think that we are sincere in speaking this way; and we have also suggested that the other parties are sincere in speaking in the way in which they speak. We haven't suggested that we are better people than they are. My leader has suggested that the Minister of Health did not wish to proceed with this program. The Minister of Health said so and you say so. We don't say that we -- we don't suggest -- (Interjection)-- my honourable friend, and I better explain now because I see that he is very acute at picking up these remarks. I said earlier in the debate - and I was being facetious and I'll admit it and I'll apologize - that the 300 doctors who came to Canada went to Saskatchewan. I don't know how many of them went to Saskatchewan. I don't know whether that's true at all and I was just possibly in an ill-advised way trying to be amusing, but I suggest that I don't know what number went to Saskatchewan. And when my Honourable Leader referred to the Member for St. Boniface's profession, I'm sure he thought - and I'm sure he's right - that the Member for St. Boniface had a sense of humour. We still think he has a sense

(MR. GREEN cont'd)... of humour even though he is trying to attribute that remark as some display of lack of sincerity on the part of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think we've ever said that the other parties are not sincere. As a matter of fact yesterday I was trying to be extravagant in suggesting that the present administration sincerely thought that they could come into this province and do all of the things that they wanted to do without imposing a sales tax. We don't suggest they're insincere; we suggest that they are wrong. And, of course they suggest that we are wrong, and that's what makes debate - our belief as to a certain state of affairs, as to a certain method of dealing with things, and the contrary belief on the other side that we are wrong; and we can't have a parliamentary system if people don't suggest that other people in the House are wrong. We don't suggest the lack of sincerity, and I certainly, Mr. Speaker, in my years of politics have come to learn that most people who are elected to public office -- as a matter of fact I could say almost without exception (the reason I say "almost" is that I can't recall every single person that I've met) but I said it when I made my remarks in the debate on the Speech to the Throne, that most people who are participating in political life are doing so because they think that they can do something useful, and I say that the members of the Liberal Party are trying to do something useful; the members of the Progressive-Conservative Party are trying to do something useful; we are trying to do something useful; we all have different ideas as to how we can be useful. --(Interjection)-- Well I'm sure my honourable friend doesn't want me to again go into the debates that we've had on what I think of their program. Let's be agreed that we think that we are all here honestly believing that we are trying to be useful, and I believe that of the members of the Liberal Party, and if it needs re-statement I re-state it now.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that we, the same as other parties in the House, do not feel that we are representing a special group, we do not think that we are making a special plea for one group in society. We do feel that certain people in society have not been getting a square deal and we don't make any apologies for bringing that to your attention. But I don't think that when we speak in favour of a position of a trade union on a particular aspect that we are therefore defending a criminal element which my honourable friend said exists in the United States trade union movement. This is when they speak of the rights of management. I don't regard them as defending people like Paton and Cox or the people in Prudential Finance who stole securities. When they are speaking of free enterprise I know that they are not defending those people, and when we are speaking of the rights of the working man to be treated the same way as everybody else in society, I want my honourable friend to accept the fact that I am not defending a person who has been found guilty of a criminal act in relation to trade unions.

I have from time to time suggested that certain acts have been made criminal which should not have been criminal, such as the walking up and down the streets with signs, but I am not defending the criminal conduct that my honourable friend has alluded to, and I hope that we make ourselves understood to one another on that basis, that we don't disagree with each other's sincerity; we think that they are sincere, but they are wrong, and I heard the Honourable Member for Lakeside say it in a very fine way yesterday. He thinks that we are sincere and I'm positive that he thinks that we are wrong, and I say that that's a perfectly legitimate opinion and I know that he allows that same luxury - or not luxury, that same privilege to myself to think the other way.

My honourable friend for St. Boniface makes a big point of the "compulsory", and this has been the label that has been stamped on this Medicare program by the Progressive-Conservative Party, the label which is continually being used to identify this program by the Liberal Party, and the label which has been used most continuously by the doctors - that this is a compulsory program. Well I'd like to examine that particular feature because that's the feature of medical care which has troubled me ever since the program was brought in in the Province of Saskatchewan. That is, that certain political groups say that a program is compulsory because everybody has to contribute to the support of it. That's the only compulsory feature of the program that I know of; that is, that everybody in the Province of Manitoba will have a responsibility for seeing that this program is in existence. (When I say a responsibility I mean a financial responsibility); that nobody can say that "I don't wish to support this program," and that is the compulsory feature of this medical care program, I take it. There's no other compulsory feature. Nobody, for instance, has to go to a doctor, and has to say that "I wish my medical fees paid through this program." They can say to the doctor, "I don't believe in the Manitoba Medical Care Program and therefore I want to obtain my medical care

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . aside from the program," and the Doctor can say the same thing that "I won't accept you as a patient if you are going to pay me through the Manitoba Medical Care Program." So there's no other compulsory feature. The only compulsory feature is that everybody has a responsibility to see that the program is in existence.

Well if that's the case - and I think that it is and I let myself be corrected by the honourable members for the Liberal Party and the Progressive-Conservative Party if I'm wrong - then why don't we introduce this language in every other area? Why don't we start talking about our compulsory public schools program? And if anybody should talk that way it's the member for St. Boniface, because he believes that everybody should have the right to go to whatever school system they want to, and that if they pay money to -- if they don't make use of the public schools program that their taxes should go to the school of their choice - in this case some private school which they feel their taxes should be paid to rather than the public school which they don't use. But I haven't heard him yet refer - and maybe he's done it but I haven't heard him - refer to the compulsory public school system, which is compulsory on the very same basis that everybody had to contribute towards maintaining a public school system. Not everybody has to go to it but they have to contribute to it.

Why don't we start talking about the compulsory fire protection system, because that's the only basis upon which it's compulsory. Nobody has to call the fire department especially if they're not in an area, as I've said before, where the fire could overlap to somebody else's property. They could permit their home to burn to the ground and not call the fire department, or else they could maintain - and some people do maintain - an entire fire protection system within their own building, but they cannot be relieved of the responsibility for providing a public fire system. They don't have to use it but they cannot be relieved from providing it, but we don't speak of the compulsory fire system.

Well why not refer to the compulsory police protection program, because nobody has to avail themselves of the services of a policeman. They could say that property was stolen, that they don't care; they're not going to call the police in to do it or else they could say that they're going to hire a private detective to catch the thief and get back their property. But if they said that, they couldn't avoid assuming the social responsibility of paying for the fire protection system, or for the police system.

Or, to take a still more sensitive example, what about this compulsory nuclear weapons program? Over half the people in this country in the federal election in 1962, voted against the party which said that we should accept nuclear weapons in Canada and pay for them. Over half the people said that they were against it. Then the Liberal Party was elected in 1962 and they went into this compulsory nuclear protection program whereby every citizen in Canada had to assume the financial responsibility of paying for that program whether they wanted it or not. But we don't refer to it as a compulsory program.

Now what is the difference between programs of this kind and the medical care program, and why, whether we are Socialist or any other "ist", do we accept programs of this kind without argument? What is the basic feature that distinguishes them from programs which we don't want or which some people don't want as now suggested by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. In the one case - and I think the Honourable Member for Lakeside put his finger on it yesterday exactly, in a very definitive way - in the one case we say that the provision of this service, whatever it may be - and let's take the fire protection service - is not an individual responsibility; it's our social and collective responsibility. We say that this isn't something that society says that the individual must do; this is something that we say that if we're to do it properly, we have to do it socially, therefore recognizing that we have a social responsibility for the provision of adequate education, for the provision of adequate health, for the provision of fire departments or for public defence, for mosquito control; that recognizing these things, we say that there is a social responsibility on all of us to see to it that these services are provided. Whether they are used or not is an individual responsibility, but no one can escape the social responsibility by saying that he individually doesn't want it. And the argument between us, between my honourable friends in the Liberal Party and I suspect in the Conservative Party and the members in this group, the difference between us is that we say that there are many things, many more things for which we should accept social responsibility, and the members of the other parties say that we are already assuming social responsibility for too many things, some of them should be cut back on, or at least we should go no further.

Now that's the only difference between us. My honourable friend needn't identify it with

(MR. GREEN cont'd).....Communism, needn't identify it with any other "ism". That is the dividing line. Some people, and myself included, myself included - and I speak for myself - would be prepared to accept social responsibility for a great many things, but I do that as an individual. My Party has a position of accepting social responsibility for a number of things, one of which is the provision of adequate health care in society, and I am in perfect agreement with that program. What the Member for St. Boniface is saying, and all that he is saying, is that his party doesn't feel this is a social responsibility. He feels that it's an individual responsibility, and if any particular individual can't afford it then the state should give that individual charity so that he wouldn't suffer. That's his position.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd just like to make a point clear. I said I was speaking for myself on this, not the Liberal Party. I repeated that three or four times. You said you're speaking for yourself. So am I.

MR. GREEN: Yes. Right. Mr. Speaker, the Member spoke for himself. I seemed to detect his remarks as being a fairly accurate presentation of the views of the Liberal Party as I've heard them in this province. I've heard the Leader of the Liberal Party speak on this subject. I think he has said that "we think that the medical care program in this province is a good one. Where an individual can't participate in it, we think that he should be given the assistance of society, so that he will not suffer." I think that the Member for St. Boniface took the same position. And I say that that's a sincere position. I happen to think it's the wrong position but it's a sincere position, and I think that they take it because they think that's the best way of providing health care and still maintain individual freedom. We on this side feel, Mr. Speaker, that the best way of providing medical care and the best way of achieving individual freedom, is through the kind of program we suggest, and if you want to make it completely voluntary - and I agree with that; I agree that it should be a completely voluntary program - wipe out the premium. You won't have to worry about putting people in jail because they didn't pay a premium; you won't have to worry about a bureaucracy, and I know the Member for Lakeside doesn't like bureaucracies. Wipe out the premium. Have this paid for out of general revenues, out of your anticipated sales tax, but wipe out the premium. Then it's a perfectly voluntary program. Nobody has to be called upon to pay premiums and everybody is entitled to the use of medical care. That would be a truly voluntary position and that's not far from the position -- as a matter of fact I didn't hear the Minister of Health from the Liberal Party in Ottawa when he was here, but I think this is what he said: "Oh, you could have had it perfectly voluntary; you didn't have to finance it by a premium. You could have eliminated the premium, financed it yourself and then it's a perfectly voluntary program." And I agree with that. --(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Speaker, there's no such thing as voluntary taxation so unless we are prepared to refer to every program that is financed by taxation as a compulsory program, let's stop talking about the compulsory Medicare program, unless we want to attach that adjective to every program instituted by this government that's financed by general taxation. --(Interjection)-- Well, if you wish to do it, then start doing it. Start going out to the people and then the issues will be very clearly divided as between us and the other parties. There wouldn't be any more of this blur in the centre that different people talk about. You go ahead and say that we are going to continue our compulsory public schools program in the Province of Manitoba; we are going to institute our compulsory program for industry and commerce for the moneys that we spend in this department to attract workers from overseas so as to keep the wages low. All of these things should be referred to as our compulsory programs, and we will refer to them as voluntary and let's see who's right on it. But I say that this is not the representation. It's only when you are dealing with a program that you don't like, that you would really rather do without - and the Minister's made himself perfectly clear on this - that you attach this adjective to try and make that program something that the public should not recognize as being the right way of doing things, because really what the Member for Lakeside said is correct: it's a recognition that we were right and you people were wrong, and therefore you have to attach the adjective "compulsory" in order to show that we were forced into this even though it's the wrong program.

The Member for St. Boniface says that we have not only a responsibility, but we have a duty or a right -- not only a right but a duty to help the underprivileged. And that's the basis of the Liberal Party program; that if there are underprivileged people they should have their Medicare premiums paid for them. Well Mr. Speaker, it may sound idealistic, but I say that our party is attempting to establish, our party is saying that we have a responsibility to see to it that there are no underprivileged. Now we may not get there but we say that that

(MR. GREEN cont'd)....is the objective. To see not that the underprivileged are looked after, but that there are no underprivileged. That's our objective. And we say that it's not true that our way encourages the free-loaders in society. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface says that Socialism encourages free-loaders; that if you give people all they want they won't work. Mr. Speaker, he's wrong and he knows he's wrong. We in this party believe that man is most creative, is most productive when his material and essential needs are taken care of. And hasn't that been the case? Haven't the frustrated and unproductive people been people who haven't been able to have their security looked after? And hasn't the opposite been true, that when a person is not concerned with the material things of life he is able to be more and more creative? Who are the people who work the hardest in public affairs, in doing free public work, for nothing - for no material reward? The people whose material needs are taken care of; the people who do not have to worry about want and deprivation, are the most productive people, and if I believed, as my honourable friend from St. Boniface surely does, that providing people with their needs will make them lazy, then I would be a free enterpriser. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that when a person's material needs are satisfied, he becomes three and four and five and ten times more desirous to produce and able to produce than he was before these needs are satisfied. And this is why, Mr. Speaker -- does my honourable friend from St. Boniface want to get up? Yes, go ahead.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to say that if this is what you believe in there's no end to this. The next thing that will be compulsory - bring them their food, and so on. What is the line? Now you tried to describe the line between us, and what is the line between Communism and this line of thought, then?

MR. GREEN: Well Mr. Speaker, I wasn't discussing the matter in the abstract. I was discussing it as it relates to a comprehensive medical care program, and I say that wherever that line is, it lies to the left of a comprehensive medical care program. I'm not going to try and identify the line. Different people in this group differ on where that line is, and different people in your group obviously differ on where that line is. All I know for sure at the moment is that I'm certain that the line lies to the left of providing a comprehensive medical care program; that we recognize a social responsibility for saying that every person in Canada, rich and poor, and I don't care who it is, I think that society is responsible for seeing to it that the millionaire's child gets his health care needs without direct payment. Yes, I believe that and I believe that society's responsibilities -- it's the same as the public school system.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's a waste of money.

MR. GREEN: I don't think it's a waste of money at all. Mr. Speaker, I say that everybody should be treated on the same basis. I'm not at all concerned that I'm going to give health care to somebody who can afford it, just as I am not at all concerned that we are providing thousands of dollars of educational opportunities to people who could afford it if the state didn't provide it. It doesn't concern me in the least. I think that this is the way society should operate. And I repeat that we will not be less productive; that the hangers-on, that the people who have lived on charity...

MR. DESJARDINS: The free-loaders.

MR. GREEN: You call them free-loaders? What is it -- the Member for Emerson, he called them "the bearded goons on the picket line" and I'll never forget that. That's what he called them; that these people are the result of the system that we believe in; but they've always been a characteristic of the system that you believe in. Give us a chance and see whether we reduce them or increase them. I suggest that they'll be reduced; they'll be reduced materially, and that's the difference between our thinking. It hasn't got anything to do with "isms"; it hasn't got anything to do with making people less productive. It's a difference of approach and we think that you're sincere; we think that you're wrong. We think that the fellows over here in the government benches, we think the same of them, but we think, Mr. Speaker, that the way in which we are approaching these matters -- and I want to deal with one more point that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface made.

He said that the Manitoba people are now getting good health care and that if we establish this system we're going to need a lot more doctors. Well that could only mean one of two things. It can only mean one of two things: it means that if we are now getting good health care and we're going to need a lot more doctors, then what he is saying is that there are some people who are not now going to the doctors who will go to the doctors if this service is provided. Now he is evidently saying, evidently saying that these people are going to use the service when they don't need it, and that's why you should have a utilization fee. If that's the

(MR. GREEN cont'd)...case, then my honourable friend believes - and he can correct me if I'm wrong - that the 70 percent of the population or the 60 percent of the population who now have that privilege -- I am a MMS member and no doubt most of the members in this House are MMS members. What he is saying is that we 70 percent, we don't use more medical service than we need because we're good people. The 30 percent who are not now in the service and who are, by the way, the low income level of our society, by and large, that if they get the service because they are bad people they will over-utilize it. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that those people will no more over-utilize the service than we are, and I respect the sincerity, not only of the members of the Liberal party and the Members of the Progressive Conservative Party, but the sincerity of all of the citizens in the Province of Manitoba that they don't consider their doctor half as popular as the Member for St. Boniface thinks they do.

I think that most people like to stay away from a doctor. I'm one that does in any event. I don't think people are going to run to the doctor's door because they now have an MMS service, any more than people are going to run to have dinner out and drink beer because we are going to open the places on Sundays. --(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm concluding my remarks; I've wanted to deal mostly with what was said by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. I hope I impressed him with the idea that if we differ it is not because we say they are sincere or we say that you are - that we differ because we think they are wrong and undoubtedly he thinks we are wrong.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, I am going to take a little different line of approach in regards to this Medicare bill. I think that of all the remarks that have been made this morning and the Utopia that my honourable friend from Inkster would like to arrive at, he seems to have overlooked one fact, the fact that we're trying to say, that we shall set up a medical scheme and we forgot the one person. The one person is the only person that can make it work - is the Doctor.

I'm going to suggest to you, Sir, that we are in a state of crisis in Manitoba in regards to lack of doctors. I don't think this is an unknown fact, I think statistics have proved out that in comparison to other countries we do not have the doctors per hundred, per thousand of population they have in a lot of countries, and I'm going to suggest to you that if we move outside of Winnipeg under this scheme we're going to take a look at where you're going to have one employee, who is the doctor under this scheme, who will have the responsibility of looking after roughly from 1,500 to 2,000 people. I'm going to suggest to you, and I'm not a doctor, that if they even want to have one medical a year it will be 2,000 hours - and we're talking about minimum wages, we're talking about wage scales and all the rest of it. Now we're forcing on a class of people on a compulsory basis that these people to be remunerated have to say all right we'll opt out or we'll take their services.

The Minister made the statement in his presentation of the Bill that he hoped that we would come into the picture similar to the HCX plan which was a full range of services at the patients home or physicians home including immunizations, injections, allergy, medical examinations and tests, including basal metabolism test, heart tracings, brain tracings, laboratory and X-ray services. Mr. Speaker, for those of you living in the City of Winnipeg this doesn't mean too much because most of the clinics have this, this is a service that is being provided; but I'm going to suggest to you that in all of the hospitals outside of Winnipeg this has been a big fight to get the X-ray and lab technician services in the hospital to give the people the proper care and tests that they could get under the Health Services Act. Now under this Bill you're going to force doctors to either put equipment in to do this type of testing in the rural areas - or what? Charge it up to the health services, to the health units? Mr. Speaker, in my opinion young doctors will not tolerate that kind of a system; you're going to have them either all move to a central area and leave everybody else out in the prairies with nothing - and you're going to charge the people a premium to say we can give you the service. Mr. Speaker, it's impossible! You're selling something that you can't provide in my opinion - that's exactly what you're doing.

And there's another thing too. I think, in my opinion, I've mentioned this before when the Minister of Education was Minister of Health some years ago, and I still believe this thing. You've got a class of people working in areas who are part of a community and for gosh sakes you're taking away the only incentive they have to be a part of a community, to the service they give, to give good medical service to people that can't afford it. This is wrong. This is absolutely wrong. Forcing them by a piece of legislation to say look - you've got to go and if you can't pay it the government will pay it. No incentive, no incentive; I know. Mr. Speaker, I can

(MR. DOW cont'd)...say this from personal experience, my son is a doctor; and I don't want to bring his name into it. I have many acquaintances, I have driven with them. You say the people can't afford it. I have driven with these individual doctors who have gone through the various rural communities and they've made legitimate calls and calls and calls. They don't even write them down, they don't charge them. These people are getting the service today from our doctors, and when you say by this type of legislation I believe we have a good system in Manitoba, I believe we're getting good medical care and for gosh sakes why are we going to take away all these incentives from one class of people - the Doctors. Take it away from them - to benefit who? I'll ask you, Who's going to benefit? These people are not being deprived of services.

MR. DOERN: ...vote against the plan.

MR. DOW: I might do that too. You make your speech when you want to.--(Interjection) --Yes where it's not so healthy in there, the usual place. Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to agree with my colleague from St. Boniface, and here again I'm speaking personally, this is not a Party deal. I don't agree that Ottawa has forced this. I don't agree. I've read some of Mr. McEachen's statements in Hansard, of which, part of it I'll read from some of the quotes I have in which he says, "In my discussions with the provinces as to what percentage of coverage the Federal Government will be prepared to view as universal if a premium system of financing were adopted, I have agreed for the initial period of coverage 90 percent would be acceptable." Mr. Speaker, I understand that the offer was made of 80 percent by the provinces - an offer was made by the province that they would accept this on a voluntary scheme at 80 percent, right?

Surely, surely, Mr. Speaker, will all the debate we've had in the last few days in regards to paying advertising firms to setup how to collect sales tax, what a sales tax means, surely a few dollars -- and just this morning the First Minister said to me you're quite good at voting for spending of money. I said I haven't altogether advocated -- but here Mr. Speaker, I'm advocating this that if we spent a little money surely within the next year and a half till July of '68, if we couldn't prevail on the people of Manitoba to increase from the 70-odd percent they have now to the 90 percent and stay on a voluntary system - and for gosh sakes let's leave these doctors run their own show. You're going to drive them out of the province by this fact of offering all of these services which you cannot produce.

I'd like the Minister to answer the question: how much does it cost a Doctor to setup his own place to give the services he says he's going to offer? It's a lot of money. These young people are not going to put it up. Does this come into a fact then that the province must equip these places? In my opinion, Sir, we've got a system, under the health unit system where people can go under direction of doctors, health nurses, and they can get their tests and come back to the doctor for diagnosis. But in this plan, uh uh, we're going to be paid for this. Can't you see the ultimate clime? It's a disastrous scheme in money but it's more disastrous in the fact that you're not going to have the personnel to provide the services in the outlying areas.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable member a question.

MR. DOW: Yes.

MR. PETURSSON: If the doctors are to be driven out of the province by the introduction of this plan, where will they go to after July 1st, 1968?

MR. DOW: Oh I wouldn't answer, it's so ridiculous. There's hundreds of places.

MR. PETURSSON: Where would they go?

MR. DOERN: Would you submit to a question?

MR. DOW: Yes, sure.

MR. DOERN: If you're so concerned about the rural areas and what you say can and can't be done, are you aware of the resolution that is put forward by the Honourable Member for Neepawa.

MR. DOW: What about it?

MR. DOERN: For dissemination of medical services all around the province supported by the government.

MR. DOW: That's what I'm saying.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 12:30 and I'm leaving the Chair to... order please!

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I was prepared to adjourn debate on this question.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I'm afraid I overlooked that point.

MR. CHERNIACK: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I again repeat, it is now 12:30 and I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 2:30 this afternoon.