

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 19, 1968

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Before we proceed I wonder if I may direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 30 members of the Rossburn 4-H Club. These members are under the direction of Mrs. Johnston. Their homes are located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I have now confirmed approval from Ottawa to release the report on the Churchill Development Plan. I wonder if I might have leave of the House to table the report.

MR. PAULLEY: We have no objections at all to leave being granted to the Minister. I asked her the other day whether this would require leave from the Federal House. She thought at that time yes. I'm glad that we don't have to await federal authorization for the tabling and I'm glad to receive it.

MR. SPEAKER: I might add the tabling of the report will be a great relief to me also.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, thank you. It's good to be back again after that little while the other day. I shall try not to repeat too much of what I tried to say last Tuesday but I think most of us, I think all of us being human beings, it might possibly be in order if I take the trouble of trying to read the resolution again, at least the operative part of it. And it reads thus: "Therefore Be It Resolved that the Law Amendments Committee of the House be instructed to undertake during this session a review of the sales tax and the effect and make recommendations to the House."

I shall try and make a few remarks in regards to this resolution, and I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that if this resolution were adopted that it could give a lot of people, or at least certain classes of people, an opportunity to review the matter of taxation and to take a re-examination to some of the matters that are of great concern and causing undue bitterness and the like. And I think that we have to agree that after this tax being in for nearly a year now, I think we have to agree that from time to time we have to take a look at things all over again.

However, Mr. Speaker, the main item that I wish to bring up, or at least I'm going to try to bring up in my comments, is the double and the triple taxation of goods bought at auction sales. This is possibly a good example of why we should have a Law Amendments Committee and I do hope that the Members of this House take this resolution serious because there are a lot of points, although I only intend to more or less stick with the one, I'm sure that other members will bring up other matters concerning the importance of this committee.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the situation arising out of auction sales is of great concern to a lot of people in Manitoba, and it involves a lot of people. I doubt if very many members are aware in this House of the number of people it involves. I have no official figures to prove how many people it involves, but I certainly believe I can give you an idea. An average auctioneer will possibly have from 25 to 35 auction sales a year, and more than likely there will be an attendance of from two to 400 people at these sales, and you can readily see that possibly six to 7,000 people are involved just attending the sales of one auctioneer. I am certain that all of us know that there are two and three and five auctioneers possibly in each of your constituencies and when you take the 57 constituencies it amounts to a lot of people concerned, and I think I would just like to mention a few things that take place.

I wouldn't doubt it a bit if there were possibly 150 to 250,000 people going to auction sales each year, and one of the points that I wish to bring up - if a Law Amendments Committee were set up that it isn't just a matter of revenue in this case where auction sales are concerned, it is also a matter of being practical and a matter of being fair to certain conditions. Now I believe that possibly my attention is maybe more on farm auctions than on city auctions but certainly it applies very much to the town, village and city auctions that are held across Manitoba.

I think I mentioned the other day that the main point that this committee should consider is the fact that so many of these goods are doubly taxed, even triply taxed, sometimes four and five times over. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is - there is no doubt in my mind - and I see another auctioneer, the Honourable Member for Morris, I think he can verify some of

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) these statements — there is no doubt in my mind that this is actually happening in nearly every community and in every constituency other than possibly not quite as many in the city constituencies.

It is hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, that whoever drew up these rules, and I'm not blaming the Provincial Treasurer particularly, but I think that whoever had the nerve, if I may use the word, in taxing some of the things at auction sales, should have the kindness toward these people to make sure that a review can be made of this matter. I want to make it very clear that if I speak of auction sales, I am basically speaking of goods bought, of used goods bought by people, such as clothing and other things, and farm goods bought at auction sales. I'm not referring, I'm not saying that used automobiles or the like should not be taxed. I am certainly not including them at this time. And I think we know that goods bought at auction sales are nearly always used goods. Very very seldom are they new goods and this of course makes it important that a review and a re-examination should be made as to which articles should be taxed or not. And I don't mind saying here as late as last Wednesday— why I say I think we ought to be practical about this thing, last Wednesday I happened to have an auction sale bring less than \$1,300.00. The whole sale, the revenue that the government was getting was less than \$9.00. A week before that an auction sale that I held totalled around \$9,000.00. The whole amount was only \$11.31. And I want to point this out also because I think it just isn't practical, and I don't think that the government would lose so much revenue, I think it's the bitterness and the resentment that takes place at these sales, leave alone the embarrassment of the auctioneer — especially if he is not on the government side — to mention this at every auction sale that the tax will apply on certain articles. But it exists and we have to face the facts as they are.

Now my point, Mr. Speaker, is basically on — not so much on only the double taxation in nearly all cases, but I know that the Honourable Member for Morris and myself and other auctioneers, could certainly point out where we've had auction sales for the second or third or fourth, or even the fifth time, and I'm sure he could possibly mention sales that he's had on the same farm on the same homestead for the fifth or sixth time. And I think that this could be called a lot of names. I don't want to go into triple or sixth time taxation. I believe that people should have a chance to get a hearing on this.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, I think it's putting an extra burden on individuals for very often farmers already caught in the inflationary situation that we hear of so often in this House, and to put it in the words of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture "certainly in the present agriculture cost-price squeeze" this is just a little bit of an added burden that is really a nuisance to a great extent.

Now I have mentioned I just can't see the point in the little amount of revenue received from this type of an auction sale. I just think it isn't fair when you read your sections of The Manitoba Revenue Tax Act when you see that a manure shovel, a fuel tank or a wheelbarrow, or a pump used to water your cattle, or used glass sealers, sold for the tenth time at an auction sale. They are taxable. Sure the Minister may say that put a little prune or a little cherry or a little raisin into the sealer, then you can sell it as food and they are not taxable. But this is not really the intention of the Act I'm sure. But I do believe — (Interjection) — I think he knows. I do say this, that if there are articles such as farm batteries or thresher belts and the like, if they ought to be taxed if they are not used for farm uses, fine. I have no axe to grind on that. But I do believe that an affidavit signed by a farmer would certainly do. It happens to do in the federal case; it happens to do in other matters of taxation. I certainly think it should be worthwhile when a farmer signs an affidavit, and if he uses that battery in his tractor, fine.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that this government does not want to take revenue of this nature, because the amount is very negligible really. And basically it is money that should not be taken from farmers, not only farmers in a lot of cases, as I mentioned, there are possibly 200,000 people a year attending these auction sales. There's a lot of newlyweds; a lot of immigrants, come to these sales that are buying used coats. This may in itself already be discriminatory to a certain extent but if they are willing to wear these and willing to pay for them, I think this committee would certainly like to look into it and possibly say, well let's take another look at it. Let's adjust a thing like this. Surely this is not what this government or anybody else has in mind. I don't think that is the intention, and I think we should take a very very serious look into this matter by setting up a Law Amendments Committee and possibly

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) we could get at the problem.

As I said before, I'm not asking this government or this committee, if it were formed - I'm not asking them to cancel the five percent tax on used automobiles at this time. I think that would be going too far but I do want to emphasize strongly once you start taxing the same articles, and this happens every day, other than in wintertime, this happens every day in Manitoba. Once articles are being taxed four, five and six times, the emphasis then should be that surely we must take another look at this thing, especially if it isn't bringing in the revenue that the Minister must have had in mind when he put it up, and I think this is where we have to consider putting up a committee so that this can be looked into. And I'm sure that if this committee was appointed, and their suggestions were followed, I think this could even give the government a lot less work because perhaps some of our so-called scrap buyers who are licensed might to some extent diminish since then they would not have to buy some of these goods under this licence area, might possibly not even be tempted to take some of those goods home for their own use, and I think it would avoid a lot of licences that people buy now for - actually for the right use of buying scrap and so many other things that I wonder - and I'm not questioning that they are not honest about this, but I am sure it creates a lot of work in the department and I think would be remedied by a committee.

It might sound like small peanuts to the members in this House, Mr. Speaker, but I am very serious that it is a big thing out in the country and even so, to a lot of people in the cities, and I must again emphasize that it isn't a matter of just saying, now try and cancel these taxes. It's a matter of looking at certain aspects that are being taxed, and certainly this is not asking too much. Possibly the answer then does lie in a Law Amendments Committee hearing out the pros and the cons of any matter. I am basically bringing up the auction sale matter. I am sure there are many other things that could be discussed and would be discussed if this committee were formed. But I certainly am of the opinion that with the little revenue that the government would lose, by listening to this committee if it were formed, and listening to the people, if they had a chance to voice their opinion, I simply got to the point where I think it's a nuisance, plus to some extent, unfair to a certain class or to certain people.

I have possibly said enough on that, Mr. Speaker. I think I would like to just end up with reviewing again, and mentioning again, that the confusion and the bitterness this is causing at auction sales. I know that in certain areas if you want to try and conduct a sale, you will find it hard to get a secretary, or a secretary-treasurer I should say, they just don't want to be bothered with a nuisance. And I can point out, although it's a very minor thing to a lot of you here, I can point out that under one auction sale, you will possibly have 70 items of three and five and 23 and 37 cents, and it just gets to be a nuisance in this respect. I know that I'm possibly one of the poorest politicians to bring up this matter to the opposite side because I think as far as I am concerned, it's the best thing politically that can happen to anyone that wants to get elected other than the government that's in power, because it's getting to be such a nuisance of these three and five and 37 cent items, and I wish to point this out as convincingly as I can that surely this is not the kind of tax this committee would recommend, and if the committee would recommend not having that kind of tax, surely this government would not want that kind of a tax.

I would also, Mr. Speaker - I've centered my thought basically on auction sales; I feel that the problem is just as serious as I've said a couple of times in many other fields, and I do hope though, I want to stress this emphatically, that I think that if we want to make sure that the taxes should not be an oppressive burden on individuals, and if we want to make sure that the taxes should not discourage development, and much could be said on that, then we should, we should certainly all of us vote for this resolution, because I don't think in a lot of cases that taxes are fair and not even practical.

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

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Virden, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. D. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank all members who

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd.) took part in this resolution under my name and the amendment, the sub-amendment, and still this present amendment that I intend to speak to.

I don't agree, Mr. Speaker, with all of the approaches of some of the members, but I do appreciate some of the points that they drew out. I can think of the Honourable Member from Springfield who said a few days ago, who can operate without a positive pay day, and I think this is the main point of my thoughts when I put this resolution on the Order Paper, as this resolution would give a positive pay day for the grain farmers.

The Honourable Member from Brokenhead referred to the Wheat Board not exactly expressing appreciation for it being advised or it being talked to of a change of policy. But I think these are changing times, Mr. Speaker, and any board should take a directive from the people the thousands of farmers who are greatly affected by — (Interjection) — Yes, Mr. Minister, it was set up expressively for the benefit of the farmers, and I think this is part of this resolution.

I also would like to thank the news media for the coverage that this resolution was given, not only here in the Province of Manitoba but to our farm province to the west, and namely, Saskatchewan, Regina, Yorkton and Saskatoon TV and radio stations gave this very full coverage which I appreciate.

But, Mr. Speaker, no resolution has real weight unless it is well debated and I do compliment the members who took part in this debate because I think it is the pros and cons and when the reaction comes back from the constituents involved, one knows whether he's on the right track or not.

I also compliment the Wheat Board for the way they run their business and listening to some opposition members who were trying to lead that I'm opposed to the Wheat Board, but couldn't be farther from the truth. I do appreciate what they're doing, but I do say there's adjustments from time to time.

The main purpose of this resolution was to stabilize to some extent the grain farm operator as the trend today is away from the farm by our young, prospective farmers who don't feel that there is enough stability in the farm operation or a firmness of policy, and this trend is extremely dangerous to the economy of this part of Canada, and indirectly for all Canada, but more especially the rural parts.

Now as to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, I could possibly support his idea that we have representatives from the Wheat Board to discuss the whole matter. But, Mr. Speaker, the resolution was simply to draw the attention of the Wheat Board of the desirability of having a firm date which the final payments be made. And from support I've received from so many farmers and farm organizations, it would seem to indicate to me that it was a pretty good idea, and I might say these farmers and farm organizations that have been contacting me are not all from Manitoba but from the other provinces greatly affected, and I might say my boundaries do touch Saskatchewan and I do associate with many Saskatchewan farmers and I have had no — their expression has been certainly the way that I'm trying to say it here.

I know that the Wheat Board officials have indicated that they would have some difficulty in doing this at the present time and I say, as I said in my opening remarks, this is the responsibility of the Treasury of Canada and we know that they have a direct interest in this. But they don't say it couldn't be done, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat, they did not say it could not be done. For this reason I would ask the members to defeat the amendment of the Honourable Member from Gladstone and support my resolution as it stands because it is to the betterment of all Canada and especially the grain farmers in western Canada. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I know that this resolution has been under discussion for some time. I don't intend to unduly prolong the debate on the subject matter. I just wanted to make the observation that I don't really take the position that I should oppose either the main motion or the amendment thereto in that both are relatively good motions before the House. I don't see anything wrong with consulting with the Canadian Wheat Board such as has been suggested by the members to my right. I think possibly it's a step in the right direction, so if I may just say these words, Mr. Speaker, I think we've explored the subject matter. I want to say that I support the amendment to the motion and I also subsequently will support the main motion.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: With regard to the next resolution standing in my name, I may say that I have given this some consideration. In my opinion the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye is a substantive motion. On Tuesday the 9th of April the honourable Member adjourned the debate and by doing so he indicated to the House his intention of closing the debate on that subject. On rising on Tuesday, April 16th, he informed the House that he had taken the adjournment in favour of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. This I find is contrary to the established practice of this House and it is also a contravention of our Rule 46, Item 2, which reads as follows: "Subject to Rule 36, the mover of a substantive motion must reply although the debate thereon by being adjourned becomes an Order of the Day." Technically speaking the Honourable Member closed the debate on that day by having risen and spoken as he did thus nullifying the opportunity of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell to make his contribution. Notwithstanding that which has gone before, I feel the Honourable Member for La Verendrye might be afforded the opportunity of rising in his place and closing the debate at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, might I ask a question on the subject of the ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: I hope the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will realize my position and I must decline the question at this particular time. One leads to another as I hope he understands, but I have spoken to the Honourable Member for La Verendrye and explained to him what might be done if he cares to rise in his place at this time.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wouldn't have too much to add to what I said in my presentation of the resolution. I'm happy about the debate that went on and was very pleased to see the First Minister take part in the debate. However, I would say that it hasn't changed my mind at all on the subject. The First Minister said that he agreed with the "whereases" in my resolution, but said that the operative part should be changed to thanking the Minister of Agriculture for accepting the double portfolio and I don't intend to bring in a resolution to do that. I don't mind thanking the Honourable Minister for accepting both portfolios. However, this does not change my mind as far as criticizing the First Minister for, should I say loading the honourable gentleman with two ministeries. I do not say this as criticism of the persons themselves in the department; it's the decisions, it's the actions of the persons involved. I am still of the opinion that we should have a full-time Minister for the reasons that I gave at the time of the presenting the resolution. I would further say that in my opinion that when the First Minister was Minister of Highways he certainly had a full-time job, I think he did it well, he was the type of a person that looked after his department, knew it well, knew all the roads in the province, and sure made it a full-time job.

Now I have said it before and I say it again, there is a terrible amount of work to be done in the Department of Agriculture and this is the basis of my criticism for having the Minister of Agriculture having two portfolios. I realize that the Minister is not the only person in the Department but he is still the head of the Department. Like any other organization he is responsible for directives, for co-ordination and so on, and certainly the effects of the work of the department depend on the person who heads the department, just like a company, or a farm, or a corporation, or whatever it may be. So these are the main reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I certainly feel strongly that the department should be headed by a full-time Minister.

Now I also want to be fair and realize that this is a temporary situation. The First Minister pointed it out in his speech and I realize this. However if we are to be factual the situation is not different for agriculture than for Mines and Natural Resources because both changes were made at the same time. The Provincial Secretary who had Mines and Natural Resources was relieved by the appointment of the new Minister. And again I say that in my opinion there are other members in the Party who could accept a portfolio and therefore the Minister of Agriculture himself, or somebody else, could be full-time Minister of Agriculture.

So I suppose there is a lot more that could be said. However I don't like to repeat. This is my main point and I should say our group's attitude for presenting this resolution, and I hope it will be supported by the members of this House because actually it is for the benefit of agriculture in our province. As I said, it needs all the directive we can give it in this fast

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd.)... changing time. It's a difficult time for any Minister of Agriculture. There is an enormous amount to be done and certainly it deserves the full time attention of a Minister.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and nays. Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Fox, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; Nays, 30.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. James and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I would like this afternoon to take a share in the short debate on the resolution as it pertains to the recreation and recreational facilities insofar as it pertains to our children, and in some cases adults, in the Province of Manitoba.

I would like to commend the member, my colleague from St. James, for the intent that he expresses in this resolution and I would also like to commend the honourable Member for Seven Oaks insofar as the amendment that he has made thereto. I would like to discuss briefly the amendment firstly, and if I may be permitted to quote partly from the amendment as he states, "and be it further resolved that this House commend the municipal councils, school boards and community clubs for their efforts in providing recreation facilities despite their limited financial resource."

I would like to, Mr. Speaker, make it clearly understood that I am in wholehearted support with the intention as he expresses his feelings towards those people who play their part in making these things possible. However, that portion of his amendment, where he refers to in the therefore be it resolved that this House request enabling legislation to permit school boards and municipalities to initiate and enter into joint construction and development projects, for recreation, is I think another matter that I don't believe that I could quite concur in. I rather feel that the intent that the Honourable Member from St. James in that portion of the main resolution was to, in a better way probably, take advantage of the existing facilities that we now have, and rather, if I understand the purport of the amendment of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that he would like to see the councils in the various parts of the Province of Manitoba along with the trustees - that is the school boards - get together in probably building and constructing new facilities. I would like to say that at this time I don't think that I could go along with that thought.

Now as I understand my colleague the Honourable Member from St. James, that in his constituency he does have a complex that is well-suited for recreational purposes and I would like to commend him for the thought that he's extending, that he'd like to see this develop further throughout the Province of Manitoba, that is in the cities of Winnipeg, Brandon and all rural areas and other cities and towns in the province. I think we would do well to consider this, if there were some way in which we could establish means through legislation whereby municipal councils and boards of trustees could get together in making better utilization of the recreational facilities that we do have.

I know in my own constituency, when I think back over the years of the new schools that have been built, we have gymnasiums in these schools, and there must be some responsibility on the part of someone or some organization or some group to see that these facilities that have been built are cared for properly and probably would not be abused in any way. And while I think the thought that is in the mind of the Honourable Member from St. James that while it is fine to have these facilities - and I can think of times when different organizations within towns or communities would like to use the area that is used as physical fitness training and other purposes in the gymnasium areas of these schools - they are not allowed to do so because they don't get

(MR. EINARSON cont'd.)... the consent of the school board to do this.

I think with this thought in mind, Mr. Speaker, that this is certainly food for thought that we can improve or in developing some legislation whereby this could be accomplished. I do not know what the best authority would be to handle this, but in my opinion I would think possibly a municipal council would be the right body to take care of that task.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that while I am not in concurrence with the amendment to this resolution, I want to say that I do commend again the Honourable Member for St. James for bringing his resolution in and that is what I do support. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the amendment lost.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yeas and nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A Standing Vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Fox, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Pauley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Urski, and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; Nays, 30.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. Are you ready for the question on the main motion? The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly on the main motion and have some difficulty with it, because in the main it's a very watery sort of thing and doesn't say very much; it lacks real substance. Rather than saying that the municipal councils be encouraged to give leadership and direction, it doesn't say by whom they should be encouraged or who should give the direction. It's something that is difficult to oppose because there is so little there to disapprove of. If my honourable friend the mover of the motion were to be offered a glass of whiskey that was as well watered down as this motion is, then he would have difficulty in recognizing what it was he was really getting, other than water. But being happy with even the little he was getting, he would accept it, as I believe I would too, but it's an awful lot of water for a very little bit of whiskey.

We can't feel that everything that he says in here is true, that the recreational needs are on the increase, and at the same time there may be recreational facilities that are not being used to the maximum, and therefore we should urge those who have access to them to do that and encourage increased use. How can we oppose this? But there are areas in which there are few or any recreational facilities where somebody would have to - and I think on some higher level than the municipal councils who now are in charge of the recreation that is being given - if they do not have the leadership or the direction already, then someone must provide it and that someone unfortunately is not named in the resolution. It would probably be the Provincial Government and the various offices over which it has some rule and some control.

I recall days when I was on the Winnipeg School Board and the School Board was endeavouring through the Parks Board to have recreational facilities introduced of one kind or another - this was in the early 1940s and middle '40s on up into the 1950s - and through the City Council in Winnipeg, mainly through the council there was continued resistance against almost every step that the School Board was trying to initiate, but the pressure gradually built up through the development of public opinion until we did get what they called "tot lots", small playgrounds, and auditoriums in schools - which in many schools were non-existent - where recreational activities could be indulged in.

But this was the School Board, and I'm happy to say that if it had not been for the pressure of some of the members who represented what was then the CCF Party, we might not have many of these things in Winnipeg even yet. They were the ones who initiated the ideas and continued to push for them, to propagandize, and were instrumental in getting public opinions swinging that way. It may be that the mover of this motion would wish the New Democratic Party to take over and to encourage the municipal councils to give the leadership and the direction that he is now calling for, and I'm sure that the members of our group would be very happy to co-operate with him or the members on his side in helping to initiate some of

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.)... the very points that he is naming.

Now he lives in St. James - or he represents St. James. This is an urban community where many things are possible that are not possible in rural or even more isolated communities. I'm thinking - for some reason my mind keeps turning to the northern part of the province - I have lived in some isolated communities in my time, not for any long periods, but I feel that I have some insight into what many people in isolated communities have to put up with. I have visited a number and have known many people from them where for, well from the time that they were established, did almost completely without recreational facilities in the ordinary sense. Well, Gimli had the lake to swim in in the summertime and to skate on in the wintertime, to run dog teams over in the wintertime, if that can be regarded as recreation; but they did without such things as an indoor skating rink, an indoor curling rink and many other facilities.

I can remember as a boy out in Saskatchewan, with some of what we called the older boys, clearing snow off the ice on a creek and skating on that with a large bonfire up on the creek banks - and those were wonderful days. This was not organized recreation as it is ordinarily known, it was initiated and kept going purely by those who wished to indulge. Other than that, we as boys managed to get into trouble in one way or another or to keep out of it, but the towns were small and the facilities were limited, and nothing done other than the annual country fair which came once a year to divert the attention of young people from many things to which their attention should not have been attracted in the first place.

I am thinking of places up in the north now, such a place as Gillam which it was our privilege to visit the other day, a small settlement that had been living a very isolated existence with practically nothing in it until the Hydro moved in to develop the Kettle Rapids Falls for Hydro power, and it was on the initiative I believe of the Hydro people themselves rather than the government that various recreational facilities were put in there. This was not on the initiative of the community which had limited means and limited resources, as many small places have, and so now when we visited there we were able to walk into a very modern pool room with about eight tables. There was a large recreational hall also in the town where moving pictures could be shown, where dances could be held. There was a curling rink with three fine sheets of ice; there was a library, and of course television reaches into that area now and radio. The Member for Churchill is presenting a bill to the House calling for the - what is it - the incorporation of a golf club at Thompson? Whether this is on the initiative of the community or not, I don't know, but these things are brought in. At the same time, there are a great number of other places that have limited facilities or no facilities at all. I think of a complaint - there are many young people or some young people in these places, still there, not old enough to leave as yet, but as soon as they get an education their inclination is to move away.

The Department of Northern Affairs I think it was, in Ottawa, was one time discussing some of the problems in the North, and among others it was pointed out that the Eskimo birth rate was the highest known anywhere in the world; there were 108 births per thousand population. Some 44 of these died and that still left a birth rate of 64 per thousand population which is more than two and a half times as great as the general birth rate across the country. In discussing this, one of the men is reported as having said, "Of course you can't expect anything else with the Eskimo, after all they can't be expected to spend their whole time reading the Anglican Prayer Book," and so the only other form of recreation that they had, I leave it to your imagination.

Now this doesn't only apply to the Eskimo there. I remember seeing a movie on one occasion called "Tight Little Island" during the war years. Many of you may have seen it. In the opening scenes in that moving picture the comment was "these were simple folk who lived on this storm-beaten island and their pleasures were few" - and then you saw a shot of a door banging open and the children coming out, the largest right on down to the smallest. There was probably about 20 came running out that door. They were isolated and their pleasures were few.

Some provision had to be made in that community for recreation and one of these was the drinking of whiskey, which is by many frowned upon but it wasn't frowned upon by the inhabitants of this tight little island. When the news was brought to one old man because of the exigencies of war and so on the whiskey imports were no longer coming into the island, when the news was brought to this old man who lay sick in his bed that there was no more whiskey,

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.)... he turned over in his bed, faced the wall and died. There was nothing else to live for.

Now, whether it is whiskey or the raising of children that the Member from St. James has in mind I don't know, but he leaves it to the municipal councils to determine what form and to what extent the recreational facilities should reach. I am prepared to support his resolution, even watered-down as it is. I hope if I pay him a visit that his whiskey will be less watered-down —(Interjection)— occasionally, whenever it's given to me. Well, you know what plant is going up at Gimli; I have to give some support to what we would call home products.

As I say, I would like to see much more in this particular resolution than what there is, because there is, as the member from St. James himself agrees, there is a great deal to be done to use to the maximum the recreational facilities that exist here; there is a great deal to be done in places where the recreational facilities are limited down to the very narrow minimum that I have indicated in some other places. I would be happy to support your resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I do not intend to support this resolution. I think this resolution is completely meaningless, and if it contains anything at all, it's a criticism of the municipal councils of Manitoba for having done nothing.

I was of the impression, Mr. Speaker, that members of this Legislative Assembly had to be adults, 21 years of age, British subjects, before they could take their seats in this House. Evidently I have been naive in believing that an adult was a grown-up person, because what I have witnessed here today has convinced me that the members of this House are unable to separate the chaff from the wheat or the good from the bad, and they have turned down an amendment to a resolution which gave meaning and purpose to that resolution.

I am a little bit disgusted with the way this government has acted since it has taken office. For the last ten years it has turned down every resolution that was ever proposed by any member of the Opposition, or of the two Oppositions. But the strange thing is, Mr. Speaker, that after turning down most of these resolutions, you found them enacted into legislation say two or three years later, when they figured that the memory of the people of Manitoba was so dulled that they would imagine that that legislation was the child of the brain of the government.

I feel that in this House here, regardless of where a resolution emanates from, if it is a good resolution and is in the interests of the people of Manitoba, that it should be adopted by this House. I'm sorry to see the treatment that was accorded the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks resolution today when the government voted as one man in turning it down. You turned down a good resolution and you have left us with nothing, and I don't intend to support it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

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

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Could I speak on this for a minute before ...

MR. GREEN: Oh yes.

MR. BEARD: I would just like to point out to the Honourable Member from Wellington Mr. Speaker, that in talking about Gillam he forgot that they had a Go-Go Girl show on at 8 a.m. in the morning and I don't think you could match that in Winnipeg. —(Interjection)— We got there too late for that one. Also, in commenting on the Eskimo birth rate, you must take into consideration that they have to put up with a couple of months of 24 hours of sunshine, so I think maybe that would answer some of his questions.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, in his absence, may we have this resolution stand? If anyone wishes to speak he may do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, when this amendment was proposed by the Honourable the Member for St. John's - pardon me, for Inkster - the amendment, I noted that the Minister in charge of that department on the government side, indicated that he was prepared to support the resolution. On reading the resolution over carefully, Mr. Speaker, I must say I'm

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)..... surprised to see the government agree to the amendment as presented, and I must say that I am not prepared to support the amendment.

Some of what the amendment says I can agree with but the amendment, it seems to me, is absolutely contrary to the original resolution, because the original resolution proposes a partnership or a co-operation between government and private enterprise, in further exploration in the Province of Manitoba of our mineral potentials. The Act has already been passed, it's on our statute books, but the government so far has designated only a very small portion of the province where the Act is applicable. My resolution sought to extend that; to make the incentives available to all parts of the Pre-Cambrian shield, which is the area where we can hopefully expect to have major mineral finds in the next few years, but it wasn't a change in the concept of the incentives. The concept of the incentives initially, as started in Saskatchewan, was a co-operative venture between government and private enterprise. The amendment it seems to me is a complete change on this and it goes and states that what we need is an intensified public program for the exploration of our mineral potential.

Now admittedly it goes further on to say that we should develop mines to the maximum greatest possible benefit accruing the people of Manitoba - that part I agree with; that we should use co-operative or private enterprise, or crown corporations, or combination as necessary - that part I can agree with. But I cannot agree, Mr. Speaker, that the proper approach to the exploration system program is to scrap a co-operative venture between government and private enterprise and replace it by a public program of exploration. It seems to me that this is not the method by which we will get the maximum benefits in the Province of Manitoba. If my honourable friends propose it's in perfect keeping with their philosophy, because their philosophy is that the government should do everything. That isn't my philosophy. Mr. Speaker, and I reject it. My philosophy is that we should - the government should, yes, give leadership in all areas possible, but the people themselves in the final analysis are the ones who should be doing, and that government should co-operate - government should assist. But that the best way of developing our province in the final analysis, is to have the people themselves do it and that this is not the proper function of government, to take over as the exploration body for mineral resources. I don't think that that's the answer to our problem, this is why I had urged the government to intensify the program that it had, which I think is a sound program. I might point out that in the Province of Saskatchewan for example, which I think was the first province to initiate this type of program, they tell me that since 1965, when the program came in, they've had 12 companies undertaking exploration work in Saskatchewan. First of all - no, from 62 to 64, some 12 companies doing exploration work in Saskatchewan and their annual expenditures were something in the order of \$250 to 300,000.00. This was prior to the establishment of their incentive program. Starting in 1965 when the assessment program was established they've had 92 companies or individuals taking part in the exploration work of the province. In 1968 alone, just the one year, they anticipate that the exploration work by these companies is going to be some \$5 million. Compare that, Mr. Speaker, to a previous program, that is the previous period when there was no incentive program of between 250 and 300,000 per year changed to \$5 million per year. This is an indication of the effectiveness of the program. When you consider there were some 10 or 12 companies previously and now there are some 92 companies or individuals, it has been an effective program in Saskatchewan.

When we look at what the Federal Government has done, The Federal Government followed largely the Saskatchewan plan. It was passed through the Federal House in I believe 1966, the Order-in-Council was in August of '66, the actual program began in November - December 1966, and since that time, that is, say the 1st of January 1967, which is only barely a year and some months ago, the Federal Government has had a total of 74 corporate and individual applicants to the program and these related to 86 different exploration programs. The total expenditure under these programs was some \$11,650,000.00. This was the amount that private enterprise was prepared to put into an exploration program. The Federal Government's share, the incentive, was \$1,300,000.00. So the incentive program there again had benefit in getting private enterprise involved. And this Mr. Speaker it seems to me is the proper approach, on the one condition of course, that we protect at all times the interests of the taxpayer, that we make sure that when these companies do find something we get our share back and we participate in the programs. But this is the basis on which basically our mining laws and our mining Acts operate, that if corporations do find something then we

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)... participate in it. We may not be participating enough. This is something that I would be prepared to look at. We maybe should have a larger share of what is produced. But the first thing, Mr. Speaker, is to make sure that we produce something; and you can only produce in the mining area if you have exploration.

So with the evidence in Saskatchewan of an effective co-operative program, with the evidence in the federal field of an effective program where the incentives have been operational, I say this is the program that we should follow in the Province of Manitoba. That the first step the government has undertaken of passing the Act is a right step; that unfortunately they have failed to follow it up by making sure that the Act is effective; that at present - and I indicated originally in my discussion when I introduced the resolution - that at present a much too small portion of the province is covered. It is only that very small, relative to the whole of the area that is, it probably accounts only to oh, one-eighth of the area of the Precambrian Shield. It extends from roughly the mouth of the Winnipeg River at Pine Falls to three-quarters of the way up Lake Winnipeg, just that portion between Lake Winnipeg and the Ontario boundary is included. This is only a small portion of the Precambrian Shield.

One of the ministers when speaking in reply said, well we don't need to do it in the other areas because it's already being done. Mr. Speaker, I know that some of the companies are operational in the other areas but there hasn't been in my opinion sufficient work done. A great deal more needs to be done. A great deal more needs to be done by many small operators, by many private exploration groups, by many individual prospectors, because these are the ones who in past years have shown - and you can go through the records of the various mines found not only in Manitoba but elsewhere - most of the time it's been the individual prospector right out on the ground who in the final analysis has made the great find. Government has a responsibility I agree for the electro-magnetic surveys, for the air surveys and these in large part have been done. More will have to be done I know, because as time goes on, new methods come in, we can reach by the technical methods deeper in the ground and this has to continue, and I'm not objecting to that! but that on-the-ground work, that real surveying right down in the rocks themselves, must eventually be done by people who are there and can best be done by the individual prospectors. Certainly that has been the history of the mining development in Canada.

And so I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we would be better off to turn down this amendment which in my opinion is the wrong approach, it's the wrong philosophy as far as I'm concerned insofar as having the government do the whole thing, and go back to the original motion which is an approach that has worked elsewhere, a co-operative approach, an approach with government working with private enterprise and not government simply taking over the whole of the responsibility. I appeal to my honourable friends opposite, I suspect that the Minister did not fully read the resolution when he first indicated the government would support it. He spoke immediately after its introduction and I don't think that he had the full import of what was being proposed by my Socialist friends to the left; because what they are saying is, let the government do the whole thing. I don't think that that is the answer to our development.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my Honourable Leader has yielded so that I may ask a question to the Leader of the Opposition if he'll give an answer. I wonder if my capitalist friend would agree that the government is an instrument of the people, and that the people act through their government.

MR. MOLGAT: I certainly think that's the case, but whatever the people can do for themselves, I say they should be allowed to do it, not the government do it for them. My honourable friend can call me his Capitalist friend if he likes, Mr. Speaker, but I believe in people. I'm a free enterpriser and I think that the people themselves are the ones who can best determine what they need, can best do it, and in those areas where they can't then government steps in. Government doesn't step in to do the things that people can do for themselves better.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was quite interested in the remarks of the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party - most interesting. I don't know yet where he stands and where his Party stands insofar as the development of our mineral industry is concerned and the benefits toward the people of the Province of Manitoba as a result of the development of our mining industry. Because a few days ago in the first motion of confidence or non-confidence in the government my honourable friends of the Liberal Party joined the Socialist ranks in condemning the government because they weren't extracting more revenues from the developing

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... companies, mining companies in the Province of Manitoba. In a vote that was taken yesterday, my honourable friend voted against a motion dealing with the failure of the government to develop the natural resources and industries of the province that would accrue to the people of Manitoba a more fair return from our natural resource potential. So, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't know where my honourable friends of the Liberal rank stand. One occasion they appear to be sort of socialist inclined and then a day or two later they change the colour of their hides and become the champions of free enterprise. One of these days possibly we will know where they stand. I know where I stand; I know where my Party stands insofar as the development of the natural resources of Manitoba and indeed of Canada.

MR. MOLGAT: If you'd listened to my speech you'd know where we stand.

MR. PAULLEY: As a matter of fact I did listen to my honourable friend and the more I listened to my honourable friend participating in the various debates, the more confused that I become and I'm sure Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is confused at all times and does not clearly delineate except on the basis of political expediency where he and his party stands from time to time.

MR. MOLGAT: Let us stay awake and alert.

MR. PAULLEY: Now my honourable friend just a moment or two ago insofar as the development of natural resources took us on a little trip up to the province to the west of us and talks about the incentive programs that are being developed in the Province of Saskatchewan. I would suggest to my honourable friend that in the incentive and development programs in Saskatchewan, except for now giving more to the proprietors of the industry, particularly in the potash field, that the incentive or the program of development in Saskatchewan under the CCF government was such that the people of Saskatchewan did receive a reasonable return from the investment or at least from their God-given right under the soils, and of course it's since the advent of the free enterprise there that there has been a process of diminishing returns to the people of Saskatchewan from their assets, particularly in the field of potash.

Now what is the proposition before us? The proposition by way of amendment of my colleague, the Member for Inkster, is that we undertake an intensified public program for the exploration of our mineral potential. This is what we really — this is the crux in my opinion. Because Mr. Speaker, if, if we have lined out what is our potential and done by the public, then surely to goodness the public through its government and through its government agencies are in a far better position to say to entrepreneurs and developers, we have this asset here or that asset here and bring it into a ... basis so that all can participate in the benefits. We're not suggesting in this particular resolution that all of the development of our mineral potential, the development should be undertaken solely by the government, but we say that under an intensified public program that we should know what our potential here is in the Province of Manitoba so that the citizens, the taxpayers not only present, but future as well, will be able to receive the benefits.

I remember now, we often hear in this House Mr. Speaker, of the development of Thompson. I wonder how many members, possibly the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer will recall, I don't know whether he was on the trip that I want to refer to in a moment, or not. That was a trip we took up to northern Manitoba, I believe it was either in 1955 or 1956, up into the area where Thompson is now located. There were two lakes, companion lakes. I'm sure my honourable friend the Member for Churchill will know of Moak and Mystery Lake, and at that time we flew up into that area — there were no roads, not even a railroad went up into that particular area — and we went into the mining camps there and saw the activity of exploration and I'll never forget that talking to the geophysicists and the mining engineers in there when I asked them of what the potential was in that particular area where we visited, what the potential was, and they said to me "Not very good." Not very good because the assay of the cores they were extracting or whatever they were doing, pulling them out, didn't indicate very very much, and they said that unless there was some real need for low grade nickel ore, doubt very much whether it would be a very profitable undertaking.

Now I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether it was just by chance or otherwise that some six months later, after we had come back from that journey in the late summer up into Moak and Mystery Lake that we had an agreement before us in an ensuing session of the Legislature to consider an agreement with INCO for the greatest discovery of nickel ever found in Manitoba and comparable to that at Sudbury. And the terms, I suggest, of the agreement that we entered into at that time were the terms that were based on the findings of Moak and Mystery Lake.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the purport of the amendment that we have before us would put the province in a far better bargaining position if we knew of the potential, our mineral potential in Manitoba.

My honourable colleague from Inkster is not suggesting that we should actually do the developing but actually we should know, and that's the purport again, of the amendment, that we should know what our potential is so that we can bargain on behalf of the people of Manitoba as best we can for the development of our natural resources. We didn't have this back in 1956-57 and we haven't got it today. I suggest that many of the problems and troubles that we've had insofar as the diminishing revenues in Manitoba from a return on our natural resources would have dissipated had it not been, or had we been in a position to know more of our potential.

My honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party, a moment ago talked about the little fellow with his hatchet going from rock to rock chipping off a rock, as I understood him, to see whether there was any mining potential. I don't know how long ago it was that the last hard rock miner passed away, to all real and intents and purposes insofar as the development of the north is concerned, but I suggest some time ago. This isn't done now, this isn't done. Real exploration is done now by large corporations and not by the individual. Oh sure, occasionally the individual does find —(Interjection)— Oh, I've been up north but when I go up there I go with my eyes open, and I suggest and recommend that highly; I recommend that highly to some of those who in their dreams go north. I think it would be a good idea.

But that is the situation, the development and the assaying or the assessing of the potential for the benefits of people in order that they get a fair shake and break in the development of our natural resource industry in Manitoba. What happened at Sherridon? What happened at Sherridon, going back up north. A few years ago at Sherridon, some 15 or years ago Sherridon was a very thriving community but because of the unknown, the unknown mineral potential in that particular area, the mine was exhausted. It's true we now have the benefit of Lynn Lake, a little further to the north of Sherridon that is making its contribution but how long for Lynn Lake? It was only about three or four years ago that there was a scare in the Town of Flin Flon, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not that particular area might have reached the end of its tether and would have to close down. Cranberry Portage, another area that was — Snow Lake, Bissett, there are so many of these areas. Wouldn't it be well if through a public program of exploration of our mineral potential we knew where we stood and we didn't have to have a policy of by guess and by gum, so that we could say to the entrepreneur in our mining industry, we estimate this amount. What is your bid? What contribution will you make to the well-being of the taxpayer and the citizens both now and in the future of Manitoba? And then, Mr. Speaker, if we do — if we do have our eyes — or obtain knowledge through our efforts of wealth producing potential and if we desire through a co-operative venture with private enterprise and Crown corporations to form a combination in order to develop that potential for the benefit of Manitobans. What wrong? Again that is the proposition contained within the amendment of my colleague. And if the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources the other day said that basically he can agree with this, I give him full credit. Because this is what we require today, Mr. Speaker, the development of the potential particularly in our mineral industries for the benefit of all of the people.

My honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer and I in many respects don't see eye to eye on the recommendations of the Carter Commission which would tax to a greater degree the mining corporations, but I'm sure my honourable friend would agree with me that if we can ease the burden, financial burdens on our people through the development of our own resources, it would be well for all of the people of our province. This is the proposition of my honourable friend the Member for Inkster. And I'm not surprised — again I say it and I repeat it — I'm not surprised at the objection of my honourable friend the protector of free enterprise, the Leader of the Liberal Party, this afternoon or a little earlier today, he wanted full disclosure of all of the inner workings of free enterprise, now he doesn't want the public to get onto their gravy train. Now you can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. I indicated at the start of my remarks that the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party first of all was a Socialist in the adoption of the Carter Commission recommendations in our Throne Speech amendment and then on our budget amendment rejected what he had voted for about a few days before.

MR. MOLGAT: ...reservations I made.

MR. PAULLEY: Self-preservation, yes.

MR. MOLGAT: No, reservations.

MR. PAULLEY: It could be self-preservation that my honourable friend is talking about, Mr. Speaker, because it's a well known adage, in some political arenas at least, that if you can be on both sides of the question at one time you can't hurt either one on any side.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I was saying to my honourable friend that he should go back to the reservations that I made when I supported his amendment then he would know that I did not support all the matters he brought up.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, there's only one thing -- now my honourable friend is talking about reservations and maybe he should go back. But I want to point out to my honourable friend, he's been in this House just as long as I have, when you park your "X" against a ballot or stand up in this House on a proposition there isn't very many reservations. You're either for it or against it. And how, how typical of my friends to my right, how typical is it, my friends on the right, want, after they have cast their vote to say, "But I didn't really mean it. I didn't even know what I was voting for." How typical, particularly of the Liberal Party.

MR. MOLGAT: It was before the ballot.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend, the Leader of the Liberal Party, now says, "before the ballot." If this was the contention of my honourable friend, surely he should have had enough intestinal fortitude to vote against it. But he didn't. He voted - he voted on one hand for more, on the other hand for less. What is the name of that animal that changes its hide no matter what sort of a terrain it walks on? Chameleon is it that they call them? Something of that nature. It's not good enough for me, Mr. Speaker, in the field of politics. But anyway...

MR. EVANS: A mugwump.

MR. PAULLEY: A mugwump, is that what it is? But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest to the members of this Assembly that here is.... I beg your pardon?—(Interjection)— No, I'm not mad about the budget vote. I'm glad my honourable friend the Member for Assinibola asked me whether I was mad against — about the budget vote. No, I'm not mad at all. Because, Mr. Speaker, in that particular vote it showed where the Liberal Party was: four-square with the Conservatives. Because they voted against a reasonable sub-amendment proposed by my colleague from St. John's in non-confidence of the government. But this outfit to my right have confidence in the government. Something that I haven't got. So if my honourable friend the Member for Assinibola wants to know if I'm mad about the vote, no, I'm not mad about it; I expected it. Because to me there isn't any difference insofar as fiscal policies are concerned between either one of them. So I say, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? —(Interjection)—

MR. PAULLEY: You didn't mean it did you?

A MEMBER: I did.

MR. PAULLEY: What do you mean by that?

A MEMBER: You figure it out.

MR. PAULLEY: All right, I want to know.

MR. MOLGAT: My honourable friend can suit himself.

MR. PAULLEY: I think that's beneath the dignity of a man of the stature of — at least I thought the stature of the Leader of the Opposition to attribute such to me. I regret it very very much. —(Interjection)— No, it's you and I'm surprised at you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if in future any honourable gentleman has any comment to make he would address it to the Chair and I think we'd avoid circumstances such as this. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, what I want to say in conclusion, and I'll accept that last remark of one of the members from whence it come. But what I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the Assembly that they give serious consideration to this resolution as proposed by my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster. When we find - when we find that there is a diminishing return to the taxpayer of Manitoba, as indeed across Canada, from the development of our mineral resources, I suggest that in some respects at least it's because really we are not fully conversant or cognizant of the potential wealth that we have; that it would aid the public sector in their bargaining position if they knew what the mineral potential was in their respective jurisdictions. And if the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources the other day did indicate general support for this resolution, I suggest that he would be taking the proper steps.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I get up on my feet for this reason that I would like to speak a few words on the amendment to this resolution and to say this, that I think it is brought out and the wording is proper. I was brought up in a country, in a small area, an area of twenty miles where there was two valleys. And in them valleys in 1800 if there was 900 people, that was it. It was just sheep runs. There was nothing there to grow because you couldn't grow it, there was too much moisture -- right on the coast, on the west coast. But they discovered something in there, a mineral at that time that was worth a lot of money and a mineral which is like an octane gas today -- you can have the ordinary gas but to have a high octane gas you have to pay more money. And this coal was the same way. They could get more speed; they could get more steam out of that coal than you could get in any coal in Great Britain.

But this is what I'm getting at, Mr. Speaker. That place was opened up -- 900 people in 1800 -- and when I came away there was 200,000 people in that area. Narrow valleys half a mile wide and maybe less than that, and the houses were terraced up on the side of the hill, all the way through. There was no valley floor in the bottom of the valley, it was just like a narrow gutter coming down. There was no provision made; it was private enterprise all the way through. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, you can say, "Here, here," but wait a while. You won't say that afterwards. Private enterprise took everything out of there but they didn't put nothing back for the people that were there. After they were finished with them: "You go where you want now. You look for your bread because we have no need of you anymore." I am talking about Manitoba now. We have the wealth up north. We don't know what we got up north. And I say now is the time to build, now is the time to go up north. We can go in there, we can build towns and cities and we can take the people in there. There's all kinds of work to be done. We can build roads; we can bring railroads; we can do the various things in there. We're not going to wait for private enterprise to come round and say, "Well I'm not going to build houses. It's going to cost me too much. I'm not going to do this. Let the little guy do that. Let him struggle to do that." I say if we have any imagination at all we should go in and do these things ourselves -- we, as Manitobans. Are we scared to do it? The money is here, the money is here. But no, we each one say, "Let the other fellow do it." But I say, "no". Let the whole of Manitoba do it. Not give it to private enterprise from outside; not give it to these people and give them a loan on top or the monies on top. I say we can do it ourselves. We don't need these people from outside to come and show us. We have the know how right here in Manitoba. And when I see these things going on I feel terribly upset. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, in the last few minutes I've listened quite intently. It seems to be an argument between private enterprise, government operations and Saskatchewan. And as a matter of interest, with all due respect to Saskatchewan with their natural resources, I took a look at the budget estimates for Saskatchewan in 1961 and from gas and petroleum the Saskatchewan Government received \$15,290,000; other minerals \$3,684,000.00. In 1968 under the so-called free enterprise system of government, the estimates in that particular year -- this year, the petroleum and gas are \$33,333,000; metallic minerals are \$1,102,000; potash \$2,410,000; other minerals \$442,000 and in 1968 the Saskatchewan Government are receiving \$37,297,850.00 -- almost double between the two systems of natural resource development. I bring this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that it brings out the resolution of our Leader that under a development of this kind we can get into this type of a picture. When you consider that returns as estimated in this House this year for mines and resources to this government are only \$3,408,000, we've got a good field to work on and if we can follow the example of Saskatchewan we may improve our revenue with a tax reduction to the people that require it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question? Mr. Speaker, could the honourable member say as between 1961 and 1968 what new development took place or whether the increase was the natural increase that would take place over a period of 8 years by the increased development of the resources that were already there. -- (Interjection) -- you say ... Well could the honourable member then, if he would like to make a comparison, compare the Manitoba free enterprise system in 1961 and the Saskatchewan socialist system in 1961 -- both years.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

A MEMBER: No, he's not ready.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Ayes and nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the results being as follows:

AYES: Messrs. Cherniack, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Harris, Miller, Paulley, Peterson and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Campbell, Carroll, Clement, Cowan, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Shewman, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 9, Nays 41.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. Are you ready for the question on the main motion? The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, before we get to the main motion - well, we are now at the main motion and apparently this last vote rejected the idea put forward by members of this party that Manitoba should not unilaterally in a very doctrinaire manner limit itself to the methods by which we should try to develop the resources of this province. Our province was that we welcomed every means, public as well as private, but apparently the large majority of this House felt that unless it's by private they couldn't do it.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable gentleman is speaking to the amendment. That has already been dealt with and there can be no further discussion on it.

MR. MILLER: Fine. All right. I'll deal with the motion itself. And in dealing with the motion itself we are then limited to only one type of encouragement for our natural resources and that is we must limit ourselves only to a program of incentives to assist in the prospecting, exploration and development through private entrepreneurs. And this of course is not only doctrinaire, it's a very narrow, a very limiting and a very - I think it cannot be a very beneficial method, it must by its very nature defeat the whole purpose of the exercise which everyone here seems to espouse and that is that we should have more development, we should encourage more development. You're not going to encourage more development if you limit it only to a select few and say here's a carrot, maybe this will stir you, maybe this will get you to do some exploration in Manitoba. And the carrot, of course, that if you happen to take advantage of our incentives, you may end up with a successful mine and in that way perhaps the citizens of Manitoba will benefit.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is daydreaming, particularly in the modern day of research, in the modern day of mining and exploration, it's nonsense to use public money which is done through incentives because incentives are actually public money. We may call them what we will but when we give tax concessions, when we give write-offs, when we give any of these concessions we are using public funds, but we are doing it through the backdoor. Instead of saying here is \$200,000 or a half a million dollars, come in and explore the area for us, we do it in a different way. We say, now, you come in, do some exploration and anything you spend, we'll allow you to write-off very quickly, we'll allow you to write it off within one month - and this is one of the points made by the Carter Commission, that these people are getting away with a great deal more than they're entitled to. Mr. Speaker, this Party that I am honoured to represent, cannot accept this narrow, doctrinaire position which seems to be the feeling of the majority of this House, that we must limit ourselves and put blinkers on and not look at the problem which is facing all of Manitoba and which all of us apparently seem to be agreed must be part of the development of this province, but we seem so rigid in our position, some of us, that we can't accept the fact that there's many ways - and there must be many ways to achieve the same purpose. The accountant or the expert who assessed the Manitoba Development Fund in Manitoba made that point very clear, when he urged this government in his Annual Report and he said to them: "You must look beyond the straight lending of money; you must participate." Now this government is great for slogans and I suggest they should have a slogan for 1968 and not wait until 1970; and that slogan should be: "Participate in '68'. Don't wait until 1970 to beat '70." Let's encourage everyone to come in, both public and private. But for the reasons I've just outlined and because this government refuses to accept anything but a very narrow approach to it and because the Liberals can't see ahead of their own noses, we in this Party cannot go along with the proposal in the main motion.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James the debate be adjourned.

MR. USKIW: If the Honourable Member is going to move adjournment, I would wish to make a few remarks on the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I can't accept the proposition of our honourable friends, either to the right of us or to the left of us. It seems that when we talk in terms of a very narrow approach to matters of public importance that the New Democratic Party has always been accused of being a doctrinaire party or one that believes in doctrinaire policies or philosophy and it seems to me that the evidence we have before us this afternoon is that in essence it is the Conservative and Liberal Party that are doctrinaire in their approach, because really what they are saying is nothing but private development, we mustn't do anything other than private development. In defeating propositions that suggest we should have cooperative development, that we ought to have public development, that we ought to have public and private together in the development of natural resources, in defeating this type of proposition, Mr. Speaker, they are truly doctrinaire in their old-fashioned free enterprise philosophy and I for one can't accept this type of philosophy because we have changing times and changing needs and there are the people of the province that we must consider.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the provinces of Canada over the years, have auctioned off the resources of Canada in competition with each other so that they might encourage development in their respective provinces and this auctioning off of natural resources has had a net effect of taking away from the people of Canada the very rights which are a natural to them and are God given to them, Mr. Speaker, I can't support that kind of philosophy. I suppose this is why I am a member of the New Democratic Party because this is where the real distinction is. I think the primary concern of development of resources, of development of industry is the benefit to the people of the people of Canada or the people of Manitoba. I don't think that the primary concern is as to whether or not Mr. Jones from Switzerland will benefit from development of pulp in The Pas. I don't accept this as a reasonable proposition, Mr. Speaker and it boils me when I hear people on this side of the House and the opposite side of the House to suggest that this is the only approach to development. Mr. Speaker, this is a sorry day because I thought, I thought that Canadians and people in Manitoba generally, especially the leadership, had more knowledge with respect, and more respect to the general public than to propose such a chaotic system of development.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to have a conference of Premiers of this country to establish a code of ethics in the way we develop our natural resources -- a code of ethics. We should not be under-bidding one another in an attempt to bring industry in to the province. We ought to talk things over with Mr. Thatcher in Saskatchewan, and Mr. Manning in Alberta, and Mr. Bennett in B. C. and so forth to the eastern side of the country and say we will not sacrifice the interests of Canadians in the interests of a few individuals that may be either Canadians or otherwise. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important point because I find in particular in the last 10 year period that Manitoba has given away literally millions of dollars jointly with the Canadian Government in the encouragement of the establishment of industry and development of natural resources. We've literally given away millions of dollars. We have provided a socialist principle to private interests. This is what we have done. And yet we talk in terms of Manitoba not being in a position to afford something like Medicare. Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous. I can't buy this kind of proposition. Mr. Speaker, I intend to oppose this type of philosophy and I intend to expose to the people of Manitoba what the viewpoint of the side to my left is and the viewpoint of the group on my right. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: It was moved by the Honourable Member for Brandon, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James that debate be adjourned. Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's in amendment thereto. The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to get into a debate this afternoon because it's been a particularly interesting afternoon on private members' day with some very spirited and highly sincere type of speeches that we have heard. There were speeches made today too, that you can take

(Mr. Witney cont'd) . . . exception to or speeches that you can agree to in a black and white manner without having a grey area. Whether or not I can continue with the calibre of debate that took place today remains to be seen. I have a feeling though that there might be a division of opinion by the time that I sit down.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment to the motion I think it's important to recognize that this motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the amendment are really two quite dissimilar matters. If you take a look at the motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, you'll note that it calls for the government to implement a plan of Medicare by July 1, 1968, but the amendment goes a great deal further. The amendment is a much broader approach to the whole problem than perhaps is realized. I realized that there was some criticism of me over the past while because I have not said anything during the course of this debate and I've been rather waiting to hear some more explanation from the members of the NDP as to exactly what it meant by the amendment that they have here.

I have taken a look at the Hansard and I don't feel that there really has been an adequate amount of explanation given, because I think there's an inconsistency in the amendment to one of the WHEREASES. If you take a look at the Whereas of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, he says "Whereas many people are finding it increasingly difficult to meet the increasing costs of the present medical coverage" - he makes reference to medical coverage. But here is the amendment: "To consider the advisability of introducing forthwith a health plan in accordance with the principles recommended by the Hall Commission for the provision of health care to all Manitobans, the cost to be borne by society generally through a comprehensive and universal health plan rather than by the individual."

What is meant, Mr. Speaker, by "health plan"? In order to find out what is actually meant by health plan, I think we must refer to the big book, the Royal Commission on Health Services and take a look at what it meant by health plan, and while it may take a little time, it may be well worthwhile just reading it. It's recommendation 30 of the Hall Commission and it says that "the medical services benefits include the services of general practitioners and specialists provided in the office, hospital, patient's home and group practice clinic." Then it goes down and it mentions medical services, it mentions surgical services, maternity services, newborn care, specialist services, anesthesia, X-ray, laboratory and diagnostic procedures, preventive medical services, blood transfusions. And then it comes into these areas and it says in Section (j) "Dental services where provided by a dentist in conjunction with maximal facial surgery". (k) Prosthetic and orthotic devices, appliances or aids when prescribed. (l) Physiotherapy where provided by a physiotherapist upon the order of a physician. (m) Podiatric and chiropractic treatment when prescribed by a physician. (n) Ambulance services and similar forms of transportation of patient except as may be designated as part of any other health services benefit. (o) Any other services specified by a Federal-Provincial agreement." And they could be a wild lot of things.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you'll perhaps remember this famous speech which I made last year and which has been quoted back to me several times over I think during the course of this debate and perhaps you will recall that at that time I spoke of the difficulties that had been fostered upon health plans or universal comprehensive health plans that had had the whole range of benefits that I have just read from this book. Perhaps you will remember that I referred at that time to the fact that the schemes in Great Britain and to the schemes in other countries, that they began to run into difficulties as soon as there was that all-embracing health plan. Perhaps you remember that because I'm sure I haven't got Hansard here with me, I'm like one of the other members who said that he didn't like to read Hansard, I'm surprised at what I do with the English language. But in Hansard somewhere I'm sure are the comments that I made that when you get into all of these extras that then these plans begin to run into trouble.

Now let me take a look at some more expansions that took place in the Royal Commission on Health Services when it's talking in terms of costs. And these, Mr. Speaker, are in terms of what are termed "current dollars" and they are some estimated expenditures on personal health services assuming existing programs and with expanded public programs in Canada for selected years 1961 to 1971. And they have expenditures on physicians' services: in 1961, per capita \$21.01; for 1971 they are projecting, \$35.29 - and that, Mr. Speaker, is an increase, a percentage increase in than ten year period, at the time that this report was being written in 1962, of about 67 percent. Actually the report would have been written around

(Mr. Witney cont'd) . . . about 1960 or 1961 that these figures have been made.

And then we come down to expenditures on dentists' services, and remember that this is part of the amendment that my honourable friends over there have moved and we're to move into it forthwith, not tomorrow, right now. And the expenditures in 1961, they're estimated here, are \$6.31 per capita; and they rise in 1971 to \$12.01 per capita. Or another case in percentages over that ten year period, that's an increase of 100 percent.

Now in the expenditure on other health services: in 1961 it's \$6.30 per capita; in 1971 it's \$7.53 per capita, and that's just a modest rise. That's a rise of about 20 percent, and these other health services include estimated expenditures on prescribed glasses for total population assuming existing programs, etc.

And then we come along to the expenditure on prescribed drugs and the estimates of the Hall Commission for 1961, per capita is \$6.11; for 1971 is \$15.97; or a percentage increase over that decade of 170 percent. And these figures are also anticipating that in 1965 there would be expanded public programs. In other words that there would be more money spent by general revenue of the province in expanding these public health programs.

And when you move an amendment of this nature and you call for all-embracing situation in health, the figures that I have mentioned here I think must be taken into consideration very carefully. Because I note that with the British Health Service, which is an all-embracing health service, that the difficulties have begun to arise already, and they've begun to arise to the point where labour government has had to impose some form of a deterrent or a deductible. And it has arisen to a point where there are members of the labour government who are prepared to revolt on the labour government over the issue. And they got into the position, Mr. Speaker, because of the all-embracingness of this program coming in all at one time.

Now the Hall Commission, the Hall Commission speaks of these programs coming in and being phased in over a period of time. This amendment says "forthwith" - tomorrow - in spite of the examples that have taken place where it is forthwith in operation at the present time. You go to Sweden, Mr. Speaker, Sweden is considered to be a country that has got a very all-embracing health scheme, and Sweden is one country that started off with a deterrent. It had a form of a deterrent in its health program, and even today Sweden is getting into difficulty. In Australia where they had drugs as part of the program that they had there, they started to put deterrents on. They're still having difficulty with it.

Now last year I recall when I made the speech - the one that has been quoted back to me - I said, "Let's not go to Europe. Let's go back over into Saskatchewan where we have a plan that is operating." And during the time of the CCF Government, not the present government, but during the time of the CCF Government when they put in a program for insurance against the costs of medical services they added physiotherapy, and perhaps you recall that they added physiotherapy. Within inside of a year, Mr. Speaker, they had taken - - or two years, I forget which one it was - - they had taken physiotherapy off the benefits that were available under the plan. And they took the benefit off because the cost rose so substantially.

So what I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, is that this resolution which is on this Order Paper is an all-embracing health plan against the experience of other countries, and against an experience that took place in the Province of Saskatchewan. And I'm rather surprised that you did that because surely what you wanted to do was to start off at least with insuring against the cost of medical services. At least you wanted to do that. And instead when it's having problems now and there are people, and you can argue black and white about costs, and there are people today who are worried about the cost of the programs that are in existence or the programs that are planned, you want to bring in all of these extra services. You want to bring in the bundle.

MR PAULLEY: Are not people entitled to it?

MR. WITNEY: Let's take a look at the matter of these costs, because I've been pointing out to you that these costs, Mr. Speaker, will rise under this all-embracing program. And I won't carry that any further. How is it going to be paid for? I haven't heard how it's going to be paid for. I have heard in the resolution there is this particular statement that's made here, "the cost to be borne by society generally through a comprehensive and universal health plan rather than by the individual." But who makes up society? The individual. Society is made up by the individual and society's money is obtained by the individual, or from him. So you're going to have to go to the individual to finance society to finance this program. And how are you going to do that? You haven't told us in dealing with the amendment to the

(Mr. Witney cont'd) . . . resolution, you haven't told us what taxes you are going to alter in order to pay for this cost. -- (Interjection) -- Oh I don't remember it being said.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, you have a convenient memory.

MR. WITNEY: Are you going to increase the sales tax?

MR. PAULLEY: You have a convenient memory.

MR. WITNEY: Are you going to do it with a premium?

MR. PAULLEY: No.

MR. WITNEY: Are you going to do it by a premium and a subsidy? Are you going to use the principle to pay? Is that what you're going to use? I think the Provincial Treasurer the other day mentioned some figures about the numbers of people on certain income levels and I think you have to start to consider. If you've got a program as expensive as the one that you're promoting in this amendment, and you've got a program that has been shown to be breaking down in other countries where it's been in operation for years, that you have to consider even on that ability to pay whether those who you think have the ability to pay, can pay it.

MR. PAULLEY: They can.

MR. WITNEY: And whether or not the fall over is going to fall back onto the people, the average people; the people who are trying to build a home; people who are trying to finance their children through the university; people who are trying to buy an automobile; people who want a holiday; people who want to simply be able to get on and go to a picture show every once in a while. You have to consider that, and I don't think that you have considered it at all.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh yes we have.

MR. WITNEY: I can hear you talking over there. You're muttering at me but I have heard no substantial indication from you; I have heard nothing from you as to how you're going to finance it and whether or not you have considered that an expensive program such as the one you are promoting can be financed by the people, the rich people who you hope to get more from; or the corporations from whom you hope to get more. Corporations, they make profits, the profits cut down, the costs go up. The very people that you want to support are going to be the people that are going to be affected by it.

Now when you talk about the question of the expensiveness of this particular plan, this universal, comprehensive health plan that has been promoted by the NDP. It's a very interesting book, I remember reading it some time ago, it's called "Medicine in Politics." And I note it was written by a Minister of Health, a Minister who for three years was with the British Health Service. He lasted three years. That was a long time for a Minister of Health in Great Britain. They generally go about two years. He went three. I intend to go thirty.

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon?

MR. WITNEY: He said, "There is a characteristic of medical care that makes its public provision exceptionally problematic." Here's a man with experience. "The demand for it is not only potentially unlimited, it is also by nature not capable of being limited in a precise and intelligent way. This can be made clear by comparison with, for instance, education. The potential demand for education is unlimited, just like the demand for medical care. Nevertheless it is possible to define a specific quantity and quality of education to be provided by laying down, for instance, the ages between which children are to attend school; the subjects that they are to be taught; the size of classes, and the qualifications of the teachers." And then he makes this sentence. "No similar criteria are available in relation to medical care." And just on the other side of the page he says in short, "The appetite for medical treatment," and remember when he's speaking of medical treatment, he's speaking of this all-embracing health treatment that you've got here: Physiotherapy, occupational therapy, dentistry, prescribed drugs, everything - that's what he's referring to. And he says, "In short, the appetite for medical treatment went en marchant." I do know what it means because I asked the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. PAULLEY: Well how about the interpretation?

MR. WITNEY: There, if you wish to find out some very interesting material of a man who was in the Department of Health in Great Britain and who ran the British health scheme, this makes some very interesting reading. And all I have done is paraphrase some -- and you may be able to argue that I just used sections out of it to my own advantage. I think they're quite clear. I think they're quite clear.

Now the other part of this resolution that I wanted to discuss too, was the statement:

(Mr. Witney cont'd) . . . "to consider the advisability." Well, Mr. Speaker, we've been considering the advisability of a - - if you want to call it a Medicare plan or of a plan to provide insurance against the costs of medical illness for a long time. You remember that the Government of Manitoba went before the Royal Commission on Health Services when it came through here. There was a brief made by the former Minister of Health; there was a brief made by the Premier, and in that time the government espoused its philosophy of need. You recall it. And then there was a period of waiting because this was a very big job that these people had embarked upon, and in that period of waiting for its results they went all across the country and when they went all across the country they found many more who had espoused that principle of need.

Now in 1963 I can recall when I came into the Department of Health, and at that time there were various plans being developed. There were plans being developed in Alberta, and there were plans being developed in British Columbia, and there were plans being developed in Ontario. And I knew that there had been a plan developed in Saskatchewan; and I knew that we had one million people; and I knew that we had one of the finest non-profit doctor schemes in the country; and I knew that we had about 70 percent of our people covered. So I went out to enquire. I went out to ask and to investigate these other schemes to see if they had any potential for this province. I went to B. C; I went to Alberta. I went to Saskatchewan. And I talked to doctors and government people alike, and I went to Ontario. And if you wish to criticize me for having hesitated; if you wish to criticize me for having taken my time, fine. But I felt that with the problems that we had here and particularly in view of the type of coverage that we had here at that time, that we could well afford in this province to examine carefully every scheme that was being made available. In some cases there was a similarity of population, Saskatchewan for instance. There was a similarity of conditions up in Alberta. There were similarities in the questions of the availability of medical personnel and doctors and dentists and nurses at that time. And then down came this volume here. Then after that volume the Department of Health considered it and we made some priorities of our own at that time in our consideration in the planning of the department. And those priorities might interest them because I have -- my honourable friend -- because I have some of them listed down. The number one priority that we had was a program relating to mental illness and mental retardation. We wanted to do more at our mental hospitals. We wanted to do more at Portage la Prairie.

The second was a program of public health and preventive medical services. It seemed to make sense to put prevention in a top priority position - the second priority position here, the prevention of illness.

And the third was a program relating to the education of health personnel because we had to have people.

And the fourth was a program to develop a medical services plan. And when I say a medical services plan I was thinking in terms of a plan of insurance against the costs of medical illness. And very often there's a contradiction made between Medicare. Medicare really means everything. There's a difference between it and a program of insurance against the costs of medical illness.

So while all of this was going on we suddenly had from Ottawa, we suddenly had its program. And its program was a program of insurance against the costs of medical services. And it was considered, and it was debated and eventually the program came down from Ottawa and we began to work toward that program. We began to work toward that program to the point where in January of 1966 we appointed at that time - the Directorate of the Medical Services Insurance. And after Bill 68 was passed last year -- and Medicare will always be remembered in my life as being a particularly interesting part of my life -- after that we passed -- (Interjection) -- It may haunt me, fine. We passed the Bill 68 and we began to work toward implementing Bill 68. But you'll remember that there were still some very grave feelings about the matters of cost. You'll remember that all across Canada Federal Ministers were split on the issue of what it would cost. Remember that. Do you remember that premiers who initially had more or less embraced it became concerned about cost. Premiers. The people who had the responsibility of the whole of their provinces. They became interested in cost as well. And you will remember that there started to be a shift of feeling. You remember that. Because of shifts of leadership, because of shifts of anything and because of a concern of costs. It finally ended up to the point where people were not too sure of what was going to happen and people were sending wires to the Federal Government saying "Are you going to change Bill C112?"

(Mr. Witney cont'd) . . . Are you going to change it?" No answer, or the answer always came back, "the law is the law." And when you asked "Are you going to change the law?" there was no answer, no answer. And then finally the present Prime Minister came down and he said, "The law is the law. My government will not change it." It's not his government now. It's not his government now and I'll show you just what is taking place. Do you recall the great distress and concern about the fact that because of cost, because of a move to try to curb rising costs of government, the Department of National Health and Welfare started to cut back on Indian services. Do you recall that?"

MR. PAULLEY: Change the law.

MR. WITNEY: That's right. They changed the law.

MR. PAULLEY: No, they did not change the law.

MR. WITNEY: And there was a great rising of discontent about it and so what happened was they at least as far as we know now, a statement was made that everything goes back into normal again. But the other day we are advised that the health resources fund is going to have changes because of the problems of costs and the cost of building the health resources facilities, to gear up and to tool up for the medical care program.

They're now saying that there might be a limit this year on the amount of money that's going to be available and when it was first introduced at \$500 million there were many provinces that said that that \$500 million is not enough, but we were assured at that time that the five year and the 15 year programs that we were asked by the federal government to initiate, that if we could spend \$400 million in five years, \$400 million would be available. There was not going to be a limiting of certain amounts of money in 1968 and '69 and 1970, etc. There is now. We don't know what the limit is, so if they're so concerned that they are writing to the provinces and advising them that they are going to put limits on the development of facilities to tool up for medical care insurance, what are they going to do about medical care itself? When? We know that some of the men that are going to form the Cabinet are going to be some of those men who have expressed great concern about costs. So where do we stand at the present time? We don't know yet.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't want to disturb the Honourable gentleman's thoughts but I might advise him that he has three minutes.

MR. WITNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I think Mr. Speaker, that I can stop at this point at any rate because I'll probably be having some more to say on this matter, as I expect that now that I have asked you people specifically how are you going to pay for it, how are you going to pay for this wide all-embracing program that you've got in this resolution or the amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: You'll get your answer.

MR. WITNEY: Fine, because I'll sure like to have it.

MR. PAULLEY: I'll give it to you.

MR. WITNEY: Fine. I'll welcome to hear from you.

MR. PAULLEY: You're right. You will.

MR. WITNEY: I just might

MR. PAULLEY: I promise you.

MR. WITNEY: Thank you very much. I'd like to be assured also that what I have said and what you consider to be an all-embracing - what I have said this amendment is, that that's what you mean by it. I'd like to know also how you are going to control your costs. I haven't heard anything about that.

MR. PAULLEY: How are you controlling them?

MR. WITNEY: Now remember on medical services insurance programs there's a possibility of keeping costs in line, through medical review committees, through benefits, but it's very difficult to do as you get into your smaller groups. So I think I'd like to ask you specifically how you're going to pay for this all-embracing program. I'd like to ask you specifically how you're going to keep it in line within what people can afford and I'd like to ask you specifically if I was right when I said to you that that's exactly what your program means.

MR. PAULLEY: You'll get your answer.

MR. WITNEY: Good. It'll make very interesting reading when we see it in Hansard.

MR. PAULLEY: And they'll be proper.

MR. WITNEY: I had something else in the back of my mind, Mr. Speaker, but I can't get it out here right now. But I suppose that after I hear these people speak, that when we get

(Mr. Witney cont'd) . . . down to the main motion I might be able to have another go at them.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm afraid the honourable gentleman has exhausted his time.

Order please. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection) -- Would you permit a question?

Did the Honourable Minister last year plan to expend any moneys in the payment of the Medicare program which he espoused and sponsored?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, we didn't need any money except to set up the corporation which we have done.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it was a great pleasure to listen to the Honourable the Minister of Health. It always is, as a matter of fact. He presents his case exceedingly well. In this case he did something even better than usual, he created a straw man and then proceeded to tear it apart bit by bit. And his case would have some validity if he hand't built a straw man to attack. He took our amendment and read into it many many things; some were there; many things that weren't there.

Let's look at this. It says that "should consider the advisability in introducing forthwith a health plan in accordance with the principles" - not the details, not the nuts and bolts, not the mechanics, but the principles recommended by the Hall Commission. The principles are quite clear and the Hall Commission itself says, and has said it explicitly and I'm sure he'll find it in the book, it's a big book. It says that "it can't be" - the Hall Commission knew that they could not implement the entire health care program that they envisage as the ideal for Canada in one fell swoop. They're not saying they should. They agree that it should be done in stages and there's nothing in this amendment that says the whole package has to be bought in one shot.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Minister in order to justify the position that the government is taking this year is therefore creating a straw man and then trying to shoot holes into it. The fact remains that if you're going to assess the costs of medical care - and the kind of medical care that this House agreed to last year - not the paramedical that he speaks about, and all the paramedical facilities. I remember the speech he made last year in which he cautioned the House that the introduction of the various paramedical services could encumber a plan, could make it difficult, might endanger it. He cautioned the members of the House and I remember this and I'm not going to argue with him on that at this time because we're not dealing with that. We're dealing with the fact that Bill 68, as he reminded us, and which he incidentally said was a highlight in his career, and I don't doubt it was because I know that the Minister is serious in his concern about this: I know the Minister is serious about his understanding of the need for medical attention for the citizens of Manitoba. But, last year this Bill was brought to us. Last year we all voted, with the exception I think two members, that it should be implemented in 1968, and it was tied to the federal plan.

Now to this extent the Minister is right, that he is not sure, he says in his own mind about whether the Federal Government will or will not proceed. The reason he's not sure is this: that he and other Ministers in other provinces have created this uncertainty. Instead of getting behind the Federal plan and saying we will support it because it's needed, he and other Ministers and Premiers across the provinces have combined in to a gentleman's agreement to try to kill Medicare now, and we are simply saying we'll have none of that nonsense. We want it now. It's as important today as it was in 1967, perhaps more important, because he points and correctly, that the cost of Medicare is increasing and it will continue to increase because the doctors are hedging against the day that they know Medicare must come. They know there's nothing they can do to stop it and they're going to improve their bargaining position and their financial position every month and every year that we delay. So the costs are going up. And it's because the costs are going up that we need the plan. I can't understand the reasoning of the Minister when he says the costs are going up, therefore we have to look at it. Mr. Speaker, if the costs were low we wouldn't need a Medicare plan. People could afford it. The point is the costs are high. The problem is that Medicare has become a very severe and a very critical factor in the life of every citizen of this province and the private schemes simply cannot cover all the people. They're too expensive.

I know of a case personally, of a woman who is a widow, who has a job, she's earning \$260.00 a month, has two daughters, both turned 19 so they are attending first year University. She's in the position of having to have her premium for herself, a premium for both girls

(Mr. Miller cont'd) . . . because both are treated as individuals and are no longer under the care of a mother, so three premiums in a household of three - the total income is \$300.00 a month. Now is this the kind of Medicare scheme that my friend and my colleague the Minister of Health wants in Manitoba? I don't believe it. I don't believe he wants this because I know the Minister and I know he doesn't approve of it in principle, so why does he go along with this kind of - (Interjection) - well, hogwash, I was going to say. Thank you. And it's not fooling anyone - - (Interjection) - - It's agricultural and this is an agricultural province, you're right. And it's not really fooling the people of Manitoba. And to try and suggest as has been suggested in this House that we can do it on a voluntary basis is completely wrong because people who are in a position where they find it a financial strain to pay for Medicare, are still going to be in that position. The people on welfare are going to be looked after. Yes, we know that. If they really get into trouble they'll be looked after. And the people who are under MMS full coverage, they'll be looked after; but it's that large mass in between and it's the large mass in between that I'm concerned about who are finding it difficult and extremely difficult to pay for their premiums. When we talk of costs surely we're not pulling a new figure out of the hat or the sky somewhere. The costs of Medicare are with people every day; we are living with it now. We're paying for it now.

The Minister says something about 70% being covered. I don't know how many of these are covered under the HCX Plan or the HC or the H Plan - and there's quite a difference in them, let me tell you. - - (Interjection) - - Plus 15%. In one plan you get complete coverage; in another you have to be in a hospital before your doctor is paid. These are different plans. You can't tell me that a medical plan which covers you only while you're in the hospital is a comprehensive plan. It's a disaster plan, that's what it is. Well it would be a disaster if that's what we ended up with. And as far as costs are concerned, in computing the cost to the province, and this is right across the country, every Premier in every province is now, the eight of them, are now pushing this idea. And the newspapers are really behind it. You can't afford it they say. The costs are going up.

If every person who is covered today paid into the plan through premium and through their taxes and they would be relieved of the premiums they are paying today then you are not changing anything, you're simply shifting from the private sector to the public sector, that's all. The people who are on welfare, who are getting Medicare cards, those people are being paid for today; they too have an expenditure being made on their behalf, and we're making it today, so you can't throw that as a new amount into the pot. This money is being expended. The only ones that you may add to the pool are those who are not covered. In other words they're not in that very low level, being on Welfare, and they're not those who can afford or are somehow in a position where they can't afford the luxury of not being covered; they have to be covered; they can't gamble and they therefore have to pay it.

But is there anything wrong with society saying - and I go back to - there was quite a discussion today about individuals - is there anything wrong with society saying that we are all individuals in this society but instead of as individuals, each running up and paying our \$45.00 every quarter to the MMS, let us all jointly through our government, which is us, pay it into the pool and have the government run it in a comprehensive scheme, so that we don't have distinctions between citizens; you don't have a have and a have-not, because what the government introduced last year actually was a plan that wasn't going to cost more money. It was going to be a more equitable plan. There wasn't going to be less money expended. There isn't going to be less money expended in Manitoba this year if the plan doesn't come in than if the plan would come in because the costs of medical care are there today. People are going to doctors and they're paying and to simply try to suggest that this cost is going to snowball and is going to kill us, I suggest to you if the costs of going to a doctor are going to snowball it will kill us anyway. If the costs have risen - - some of the figures that the Minister threw out showed very high increases and I don't doubt they may be right. I'm in no position to question them, I do know that as of January of this year I believe it was, Ottawa estimated that the per capita cost for physician services had risen to \$42.39 per capita. The fact that this has risen doesn't mean anything. This may go up to \$60.00 per capita this year, but that's all the more reason why we need a plan, why you can't leave it to the individual. And certainly, I am sure the Minister will agree here -- I'm sure he doesn't want the kind of a plan where you have to go cap in hand to prove that you're destitute, that you have to get help. Because he knows as well as I do that although there are many people who will go under those conditions and who will

(Mr. Miller cont'd) . . . qualify under the type of stringent conditions imposed on Manitoba, there are thousands of people who either won't qualify because their incomes are just over the minimum or who will simply deprive themselves and their children because they can't afford to go.

Mr. Speaker, why do we always have to look at all these plans in the sense of the crisis cost. Isn't it high time that we recognize that if we had a Medicare plan, that if people were free to go and didn't feel by going that they may not be able to do some other things, that they have to make sacrifices that they couldn't afford, that perhaps we could achieve something through preventative medicine. If we wait until the cancer is discovered - - and I'm sure the Minister knows this - - if we wait until the cancer is discovered it will cost the state a lot more money than if that cancer is spotted by a doctor during an annual check-up. And the same applies in many other illnesses. There's the preventative features of the medical care plan, a universal comprehensive one, which can and will in the long run save us money, give us a better and a healthier society than what we have today.

I remember the Minister of Education once saying that a good educational system was necessary but with that you had to have a healthy population. And I agree with him. And a way to do it is to make sure that the child as well as the parent, that the children, are given medical attention early, before the trouble starts, before the emotional breakdowns may occur and an investment of tens of thousands of dollars is dissipated. Let's not wait until the fire breaks out. And the only way you're going to avoid that kind of emergency and that kind of crisis, is if you have a medical plan which is available to all, which is open to all and which is given as a right and not as a privilege of wealth or something that one can get through charity.

Of course we have not seen the Bill that the Minister proposes to bring into this House but it's obvious that Manitoba does not intend to go ahead with the plan. I know that we've heard about voluntary plans at all times - and I have to be honest with the Minister and with the members on both to my right and to my left, who have consistently talked about the fact that they don't like what they call the compulsory features of a medical care plan. They want a voluntary plan. And that on a voluntary plan those who cannot afford to will be looked after and the rest can look after their own. But my suspicion of this type of plan is based on the experience we have here in Manitoba. It's the criteria, it's the standards imposed by any government which determine who shall and who shall not qualify, and frankly in Manitoba our idea of what constitutes ability to pay is a very low standard.

In January 1968 the Tribune carried a story that there were 76,800 people receiving old age pension in Manitoba and of these, 42,700 qualified for supplementary assistance. In other words about 42,000 - odd out of 78,000 received or were qualified to get that extra \$30.00 a month. In other words, all they had was the \$75.00 a month; that's all. Now it's interesting out of all these people, there were close to 30,000 people on provincial Medicare but only 14,500 of this were in the category of the aged. In other words, only 14,500 out of 42,000 could qualify for Medicare, because with the supplementary allowance that they got and maybe a few other assets that they might have, very minor ones, they didn't qualify. They couldn't get a Medicare card. Now what bothers me about a voluntary scheme and the idea that them who can voluntarily join in and them who can't voluntarily don't join in, what bothers me about them is that the standards, the yardstick we're going to use to measure ability to pay, based on the experience we have in Manitoba, I know and the Minister knows it just isn't going to work. You're going to hurt many people in the incomes from between \$2,000 and \$6,000 who are either not going to be able to afford it or who are going to be terribly squeezed. And as I gave the example of three people in a household, income \$3,600 a year, three premiums to pay. And there's no way out of it under the present scheme. And they wouldn't qualify under any conditions set out by any department in Manitoba; not the way we operate.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about costs or when we raise the boogey man cost in this House let's try and be honest about it and admit that the government has had a change of heart. They've had a change of heart for reasons best known to themselves. But they mustn't use the excuse that cost is the reason because that excuse is simply invalid. The cost is the same today as it was in 1967. He asked: "How are we going to pay for it?" We're going to pay for it simply by shifting what we're paying today through another agency, the creation of a public, of a medical care scheme in Manitoba sponsored by the government. Your costs are not going to vary. Absolutely nothing. The Federal Government is prepared to participate. I suspect that

April 19, 1968

(Mr. Miller cont'd) . . . the government is making its stand in the hope -- or maybe the fear, I'll say the fear in their case -- in the fear that the Federal Government is going to change its position. They're gambling with Manitobans that this is going to happen. And because of our fear in this Party that perhaps they are right -- that maybe they are right because as I said there's been a combine formed on the part of eight premiers -- (they should be investigated by The Combines Act) -- there's this combine of eight premiers who have decided that it's up to them to save Canada from itself and they're going to try to get the Federal Government to go back on the Act that they passed in 1966. And that's why we introduced this amendment. Because we, too, are afraid of what may happen in Ottawa and we don't want to wait until Ottawa changes its mind again in 1969 or say 1970. And so we say to the Minister today: Get into a plan now. And don't throw at us the Hall Commission with all the details and all the paramedical services which he says would encumber the plan and which would make the plan collapse. Don't throw that at us. Because we're not saying you should go into that tomorrow. Start with what you were willing to start with last year.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I must say it's now 5:30. Probably the honourable gentleman could continue his remarks when it next appears on the Order Paper.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

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