

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 9th, 1965

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions  
Reading and Receiving Petitions  
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees  
Notices of Motion  
Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the galleries where there are some 27 Grade 5 students from Greenway School under the direction of their teacher, Miss Lambert. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. Matthews. There are some 35 Grade 8 students from Tuxedo Park School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Reimer. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. On behalf of all members of this Legislature, I welcome you.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to address a question to the First Minister. In his letter to the Mayor of the City regarding Pan-Am Games.....

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): I'm sorry to interrupt my honourable friend but we haven't been through the routine proceedings. Perhaps we should dispose of them first and then we can come to questions.....

MR. MOLGAT: Well we are to the Orders of the Day.

MR. ROBLIN: Have we? Oh, I'm sorry --

MADAM SPEAKER: Yes. Orders of the Day.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm a little behind the game here.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Relative to the letter by the Premier to the Mayor of Winnipeg, I just want clarification on exactly what the offer is. The letter says, "will guarantee a million dollars or one-third, whichever is the lesser." Now does this mean then that the previous 50-50 offer of matching the municipal amounts no longer exists?

MR. ROBLIN: If this present arrangement seems more suitable we are willing to go for it. This is what we believe is a better arrangement than the one given previously.

MR. MOLGAT: Is the previous one still available if this is not accepted?

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I think we would work on the basis that the latest offer is the current one.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, would it not be correct to say that this new offer really is less than the previous offer?

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think it would be correct to say that in practical terms, because it's been evident from what's been taking place that the possibility of the municipalities reaching the three-quarters of a million dollars is very remote indeed.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, is it not correct that it could be, because the key element here is that under the previous arrangement the First Minister told us here in the House the other night, and I'm referring to Hansard page 333, where in reply to my question as to whether or not the 50-50 sharing had any limit to it, the reply of the Premier was, "The present arrangement is that the flat grant is \$750,000, and if municipalities raise themselves more than \$750,000 we would match whatever they raise over and above that. There has been no ceiling placed on that." Well then, isn't it correct that if the budget is \$3 million .....

MR. ROBLIN: .....proper questions for Orders of the Day?

MR. MOLGAT: Well I think it is, Madam Speaker. After all, the Premier chose to issue this letter without reference to the House and I think the proper time to ask is before the Orders of the Day. Is it not correct then, that in view of the fact that this open-end offer is no longer in existence, that the new offer is less in total than the previous offer?

MR. ROBLIN: No I don't think so, because there seems to be no practical possibility of reaching the \$750,000 in the previous arrangement. I think this is more generous to the City and I think the City believe it to be more generous to them.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, is it not correct that under the previous arrangement, had there been a deficit, that the Province would have had to match the deficit that would have

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). . . . . been raised by the municipalities involved on a 50-50 basis?

MR. ROBLIN: Under the previous arrangement, if the municipalities raised a sum in excess of \$750,000 there would be sharing, but there seems to be no practical possibility of this.

MR. MOLGAT: Is it not correct that if the Pan-Am Games were to proceed under the previous arrangement, the municipalities would have had to raise that amount of money.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to address a question to the First Minister relative to the TCA enquiry. Have there been any meetings of the steering committee organized from the delegation, with the government officials since the Thompson enquiry held their meetings here?

MR. ROBLIN: None that I am aware of, Madam Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Is it intended to have any such meetings, Madam Speaker, to keep the steering committee up-to-date as to what is happening?

MR. ROBLIN: I think the steering committee is up-to-date with what is happening and there is no intention to have such a meeting in the near future. Should it appear likely that such a meeting could be useful, it will receive consideration.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, in the House of Commons in Ottawa, certain questions were asked by one of the Winnipeg members of the Minister of Transport relative to transfers of personnel, and the reply was, as I recall it, that there would be no transfers except for those personnel who were under a Collective Agreement. Has the government made any representation to Ottawa in this regard?

MR. ROBLIN: We have made representations ad nauseam on this regard and we have received a very clear answer that the TCA are going to continue to make such transfers as they think are necessary for the conduct of their business. We have been able to get no assurances whatsoever from the federal administration that transfers would be stopped. This has been a subject of a number of high level communications, and that is the situation.

MR. MOLGAT: Has the request been made that the Collective Agreement not be put into force until such time as the report of the Thompson Commission is completed?

MR. ROBLIN: We have not been dealing with matters of that sort -- we have been dealing with the people concerned. And our representations have to do with the moving of persons regardless of whether there's a Collective Agreement or not, and as I say we have not received any answer that would lead us to think that the transfers will be stopped.

MR. MOLGAT: But is it not correct that the position that the company has taken is that the Collective Agreement is binding and therefore should we not be asking for suspension of the agreement until the final report?

MR. ROBLIN: The position the company has taken is that we shouldn't do anything to interfere with their little plan, but our negotiations have been with the Federal Government, not with the company.

MR. MOLGAT: Has the government, then, specifically requested that the Collective Agreement be held pending until such time as the report is complete?

MR. ROBLIN: I have already answered that question.

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . . . I think here that the honourable member is asking the same question with a slight variation.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'm trying to get an answer to the question which has not been answered.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): . . . . . say when I table the mill report of The Greater Winnipeg Gas Distribution Act for the year ending December 31, 1965, this is a report under The Greater Winnipeg Gas Distribution Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to take this opportunity to extend an invitation to all members of the House to visit the educational facilities at what is known as the old Ford Building on Portage Avenue West next Monday at 10:00 a. m. If any of the honourable members could come to that building we would put on a guided tour. I think the various teaching aid facilities there would be found most interesting by the honourable members and it would give us a morning in provincial co-operativism.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, while invitations are being extended, may I remind the House that, as agreed, as I undertook, a meeting will be held at 10:30 Tuesday, March 16th, in the regular committee room at the south side of the building to hear Messrs. Riley and Daly give us their presentation on the Pan-American Games.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, in connection with this might I ask the Honourable the First Minister if invitations have been extended to the area municipalities and to the Metro Corporation in this regard?

MR. ROBLIN: No, they have not. I took my honourable friend's proposal under consideration and I believe they have had this presentation made heretofore.

MR. PAULLEY: In conjunction with the Government of Manitoba?

MR. ROBLIN: No, by the same people that are going to make the presentation to us.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): I'm sorry, was that next Tuesday at 10:30? Thank you.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for Papers standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Elmwood, that an humble address be voted His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor for a Return showing copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba relating to a National Health Plan and/or the Hall Commission Report on Health Services.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, before the question is put may I ask my honourable friend what periods he's interested in? If he'd give us a term of years we'd be glad to accept this but I think he should give us a term.

MR. PAULLEY: Well I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that what I'm getting at is dealing with the period after the Hall Commission Report was first tabled or given to the Federal authorities, or the first revelation of what the Commission Report contained.

MR. ROBLIN: Then I take it that if the communications date from the time of the first tabling of the first report of the Hall Commission to the present time it would meet my honourable friend's view.

MR. PAULLEY: This would be satisfactory, Madam Speaker.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for Papers standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that an humble address be voted His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor for a Return showing copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba and between the Government of Manitoba and any other provinces relating to the Canada Pensions Plan.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and took a voice vote.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may, the First Minister asked a question relating to the other one as to a time period. It isn't specifically mentioned in this, but I'm referring to all three or four Canada Pensions Plans as proposed by the Liberal Party of Ottawa, not just the last one.

MR. ROBLIN: I thank my honourable friend for clarifying the point, because there at least have been four pension plans presented to us, and I have a hunch there may even be more, but we'll go back to the first edition, the prime, untouched, virgin edition.

MR. PAULLEY: We don't know what the fifth and sixth are but.....

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

Orders for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks, that an Order by the House to issue for a Return showing: 1. the number of complaints received regarding depletion of water supply in those districts in near proximity to the Floodway; 2. the number of complaints investigated; 3. the number of complaints accepted as verified in the affirmative; 4. the names of those receiving due compensation and the amounts paid to each, and the extent of the work done in each case.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, would my honourable friend agree to allow the matter to stand until the Minister is in his seat?

MR. PETERS: Agreed.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. PETERS: May we have this matter stand, please?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. PETERS: Could we also have this one stand, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? Questions standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, to determine the following question: What is the number of patients that were released from the mental hospitals and placed on "trial leave" or boarded during any recent calendar year?

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, for the sake of clarity, the government accepts this for the 1964 calendar year, if that will meet my honourable friend's approval.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Questions standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks: 1. How many expropriated property owners in the Pine Ridge district have received offers? 2. What proportion is this of the total people expropriated? 3. How many expropriated property owners in the St. Clements district have received offers? 4. What proportion is this of the total number expropriated? 5. How many property owners have had land acquired from them for purposes of the Portage Diversion? 6. In how many of these cases was expropriation resorted to? 7. Have all of the properties necessary for the Portage Diversion now been acquired and final settlement made? 8. What was the average price paid per acre on their land value only exclusive of buildings, etc.? 9. Were any monies paid in these cases for such purposes as for taking, severance, injurious affection, etc.?

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Again, Madam Speaker, as this affects partly the Department of Agriculture I'd appreciate it if we could allow this one to stand until the Minister is here. . . . . the Portage Diversion item, too.

MR. PAULLEY: On this particular point, Madam Speaker, I believe that these are questions that eventually are printed in Votes and Proceedings and if they're not acceptable to the government for some reason or other, then a nil answer, I think, would be in order. I think this is in a slightly different category of being questions that it is Order for Return as to whether the government accepts them or not. It might be a point, Madam Speaker, that you could consider. I have no real objections to it standing.

MR. ROBLIN: I would suggest that if my honourable friend is willing we'll accept the question without it standing on the understanding that we may not answer all the questions if it should be policy not to, but I don't want to leave any false impressions. I think we can answer them all but I have to issue that proviso in the absence of my colleague.

MR. PAULLEY: I think this is normal, though, Madam Speaker, and I think we would be prepared to accept that undertaking. I think it is the prerogative of the government irrespective of the request of the First Minister.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and upon a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. PETERS: Could we have this matter stand, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Inkster and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. The Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, if anyone wishes to speak in the meantime I have no objection, but I wonder if the House would allow me to have this matter

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd). . . . . stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I think that all the members of this House are aware that I am a member of the Roman Catholic Church. I think also that all, or most of the members anyway, also know that the church that I belong to, the Roman Catholic Church, do not recognize divorce; that is, does not recognize divorce for the people of their faith. Now, after having said this, I certainly do not wish to give you the information that I will oppose this resolution. I would like to make it clear that I'm speaking for myself only, that I might be criticized but this is my feelings on this, and I would like to go on record as being in favour of the amendment. As I say, I can only let my conscience guide me on this question, and I feel -- I cannot see how I can, in this House, fight and suggest that we should have freedom for certain groups, for certain people, and also advocate that the government should not bring any restrictive legislation unless it is absolutely necessary, I can't see how I could see my way clear to oppose this.

I think that I should be honest and fair, and this, first of all, will not affect those who do not believe in divorce because of religious convictions. It is not going to affect them at all, and I consider that I am one of the lawmakers of this province, and that, while we are studying laws, I think that we should have all the people of Manitoba in mind.

Right now, the way this is, I think that we are only encouraging adultery and more perjury. I feel that at times, in my mind anyway, they're certainly not suggesting that adultery should be permitted, but I think that there might be other points that might even be in certain occasions more important than that. It might be that a person commits adultery once -- might be that a couple is very happy and they could be happy -- they could forget this mistake -- and then you can go ahead and have the divorce. In another case where the man will beat up his wife, she cannot have a divorce. I think that this should be permitted for those that do recognize, do accept divorce. I think that will help in certain financial arrangements when some people will leave either husband or wife.

There is one -- as I say I'll vote for this resolution; I want to go in favour of this principle -- in the amendment there is something that I would hope that my colleague would make sure -- I'm not quite sure of Number (4), where we're speaking of incurable disease, mental disease. It seems to me that we're finding something new in this field every day and I'd want to make sure that somebody that comes back, that this is a sickness after all and I think that we're committed to -- I think that everybody when they get married feels that they have to stick by their partner in sickness. I can understand if there's positively proof that this person will never recover fully. . . . ., but I think we should be very very careful on this.

I would prefer the amendment instead of the resolution. I could not support the resolution, especially because of Number (6) where legal separation for more than two years -- I can't see that at all; somebody could again make a mistake. None of us are perfect and I don't think that because you make a mistake and you have to serve two years this should be grounds for divorce.

So again, Madam Speaker, I would say that I'm definitely speaking only for myself, I'm not speaking -- representing or even speaking for any religious group or any other group, and I feel that here in Manitoba anyway -- if I was to try to prepare legislation for people of my own church, of course, I wouldn't take the same attitude -- but for the people of Manitoba here I will go along with this amendment.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed to have it stand?

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for St. Matthews.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): I beg leave of the House to let the matter stand, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. PAULLEY: If the Honourable Member for St. Matthews is not going to proceed with this resolution, I trust that I may be permitted a word or two dealing with the subject matter of the resolution proposed by my honourable colleague, the Member for Inkster, and may I say at the offset I trust and hope that my honourable friend the Member for St. Matthews before too long will take part in this debate, because we are anxiously awaiting in this corner

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . . of the House his personal views in regard to this most important matter, and we're also anxious again in this corner to try and sense what may possibly be the opinion of the Government of Manitoba. I realize having said this, Madam Speaker, that we're dealing with a private member's resolution, and not being of the treasury benches the Honourable Member for St. Matthews would not be speaking directly on behalf of the government, but generally speaking, from my experience in this House, when a member of government takes part in a resolution of this nature he pretty well does reflect the views of the government. So I say, Madam Speaker, we are most anxious and await in anticipation not only the remarks of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews but any other member opposite, and in particular may I say I would like to hear from the Honourable First Minister, the Honourable Minister of Health, or the Honourable Minister of Welfare.

What does the resolution say in effect? It says, Madam Speaker, that the present Old Age Pension -- and we're dealing of course with the security pension at age 70 at the present time -- of \$75.00 a month, only has the purchasing value of \$55.00 today in relation to the dollar value of 1949. We say that this level of purchasing power is inadequate as a means of subsistence for elderly citizens with no other form of income. I think this has been amply demonstrated on a number of occasions, and I think, Madam Speaker, substantiated by legislation in effect here in the Province of Manitoba whereby the Province of Manitoba, through its Social Allowances Act, does make contributions to many over the age of 70, as indeed it does between the ages of 65 and 70, because of the inadequacy of the Old Age Pension payment of \$75.00.

Now there may be some in this House that having heard me say that will turn around and say, "Aren't we, the Government of Manitoba, very generous, because we recognize this fact and we do make allowances for an increase over and above the figure of \$75.00?" But lest my honourable friend the Minister of Education take this close to his heart, let me say that, while I recognize this, I am not satisfied that we should have an old age security pension of an amount that makes this necessary to apply to the provincial authorities, through social allowances or any other method, to increase what we deem should be a pension that should be adequate at least for the basic necessities of our senior citizens. And this is amply covered, Madam Speaker, in the fourth whereas where we deal with the "providing of the means for these elderly citizens to live a life of dignity in the absence of privation" should be one of our motivations in this day and age.

Then we go on in the "resolved" part of the resolution to suggest that by the year 1967, when we celebrate the centenary of our nation, that the pension should be at least equal to the number of years of the existence of this great Dominion of ours, namely, 100 years, \$100.00. I think, Madam Speaker, that my honourable colleague from Inkster is going to receive this year the support of the Conservative Government in Manitoba for his resolution. My colleague is not with me at the moment but I want to suggest to him and to this House that otherwise, or any other decision on the part of government in Manitoba, would be rejecting what the Honourable the First Minister had to say the other night when he was making reference to the consideration that is being given to the Canada Pensions Plan. Honourable members will look back -- thumb back over a few pages of Hansard, when a brief reference was made to the consideration at Ottawa of the Canada Pensions Plan. The First Minister said that he objected in many respects to the present proposal of Canada Pensions, and suggested that it would be quite within the means of Canada to provide for an increase in the Old Age Security Pension. If I recall almost directly his words, Madam Speaker, he first of all agreed that the \$75.00 was not sufficient. He said that "I would be prepared to increase it to \$100.00, to \$125.00". Indeed, if I am not misquoting my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer and the First Minister in the Province of Manitoba, he even went so far, Madam Speaker, to say, "I'd even accept an Old Age Security Pension of \$150.00". So, I say, I encourage my colleague the Member for Inkster to be of stout heart, because I say to him in all deference that frequently when he presents his resolution that he feels as though the government will not be with him. Well I say to my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster, Mr. Gray: be of stout heart this year with your resolution. We have indications of support from the Conservative ranks opposite, and possibly the only amendment that might be forthcoming in this resolution as proposed by Mr. Gray will be to increase the basic amount from \$100.00 to \$150.00.

I thank the indulgence of the House, Madam Speaker, for allowing me to make these few remarks, and I still say as I said at the offset, I'm anxiously awaiting the reply, or the contribution of my honourable friend for St. Matthews, and I say likewise to him: Be of stout

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)..... heart, my friend, and support the contentions of your Leader, the First Minister of the Province of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed to let the matter stand?

The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that whereas the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board has been of great benefits to grain producers in Western Canada; and whereas the tremendous achievement of the Canadian Wheat Board with assistance from the Federal Government in marketing the 1963 wheat crop at record high prices has been responsible, to a large degree, for the buoyant economy of Canada; and whereas the recent decline in wheat prices and the possibility of a price war between wheat exporting countries will work a hardship on wheat producers and seriously impair the national economy; therefore be it resolved that this House urge the Canadian Wheat Board and the Government of Canada to do everything possible to reinforce international co-operation to stabilize wheat prices through the International Wheat Agreement, and by other forms of consultation and co-operation; and be it further resolved that in order to protect the grain producer, and thereby stabilize the Canadian economy and world food supplies, that the Government of Canada, in a manner consistent with the achievement of international wheat price stability, establish a two price system for wheat and a guaranteed minimum of not less than \$2.00 per bushel for No. 1 Northern Wheat, basis Fort William.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, since this resolution was placed on the Order Paper -- in fact it was prior to the opening of the House -- the Government of Canada and the Canadian Wheat Board have made announcements that have a very important bearing on the subject referred to in this resolution. Last week the Canadian Wheat Board announced the final payment for the 1963 crop. This was by far the largest total amount in the history of the board -- \$272 million -- and the largest per bushel final payment on grades other than Durum. The final payment, in fact, on the regular grades of wheat, the hard spring wheat, averaged 48 cents. This ran from 46.8 cents on No. 1 Manitoba Northern to 64 cents on seed wheat--(Interjection)--The total price? Yes, I'll be coming to that very shortly.

It's interesting to note, by the way, Madam Speaker, the very substantial payments on the seed wheat and on the lower grades. I think this indicates one of the important things that the Wheat Board does, and this is an area where the farmers would lose very substantially if it were not for the Wheat Board operation, because in the olden days prior to Wheat Board, these lower grades, which at times, because of weather conditions and so on, came on the market, brought almost nothing to the producer, whereas under the Wheat Board operation with the pooling and the averaging over the year, the fact that the Wheat Board can move these out in smaller lots over the years, that it averages the whole thing out, we end up with the type of payment on seed wheat that I have referred to, a 64 cent final payment.

Now I think it's of more than passing interest that the average price paid by buyers for the '63 crop, that's basis No. 1 Northern at the Lakehead, was almost exactly \$2.00 -- a little more, in fact, than \$2.00 paid for by the buyer. The producers themselves, after you deduct storage costs and other costs, the net return to the Board and to the producer was about \$1.99, and this again is basis No. 1 Northern at the Lakehead. This total final payment of \$272 million on the '63 crop compares with final payments of \$200 million in '62; \$131 million in '61; and \$185 million in 1960. Earlier years were very much smaller than this. The average final payment of 48 cents on grades other than Durum compares with an average of 40 cents on the 1962 crop; 43 cents on the '61 crop; and again, considerably less than that in previous years. As recently as five years ago the final payment was only 12 cents per bushel.

Now, to grow a crop of 700 million bushels, as the Canadian farmers did in that year, and to export in that same crop year nearly 600 million bushels, and to sell that crop at the equivalent of \$2.00 per bushel for No. 1 Northern at the Lakehead, certainly constitutes a remarkable record. The final payment of \$272 million for wheat to Western Canada coming at this time is of great economic significance to the nation as a whole. We saw what the large wheat sales did for Western Canada and the buoyant effect that it had throughout our economy. This very large final payment, \$272 million, coming in the hands of the wheat producers at this time will have a very buoyant effect as well, not just for Western Canada but for all of Canada.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). . . . .

Now some days ago, speaking here in Winnipeg, the Hon. Mitchell Sharp indicated that the Government of Canada was not prepared to adopt any policies that would interfere with the efficient operation of the Wheat Board as a producers' marketing agency, or which would reduce the Board's incentive to go after markets on behalf of producers. In stating the government's stand in this respect, Mr. Sharp pointed out that in the opinion of the government any policy to assist agriculture by means of a subsidy paid on grain handled through the Canadian Wheat Board could in effect endanger the very existence of the Board as an effective means of marketing grain, and the Board would lose its position as an independent marketing agency for the farmer.

This has always been one of the very difficult problems that has had to be considered when guaranteed prices are advocated, and while I realize that there is room for debate on this question, Madam Speaker, I know that all of us here in the West -- well, almost all of us -- are agreed on the great service that the Canadian Wheat Board has rendered, and that collectively we are all prepared to see that the Board remains as a free and independent agency of the farmer. Having stated these facts, Madam Speaker, the concern that has prompted me to present this resolution remains the same, namely, that the Canadian farmer, because of the fact that his product is sold in world markets, is subjected from time to time to serious impact on that particular industry has a very grave impact on the over-all economy of Western Canada and of Canada as a whole, and I come back to the example of what has happened when we did have those large sales and what it did for us then.

Now, the cost price squeeze is still a very real factor in agriculture. The cost of operating continues to climb, and the government of this province with its recent increase in taxes on gasoline, license fees and hydro and heat, are adding to this burden. This increased burden of operating costs is being felt most acutely by the small farmers, and in fairness, those small farmers are asking for some guarantee, some minimum to be assured to him in the same manner as is given in other areas of our Canadian economy. Now, if the basic minimum guaranteed price for at least a certain delivery is not the answer to protect the small farmer and is not practical to administer, then what is the answer? The Minister of Trade and Commerce indicated that the government was considering other alternatives. We will await these proposals with interest, but we believe, Madam Speaker, that a basic minimum guarantee must be given to protect the family farm. We believe that there can be instituted a system which will not interfere with the independence of the Canadian Wheat Board, which will not lessen their desire to sell -- both factors with which we agree -- but that we can through a system of subsidy on a certain basic delivery, which would give the small farmer an opportunity at the time when he needs it most in the fall of a higher price, and give him a stability that is required. We think that this can be done without interfering with the Wheat Board.

Now we certainly agree that the broad objectives outlined by the Minister of Agriculture are essential to the welfare of Western Canada. These in essence are that emphasis must be placed on exporting wheat and that an aggressive and far-sighted trade credit policy must be continued and expanded. Aid to the under-developed countries of the world through the World Food Program can be greatly expanded. Every effort must be made to see that the ever-expanding markets are available but, Madam Speaker, the recent downward adjustments in world wheat prices has caused concern in Western Canada. Farmers and farm organizations are asking the government to assist in finding solutions to the problems they face. Our people feel that they have been left to stand alone in competing against the national treasuries of other major wheat exporting countries. We're the only country in the world who are presently selling wheat without any protection whatever to the wheat grower and we are doing this, Madam Speaker, here at the very heart of the continent, further from our markets than any other producer. Now I'm not interested in getting involved in some of the schemes that have been tried elsewhere, such as, for example, the American scheme which inevitably leads to production controls, or to over-production, one or the other. This is not what we are suggesting. What we are suggesting is a basic minimum for a certain delivery; beyond that, then take your chances on the market.

The wheat growers feel that the nation as a whole should be prepared through some well-developed program to assist in bringing further stability to our agriculture, and, Madam Speaker, I believe that this resolution expresses that concern and that implementing it would go a long way to providing the stability required in our wheat industry.



MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I rise to support the resolution although I really don't know why I should support this particular resolution, sponsored as it is by the Leader of the Liberal Party. I think it's ironic that the Liberal Party here in this House should be inviting us to support a resolution which, in effect, does no more than to ask the Liberal Party federally to keep its own promises. That's in effect what happened in the last federal election.

I believe that the Liberal Party at the last federal election did in fact instruct its main spokesmen in the west to make it known on every public platform that they were advocating a policy of \$2.00 wheat. Many of my friends, some of my constituents, did in fact hear that promise made by some federal candidates of the Liberal Party in the last election. I think this resolution, too, is an indication that the Liberal Party of Manitoba has little influence with its federal counterpart, because if it did it would have made representations long before now and these representations would have been successful. The fact remains, Madam Speaker, that the promise that was made almost two years ago has now been broken, and apparently the Liberal Party in Canada has no intention of doing anything about it.

The Leader of the Opposition gave us some background information as to the fundamental or basic problem that's affecting and has been affecting Canadian agriculture, particularly western agriculture, over the course of the past decade and more. It can be referred to in a few words as the cost price squeeze. The cost price squeeze has been continuing unabated, Madam Speaker, and the recent reductions in the price of wheat to the producer has merely added insult to injury. I am surprised that the Federal Government is apparently not very concerned about the impact that this reduction will have on the regional economy in Western Canada, on the economy of the individual provinces and on the livelihood of the individual farmers. It is estimated that the price reductions will reduce or lower the economy of Western Canada by some \$70 million. It has been estimated that here in Manitoba there will be a reduction of about \$10 million in purchasing power as a result of these reductions.

This is a serious problem. It merely aggravates the problem that has existed for a long time. Now surely a Federal Government that wants to be known as having integrity would want to come to grips with this problem, and especially in view of the fact that it did have its major spokesmen make a solemn pledge and promise to the people less than two years ago.

It has been suggested by the Honourable Mitchell Sharp that if we did adopt a two-price system or any system which in effect gave a minimum guarantee to the producers, that it would in some way impinge upon and detract from the workings and the autonomy of the Canadian Wheat Board. To quote him: "This would severely weaken the incentive to sell as much wheat as possible at the best possible prices". I simply cannot credit that argument. It is assuming -- the Honourable Minister is assuming that the minute that we have a tax-supported guarantee, that the civil servants working in the Wheat Board will not work to their maximum to ensure that grain is moved and that optimum, the highest possible prices, are maintained. I believe that civil servants in the Wheat Board, as anywhere else, are not motivated by any kind of profit motive. They are motivated by their professional competence, by their professional integrity, and whether or not subsidization comes into the picture or not, it would seem to me to be immaterial to these people, and I do not accept his argument; I do not think it to have much credibility.

Well, Madam Speaker, it has also been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition that perhaps we must be careful that we do not get ourselves into the same position as agriculture has got itself into in the United States where they have had relatively unrestricted production, all of which is qualifying for price supports. I am not advocating that either, but I suggest that there are some tangible and concrete proposals that might be taken up by the Federal Government, and one such is to put into effect a two-price system and to guarantee to the wheat producer a price somewhere in the order of \$2.00 a bushel. This seems to be a reasonable price, bearing in mind all of the cost factors and so on. It is not going, in itself, to solve the pervasive problem that faces western agriculture or agriculture generally, namely, that of the problem of efficiency, increased costs of production and so on. But it will help and it will ease the dislocation that many people in rural Canada are now suffering.

Madam Speaker, I again say that while I consider it not difficult to support the resolution, I certainly consider it ironic that the Leader of the Liberal Party should be inviting us to help him ask his counterparts in Ottawa to keep their own promises.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. WILLIAM H. HAMILTON (Dufferin): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): If the honourable gentleman is not ready to speak I would like to say a few words. I hope he has nothing against me saying a few words. I would have liked to hear his argument beforehand but I think that this is important enough for us to proceed, not to delay. We've heard through the media of newspaper, television, quite a bit about tax on heating fuels. Why has the government chosen to tax heating fuel in this province, is the question asked. For answer I think we should go to the Attorney-General. The Attorney-General told the people why. He said that there was no special reason; the government needed more money. That's what the Attorney-General said. Grab it where it hurts the most, regardless of the consequences. That's what we could read from what he said, that there was no special reason. By similar reasoning the government could next tax milk, because I'm sure that the government will still find it a necessity to take more money from the people. This government's appetite for money is ever-increasing--(Interjection)--Yes, why not? If that would make the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources happy I'll go along with that. If anything at all makes him happy. This is a simple matter, I suppose, as far as he is concerned. The government is dropping the Land Transfer Tax. Why wouldn't the government then consider rescinding this new heating fuel tax which in my opinion is just as bad, if not worse, than the Land Transfer Tax, but in the case of the Land Transfer Tax there was strong objection to the tax raised by organized groups throughout the Province of Manitoba, and they had succeeded in persuading the government not to proclaim this new tax. But in the case of the heating fuel tax many groups expressed their opposition, but the general consumer, the man way down at the bottom, does not have the same opportunity to protest as in the case of the organized committees and so on, in the Land Transfer Tax.

Home owners feel that this tax is most vicious, as we have said before, but what does the Premier think of that? The Premier passes this tax off as very insignificant -- in fact, he seems to say, "What of it? It's insignificant!". That's the attitude he took the other day when he spoke. He divides the yearly tax, that he comes up himself with, by twelve months and comes up with the insignificant quotient of 60 cents a month. Why, it's just 60 cents a month! I myself say this is not a correct average monthly especially during the winter months. It should be more like \$2.00 per month during the winter months, because I'm sure that most of the home owners pay \$2.00 per month tax. To a man with unlimited financial resources \$2.00 per month is very insignificant, I'll agree with the Premier, but to a man of limited means \$2.00 is still very, very significant. Some have to work three hours for the government per month to pay for this tax. Pretty soon he will have to dedicate half of his working hours to pay the Tory taxes, and that saying goes true and many people are now, just now finding out that Tories and taxes go hand in hand.

We on this side of the House believe that it is our duty, and I would say our privilege to speak on behalf of the many citizens of Manitoba who cannot afford to pay this penalty. On behalf of these people, we of the Liberal party request the government to rescind this vicious tax on heating fuels. It is not fair to tax heating fuels which are so necessary in our climate. It is just as bad as taxing baby foods. I hope that the government conscientiously considers this request. I keep hearing the word "turkey" from the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if that's all he can say. If he wants to come up and make a speech, get back into your own seat and make a speech--(Interjection)--but apparently that's the only word that he can utter.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I think that members opposite know that before 1789 the regime in France used to tax the people for the salt they consumed and that caused a revolution. The tax on heating fuel in the Province of Manitoba with the kind of climate we have is tantamount to a tax on bread, or a tax on salt. I don't want to use cliches, or words that have already been used, that this is a vicious, cruel tax but I think that members opposite must surely agree that it is a most unreasonable tax, given our climate, given our weather, etcetera.

Last year, this government saw fit to impose a series of taxes on a very selective basis. Since it was so selective it surprises me that they should have come down with a tax on heating

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd)..... fuel, and I think that the request of this resolution is justified inasmuch as this tax bears no relationship whatsoever to ability to pay; it bears no relationship whatsoever or takes no cognizance whatever of the plight of the elderly and the poor; and I think it is a fact that those people, precisely those people who have inadequate shelter, poor housing, also have the highest heating bills. In that sense, this particular tax is one of the most regressive kinds imaginable, particularly again -- and it bears repeating -- in our climate. So, Madam Speaker, I would hope that this government will be wise enough to avoid the consequences of a salt tax and avoid the fate that met the old regime.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed to have the matter stand? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, whereas the appointment of an Auditor-General in other jurisdictions has proved of great benefit in controlling waste in government and has provided savings to the taxpayer, therefore be it resolved that there be appointed an officer known as the Auditor-General, and that he be empowered to make independent spot inspections and running audits of all government departments, boards, commissions, and utilities, and to report to the Legislature. And be it further resolved that the Auditor-General should be appointed by the Legislature, be responsible only to the Legislature, be removed from office only by a two-thirds majority of votes in the Legislature.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, this resolution has been before the House on several occasions previously and I believe that the arguments for the resolution have been gone into just about as fully as we can expect. However, outside of opposition shown by the First Minister -- I believe it was two years ago -- we have heard very little about the other side of the coin, or arguments in opposition to the appointment of an auditor-general. Now I do wish that the attitude of the government would not be one in which they seem to presume that this particular officer is being suggested for some improper reason, or that there is any imputation of any kind on the government, because that it not the case, Madam Speaker. The office has been tried elsewhere and has proved to be a very effective measure and one worth considering and employing; and nowadays, Madam Speaker, with our tax loads becoming heavier all the time, the governments taking more and more money out of the pockets of the taxpayer, I think it is our solemn duty to see that there is no waste and that monies that we collect from the taxpayer are spent efficiently and to the best advantage of the taxpayer.

Now very briefly, Madam Speaker, the difference between the Comptroller-General and an Auditor-General is very simple. We don't want to mix the two or think that they are both the same offices. The Comptroller-General, the office which we now have established in the Province of Manitoba, is what is commonly known as an Internal Auditor -- an internal audit made of the accounts within the various departments. Now all that the Comptroller-General is concerned with is to see that the payment is authorized, that the proper voucher is forthcoming, and from then on he merely passes the accounts and that is it. He is not concerned as to how that money was spent, as to whether it was spent in accordance with the appropriation. He has no follow-through, no follow-up authority. Now an Auditor-General, on the other hand, is an external auditor. That is, if an appropriation is made, say, for the construction of a certain project, the Auditor-General has the full right to look into the complete file and records in connection with this particular project. He can see how much has been appropriated, where that appropriation has been spent. He can go right on to the project that is under construction and see what equipment is being used, whether it is being used properly, and so forth and so on. It's a complete supervision of the expenditure of public funds, and that is something we have not got at the present moment. It's something I believe that we should have. He actually -- you can say that his responsibilities are more or less four-fold. He has to see that the money has been faithfully and properly spent and the accounts have been faithfully and properly kept; that all monies have been accounted for; that monies have been spent for the purpose for which they were appropriated; and then he may -- and I believe would -- report annually to the Legislative Assembly.

Now there is the big difference between the Comptroller-General and the Auditor-General. The Comptroller-General is responsible to the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council whereas the Auditor-General is responsible to the legislative body and naturally answers to them. Now when he would report, what would he report on? He would report on any neglect or omission to collect money. He would report on any public money not duly accounted for; whether appro-

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd). . . . . priations were exceeded or used in a manner not authorized; and lastly, if there were any fraud in the process.

Now I could pick up newspaper reports or the federal Hansard and quote reams of places, expenditures, that the Auditor-General found were not properly made, were wasteful and so forth. I don't intend to do this, Madam Speaker. I think that most of those items or the reports made by the Auditor-General have been seen by the members of this House, and I think it would just be a waste of time, and I'd ask, Madam Speaker, that the government give this resolution the serious consideration that it deserves, and that it does support it at this particular time.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks, that debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: I'd like to have the matter stand, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): . . . . . Madam, I'd like to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

I have given consideration to the amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. His amendment, in my opinion, substitutes a proposition which would offer an opposite conclusion to the main question raised by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside in his proposed resolution. May I refer the honourable members to Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, citation 202, paragraph 13, which reads as follows: "An amendment to alter the main question by substituting a proposition with the opposite conclusion is not an expanded negative, and it may be moved." Accordingly, I must rule the amendment in order.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan. The Honourable the Member for Roblin.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): . . . . . matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Churchill, that whereas for many years it has been policy that the Federal Government provided television and radio service to the public; and whereas these services are gradually being extended to the remote areas of the nation; and whereas there is a growing population in northern Manitoba not yet adequately served by national television and radio services; and whereas the Manitoba Telephone System has expressed to the Government of Manitoba its willingness to co-operate in extending radio and television to northern Manitoba; therefore be it resolved that this House request the Government of Canada to extend national television and radio service to areas in northern Manitoba not yet adequately served.

MADAM SPEAKER: Who is your seconder, please?

MR. BEARD: Seconded by the Member for Swan River.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BEARD: Madam Speaker, in considering the problem of radio and television service, I believe that we should consider the Broadcasting Act of 1958 in which Parliament delegated to the directors the responsibility and authority for operating a national broadcasting service. The four basic principles of CBC as outlined were: first, to be a complete service covering in fair proportion the whole range of programming to cater to people of all ages, tastes and interests; second, to link all parts of the country in two ways -- firstly, through the inclusion of a wide variety of national and common interest, and second, by using its physical resources to bring national program service to as many Canadians as possible, whether

(MR. BEARD cont'd), . . . . . the Canadians live in remote areas or in the more densely populated areas in the national system. The national system, rather, should serve them as adequately and as equitably as possible. Thirdly, it was to be predominantly Canadian in context and character. It should serve Canadian needs and bring Canadians in widely separated parts of the country closer together, contributing to the development and preservation of a sense of national unity. Fourth, it was to serve the two main language groups and cultures, and special needs of Canadians in various geographical regions.

In referring to the CBC annual report of 1963-64, it is stated that the obligation of the Broadcasting Act was to provide national broadcasting service, first in radio and then in television, to establish facilities to serve the Canadian beyond the reach of existing CBC stations, or of private stations affiliated with the CBC. It is further stated that in radio some 98 per cent of the population had been covered for some years, and in television the 90 per cent figure was passed in 1961.

It is generally acknowledged that the six major CBC aims should be: first, to encourage Canadian talent; second, to contribute to the education of the public; third, to let people know what's happening in the world today; fourthly, to entertain the public; fifth, to help Canadians in all parts of Canada to understand and learn about each other; sixth, to help French and English Canadians learn and understand each other.

In checking installations through Canada, we find that Manitoba is well behind in the construction of radio and television stations in the northern part of our province. Radio and television communications are necessary if our people are to stay abreast of the news in today's modern world. Madam Speaker, in the north we have radio stations at Flin Flon, Thompson, and our CBC station in Churchill. We do find that through mineral interference it is often impossible for many of these stations to reach those places which are difficult to gain communication of any type with, and this provides almost an impossible situation in trying to modernize northern Manitoba.

But, Madam Speaker, I do feel that in speaking to this resolution we must separate radio and television. Firstly, with radio, we do find that there could be quite a simple solution. When Bird station was torn down last year, there was a land line which extended from Bird to Churchill and then back down the line to The Pas. This would allow the CBC to extend live programming through the Thompson outlet and through the Churchill outlet so that we could have live broadcasts on radio on a 24-hour basis or on the basis of the time that these stations were broadcasting. This would give us the opportunity of having on-the-spot programs. We would have up-to-date news which we're very much behind in at present -- our daily papers in Winnipeg don't get out to these places until they're at least 24 hours old, and in many cases the papers arrive two or three times a week. This presents a very tough program of trying to keep up with modern news media.

If we had the land line made available along the Hudson Bay we would have the service at no extra cost to what is being presented today. At present, tapes are made of CBC programs and they're extended throughout -- they're sent out to cover the whole of Canada. In Thompson, particularly, we get the tapes from four to six weeks old. This means that the tapes have already gone to Frobisher Bay, Churchill and some of the other far areas in the Northwest Territories. In getting these programs four to six weeks old, you can imagine what happens when -- the Queen's visit to Canada, we at Thompson got it about six weeks after she had gone back. And many of the other programs are interrupted. When we were given the Christmas programming for Thompson, in many cases they had to accept those programs which were exactly a year old because the CBC programming wouldn't have arrived until some time in February. So it was very very difficult for the station at Thompson to operate on this type of basis. And if they're going to pass along a program of education it must be through a better, up-to-date service.

Thompson station has had wide reception. It is covering most of the Indian Reservation and it is also able to serve the town of Lynn Lake at present, and we would hope that the CBC can be encouraged to make use of this live land line system of broadcasting which, again I emphasize, will not cost them any more money than what it is costing today to service the communities of Churchill and Thompson with the tapes that are being flown in and out of the communities.

Secondly, when we move over to television, we must consider the system that is set up at present. It is rather a hodge-podge type of programming for northern Manitoba. I don't think that you can call the system that is set up on Baldy Mountain to broadcast to the Dauphin-

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . . . Swan River area, as being particularly adequate. It's canned, and it's not live. The same system is set up at Flin Flon which services a small portion of that area but does not cover the industrial townsite of Lynn Lake and Snow Lake and the other small communities along the Bay line.

In Thompson we have a private, unlicensed system that is set up to bring television to the people of Thompson and when one first looks at it one thinks, well, the people of Thompson are particularly -- should be satisfied in having some television of some type or other. But they have to pay \$9.00 a month and for this they get a video tape which is taped off some of the stations in town here. We not only watch your program, we watch all your advertising plus what advertising they can pick up in Thompson and for this service we pay the goodly sum of \$9.00 a month and the programs are not up-to-date. They again are at least a week old.

Madam Speaker, this is a tentative type of system that they are now attempting to put up at Churchill. I don't know what will come of this one at Churchill but it certainly cannot be any better than the service that is being rebelled against in Thompson. I don't really have any axe to grind with the system in Thompson as is being presented through the fact that there's nothing else that private, the enterprise can do about it. But certainly if CBC, along with the co-operation of our Manitoba Telephone System, can provide a live system to the Town of Thompson so that we can adequately service not only the Town of Thompson itself but a service which would incorporate Snow Lake, Flin Flon, The Pas, the Swan River-Dauphin area, then we'll have reached the majority of the population which is now going without. Up to date it seems that government has been satisfied to consider expansion in northern Manitoba through a fact that they divide and separate the community. In the southern part of Manitoba the service goes out and they say well we can reach so many thousands of people and this provides a sum of money that can be considered. But in the north there are at least 50,000 people that are not being serviced and this is because Flin Flon has been looked on as a community of 12,000; The Pas, 5 or 6 thousand; Thompson at 8,000 and Churchill at another 5 to 6 thousand, but they're widely separated and I think that it has come to an age now where if we can televise the moon, then there is a system available where we can bring television to the widely separated areas in the Province of Manitoba and it would be hoped that the members of the Assembly can support the north in its effort to bring a modern up-to-date television and radio service to our province.

. . . . . continued on next page

MR. JAMES H. BILTON, (Swan River): Madam Speaker, I rise on this occasion to support this resolution, if I may, and I would suggest that central and northern Manitoba has been extremely ignored in the overall plan of the CBC activities from its inception, not only in television coverage but also with radio. For too long the length and breadth of Lake Winnipegosis has been a barrier, and in some instances in provincial thinking to the settled land area immediately west of that great lake. Even in this year of 1965 everything runs parallel with the American border in meeting the needs of this province, much as it did 50 or 60 years ago. A glance at the map will indicate that this is not the case in Saskatchewan and Alberta where the whole area is covered by the national communications media. I am told that the television programs we receive in the Dauphin and Swan River areas are channelled through to us from the Calgary CBC station. A few years ago some interest was shown by the CBC and the provincial government of the day toward doing something about this situation, which was unfortunately abandoned. Growing out of that development CQS-TV of Yorkton Saskatchewan was given the franchise to serve Dauphin and the Swan River area. Our people were grateful for the effort of this Yorkton organization that did so at considerable expense. I need not comment on the situation that has developed. Naturally it was a Saskatchewan enterprise devoted for the most part to the affairs of that province. We as part of the Province of Manitoba, feel that we should have more news and views of this province's activities and national affairs directly. With the developments that I have outlined no provision was given toward coverage to meet the needs of the people north of Mafeking. We have known for a long time that the development of northern Manitoba, both minerally and population-wise, requires an entirely new look. Surely that time is long past due. I compliment the wisdom of the Honourable Member for Thompson. Surely his plea that was made today and that of the Federal Member for Churchill, who has devoted much time and effort in the Federal House pleading for this coverage for many years to meet the needs of the many, many thousands of people who were numbered for your information today, so that not very much more time will be allowed to elapse before they are recognized.

I know the wheels of government sometimes move slowly but we in northern Manitoba become incensed with the constant boasting of the CBC and its so-called national coverage. The Manitoba Government is and has been working hard for many years now in the opening up of northern Manitoba with roads and the expansion of public utilities. This together with services which are almost on par with that provided for the citizens in the rest of the province. Those things are essential, Madam Speaker, if we are to keep at home the oncoming generations and more important, attract people of the professional occupations and the trades who are so sorely needed. With the developing and increasing population in Thompson and elsewhere, the large population in Flin Flon, the services being developed in The Pas, and who knows from day to day what further rich strikes may be made, the need is becoming even greater for doctors, nurses and other professional people and I must emphasize people of the many trades.

CBC authorities, Madam Speaker, are surely aware of these things and while they choose to be apathetic toward recognizing northern Manitoba I feel that we should support this resolution showing the intention of this House in getting behind the people who are pioneering that country, opening up in greater numbers, year by year.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. STEVE PATRICK, (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood: whereas it is necessary to relieve the consumers of Manitoba from unfair, deceptive and harsh sales practices; and whereas legislation to protect the consumer can be effective without impairment to normal and desirable trade conditions, and indeed restores consumer confidence; and whereas such legislation should have the effect of inhibiting undesirable sales rather than requiring the purchaser to resort to Court action after an undesirable transaction has been entered into; therefore be it resolved that the provincial government enact immediate legislation to achieve the following results: (a) to provide a three-day waiting period for purchasing of an article by means of direct sales, in which the purchaser shall be permitted to repudiate the contract of sale and to enforce immediate recovery of any money paid; (b) to provide for the licensing and bonding of dealers who are in trades where the public is most vulnerable to

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . . . unscrupulous business practices; (c) to require registration of conditional sales contracts; (d) to require advertisers to be able to prove the availability in reasonable quantity of advertised goods, thus eliminating "lure advertising"; and (e) to provide penalties for false or misleading advertising or representations.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I introduce this resolution in an endeavour to have established in Manitoba what we deem to be necessary additional legislation for the protection of consumers and also to have legislation enacted that will make it possible for redress to be obtained by persons who may feel that they have been the victims of unscrupulous dealers in industry or in business.

May I say at the offset of my remarks Madam Speaker, I mean no reflection at all for the very great majority of the business community here in the Province of Manitoba who are conducting themselves on a high plane and whose business ethics are beyond reproach. I am particularly concerned however, that there are individuals and groups in the province that have to be more rigidly controlled than they are at the present time. I might say Madam Speaker, that the subject matter of the resolution has been enacted into legislation in many jurisdictions in the United States of America and laws have been passed for the protection of the consumer in these jurisdictions.

I introduced a somewhat similar resolution Madam Speaker last year and referred to many of the jurisdictions that had laws and it was indicated at that time by the Honourable the Provincial Secretary that consideration may be given or would be given to some of the points raised. However, I find no proposals forthcoming from the Government, at least at this stage, that they are going to of their own volition introduce measures, and that of course, is the purpose of this resolution to reawaken the interest of the Provincial Secretary and the Government as to the necessity of protection.

I do not intend Madam Speaker to be long in this presentation. I think that the resolution, generally speaking, speaks for itself. One of the more important aspects of the resolution is the first item, a three-day waiting period of time between the date of the purchase of an article under a direct sales agreement and permitting within a three day period the purchaser to get out of the agreement.

I might say Madam Speaker I've had a bit of experience in this area where salesmen, particularly book salesmen, knocked on the door and talked individuals into purchasing very expensive books and afterwards when the individuals want to reconsider they haven't been able to and have got trapped. One of the experiences I had dealt with a purchase of a set of encyclopedia books to the degree of somewhere in the neighborhood of \$450.00. I grant you Madam Speaker, it took the salesman about three hours to convince the parties who signed their name to the document that their son, who was only about 4, would require these encyclopedia books, but anyway eventually, a contract was signed and the deposit of \$100.00 made on the books.

The following morning however, when the parties concerned woke up, and thought the matter over once again, they figured that they couldn't afford the \$450 and besides by the time that their son had grown up, became old enough to even understand more than the basic pictures in the encyclopedia that the encyclopedia may be out of date. They made an attempt to get their cheque back, their deposit cheque of \$100, whereupon the salesman informed them that he had deposited that in the mail the evening previously and it was on its way down to Toronto. Legal advice was sought and the information given was that it was just too bad, there was nothing in the law in order to set aside the agreement and to all intents and purposes the particular party was out the \$100 and was under an agreement to purchase the books.

However, Madam Speaker --I might say this happened in the Town of Transcona-- however, the town did have a bylaw which at that particular time stated that every travelling book salesman or magazine pedlar had to have a license in order to do business within the boundaries of the town; and on remembering this I thought well darn it all, if the law can't do anything through direct approach, maybe a little gentle persuasion might get the monies returned back to the party who had entered into the agreement. There was a provision for a fine for not taking out a license to peddle books and then in another portion of our bylaw there was a penalty of I think it was two weeks in gaol for non-payment of the fine. So I thought I'd better become a salesman myself on behalf of the party that had got into the contract and I contacted the salesman and told him that I had been a Mayor of the Town of Transcona, I was pretty conversant with the bylaws of the town and told him that I had gone into the civic offices to see whether or not he had been registered as a book salesman. I found that he hadn't been, that our law says a fine of



(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd). . . . . \$5.00 or a gaol sentence of two weeks and I'm sure that I could talk the Justice of the Peace into not imposing the fine but awarding you a two week sentence in our local lock-up if you didn't come to terms and refund the money.

I think my persuasive powers at that time Madam Speaker, were a little better than they are sometimes in this House because the chap said, "well give me a couple of hours to think this one over, will you"; and in two hours he 'phoned me and he said - "You know, he says, I'm lucky, " he says "I thought that I had sent the cheque down to Toronto and I found it among some of my sales slips and I will return it to the party concerned." Now if it hadn't of been for this particular fact or incident--and I guess the expiration of charges against himself has gone now because this was some considerable years ago-- but if it hadn't been for this type of an approach Madam Speaker, they could not have got a refund of their monies or cancellation of the contract. This then Madam Speaker, is one of the basic reasons for this cooling off or thinking over period that we're suggesting in the resolution before you.

The second deals with the question of providing for the licensing and bonding of dealers who are in trades where the public are most vulnerable to unscrupulous business practices. I note with great interest Madam Speaker that the Province of Ontario has just recently had before it or passed, legislation dealing with the licensing and bonding of used automobile dealers. This is one of the fields in which many people are taken for a ride literally, financially, by entering into agreements with salesmen who were not bonded and there seems to be no opportunity or media for which monies can be recovered. Again may I say, by and large, our used car salesmen, our used car dealers are honourable people. Here again, Madam Speaker, you get the individual who has no scruples whatsoever and I'm sure that most of the members in this House have had similar experiences to what I have had in complaints on used car dealers.

Also, there is another field in which this can be done, or is being done according to information that has been directed to me, Madam Speaker, is in the field of radio and television repairs. Here again, reputable dealers don't do these things but there are considerable number in this particular field who are, may I say, rooking the public, and should be required to be bonded for the protection of the public.

Then Madam Speaker, Item number (c) is a suggestion to require registration of conditional sales contracts. We have had considerable discussion on this, and we think that conditional sales contracts and their forms should be registered so that they will reveal the conditions under which conditional purchases are made.

Item number (d) requires advertisers to be able to prove the availability in reasonable quantity of advertised goods, eliminating "lure advertising". I think that this is most intriguing Madam Speaker, because we have continuously over the years, as consumers and purchasers, been at the mercy of those who put up an article or two at a ridiculously low price, having no volume behind it, just simply to get the customer in the front door, and tell them that there is no more, "We sold the last one ten minutes ago". And I don't know how many other members of this House have deliberately stood in line at store opening time in some of our stores to see whether or not they can take advantage of some of these "lure advertising" practices, only to find that in the big rush after the sale of a half a dozen articles or so, there just simply isn't any more left. I think that legislation and education is required in this particular field to prevent this.

And then the last item, and maybe one of the more important items in the resolution, "to provide penalties for false or misleading advertising or representation". This would cover a very large field of consumer goods, Madam Speaker. I will not go into it in any detail, sufficient for me to say that it is a fact that we can pick up our newspaper and advertising dodges of any description, and find that the glorified appeal to the purchaser is in fact misleading, and when the article being advertised is revealed or seen, it bears no relationship to the article described in the papers.

These then, Madam Speaker, are a few items that I think that this House can well consider in the interest of the consumer. I think these are articles or items that it would be well for the Government of Manitoba and this House to take under advisement. I frankly confess, Madam Speaker, that my introduction is rather sketchy on this occasion but I don't think that it is really necessary to point out to members of this House who have been and are in public life, and dealing with people as we are, surely, we've all heard of items such as I mention on this introduction that require the protection for the consumer, and do require legislation on behalf of the consumers.

MR. L. A. BARKMAN, (Carillon): I wonder if the Honourable Leader of the NDP Party would mind answering a question. In the resolution under (a) "for purchasing of an article by means of direct sales", would you mind elaborating a little bit on that point?

MR. PAULLEY: Well, what I really mean Madam Speaker, by that direct sales, I had more in line of what my illustration was, direct sales at home, where an individual salesman approaches the individual, makes a sale and then he is away. This is the main point in that.

MR. F. GROVES, (St. Vital): Madam Speaker I wonder if anybody else would like to speak on this, because I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member from Rhineland wish to speak today?

MR. FROESE: I just had a further question if the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party would care to answer it. Wouldn't you rather define in (a) just the article. It could be a perishable product and how would you be able to return it? How would you cancel the contract? . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . salesman don't carry perishable. . . . .

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Morris.

MR. H. P. SHEWMAN, (Morris): Madam Speaker, with the indulgence of the House I would ask that this resolution stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. A. WRIGHT, (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, whereas it has been demonstrated in most countries of Europe and in the Province of Saskatchewan, that a prepaid comprehensive plan of medical care can be a practical reality, and whereas the Royal Commission on Health Services recommended a government sponsored health insurance program for all Canadians, administered jointly by the Federal and Provincial Governments and financed by taxes and premiums, and without a means test; and whereas the Commission advised against voluntary plans like Alberta's and the one proposed by the Ontario government, on the basis that these plans are too restrictive and fail to reach a great percentage of the population who need the protection, and whereas the report also recommended against private plans which would cost 22 percent more than the government scheme. Therefore be it resolved that this government consider the advisability of urging the Federal Government to establish; a national plan of comprehensive, universal, health insurance, or a joint federal-provincial scheme of universal, comprehensive health insurance or failing both of the above this government should establish a universal, comprehensive health insurance plan for the citizens of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, after submitting a lengthy resolution like that one would wonder if there could be much more to say. However, in submitting this resolution at this time, I do so with more optimism Madam Speaker, than I did on the previous occasion. The Toronto Star Weekly had an editorial in February 1960 and it quoted Mr. Tommy Douglas who was then the Premier of Saskatchewan as saying that "the national health insurance would become a reality in Canada by 1970". It went on to say that if Saskatchewan adopted the medical insurance there, it would spur demands for similar legislation right across Canada, just as hospital insurance started in Saskatchewan in 1947, eventually swept across the country. Because the hospital insurance plan lived up to its advance expectations, promises, it can be hoped that the appeal of the comprehensive medical insurance scheme will spread at an even greater pace.

In submitting evidence to support the resolution Madam Speaker, I feel that I should take the time to put on the record some evidence that these plans are more practical today. I could quote the World Health Organization preamble and charter, and I could again quote the words of Sir. Arthur Newsholme, but I will not burden the records with that once more, because ever since 1919 when the Liberals first talked about comprehensive health insurance for Canada, we have been doing not much else but just talk. And while we have been talking and talking in Canada other countries have acted.

It may startle a lot of people to know just what has gone on in the rest of the world. Take Albania. Since 1947 there has been health insurance with cash benefits including treatment at doctors' office, and includes prenatal and confinement care. Australia; the first laws were in 1912 for maternity benefits, sickness and hospital benefits, and since 1945 pharmaceutical benefits,

(MR. WRIGHT, cont'd). . . . . and since '47 a national health service, and since '48 hospitalization, medical care and full cost of pharmaceutical requirements. Austria: the first law was in 1938, and more recently governed by a law of 1955 giving general and specialist, medical care, hospitalization, medicines and appliances, home nursing, transportation and no time limit except for hospitalization, some provision for convalescent preventive service, complete maternity care. Belgium: currently governed by the law of 1944 as amended since. 75 percent of specialist care, surgery, hospitalization, laboratory services and appliances, part of the cost of general medical care, medicines, dental care, nursing. Bulgaria: since first law of 1918 and currently governed by the laws of '49 and '51, coverage for general and specialists medical care, hospitalization, sanatorium and dental care, medicines and appliances, maternity attendance by midwife or by physician if necessary; also medicine. Burma, Madam Speaker, covered by the law of 1954, free medical care, specialists and laboratory service at diagnostic centre, standard ward hospitalization, emergency home calls, ambulance calls and medicine, maternity, prenatal, confinement and post-natal care. Chile: governed by the laws of 1952 and 1953, for wage earners - periodic medical examination, general and special medical care in clinic, hospital or home; 85 percent of the cost of hospitalization, medicines and dental care including the cost of materials; no time limit; limited preventative and curative medical service for salaried employees. China, Nationalist China: since 1950 free hospitalization, including surgery. China, the People's Republic: since 1951 medical treatment, hospitalization and ordinary medicines provided at employer's expense at clinic or hospital of enterprise or one designated by it. Patients, except model workers and combat heroes, pay the cost of expensive medicines and meals; transportation, prenatal and confinement care paid by the employer. Czechoslovakia: governed by legislation of 1956, medical care, hospitalization, dental care, medicines and appliances, travel expenses, sanatoria, partial cost of holiday camps, no-limit on the hospitalization; medical care and hospitalization. Madam Speaker, I could go on and quote from Denmark, France, Germany, West and East, Greece, Italy, Ireland, Iran, India, Iceland, Hungary, Japan, Libia, Luxembourg, Mexico, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Spain, United Kingdom, U. S. S. R., Turkey, Switzerland, Sweden, Yugoslavia. Madam Speaker, all these countries have enjoyed the "so-called luxury" as we call it here, of more or less comprehensive medical care.

We have plenty of evidence to support our contention that a government-operated comprehensive plan of medical care is a practical objective today. But now in '65, 1965, after the report of the Royal Commission on Health Services, we find, and I said before, Madam Speaker, I am a little more encouraged, maybe because we find men like John Diefenbaker coming out now since the Hall Commission Report endorsing these recommendations calling for a Saskatchewan type plan of national health program. Now this certainly is progress.

And what about the Liberals? Well, Madam Speaker, I have an article here I clipped out of the paper the other night. I'll show you what the Liberals are thinking now on this --I've got so much material here that I-- this is from the Free Press of March 6th, Madam Speaker, the headline is: "Liberal Lobby Pushes for Pull. Pressuring Pearson to Call June Election on Medicare". Now it's a long, long way since 1919, but here we are, becoming politically expedient now. This article by the way is by Peter Newman. "Massive pressure is building up inside the Liberal Party for a general election this June with Medicare as a central campaign issue. No final decision has yet been made and a strong lobby inside the Cabinet remains opposed to the idea, but supporters of this strategy make four telling points. I mention them Madam Speaker, to show you that political expediency is involved. "Point one is that "This House of Commons has outlived its usefulness and that only a general election, which they're convinced would mean a Liberal majority, can restore Parliament's effectiveness. 2. That some imaginative new policy initiative must be found to disperse the clouds of scandal overhanging the Pearson administration. Even though Yvon Dupuis, ex-Minister Without Portfolio remains the only Liberal Minister actually charged with specific wrongdoing, this week's Rivard escape has brought many Liberals to the realistic conclusion that they can't rely much longer on muddling from disaster to disaster." I'm not going to burden the House with the whole article, Madam Speaker, but a little farther down it says, "that the pension plan and other legislative achievements of the Liberal Government would not make particularly effective election plans since people are inclined to vote for the promise of future benefits rather than for something they already have."

I think our First Minister's guess the other day was a pretty good one, too. And it said; "I guarantee free medical services would have the kind of universal appeal politicians dream of."

(MR. WRIGHT, cont'd). . . . . Since 1919 they finally got this dream out where we can take a good look at it. "And that a strong Liberal stand for Medicare would cut the policy ground out from under the NDP in the campaign and presumably garner a great many Progressive votes." --Progressive votes, Madam Speaker-- and by appropriating Medicare the Liberals would be implementing the last of the NDP's major legislative crusades which have included the adoption of a national labour code, and the establishment of a universal pension plan." Well, they even have given us quite a plug there too. Oh, the article's a dandy --it goes on to a second page but I'm not going --I'll read you a portion of it -- I think this --and I'm still quoting, Madam Speaker, from this editorial by Peter Newman-- "Unlike the carelessly drafted pension scheme which the Liberals had to keep revising, any medical care plan would be based on the meticulous report of the Royal Commission on Health Services." Meticulous report! --"This admirable 1289 page document drawn up under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Emmett Hall of the Supreme Court of Canada, is probably the most practical Royal Commission Report ever written in this country." One can understand, Madam Speaker, why they're attaching so much importance to the expediency of suddenly now after all this time using Medicare as an issue for perhaps June.

The other night the First Minister spoke on page 225 and 226 of Hansard, he put on record his comments about the Canada Pension Plan, and while I may not agree with everything he said, I admire him for his courage in saying exactly what he thought about the Plan. But he also said that he thought that what we needed more in this list of priorities was a health plan for the medically indigent; and it seems to me, Madam Speaker, in the few years that I've been here this is where we have to differ. We have been asking for this for people who are not yet indigent. One would wonder just how many thousands of people are so close to the borderline of becoming indigent. We have the government from time to time throwing at us this much vaunted Social Allowances Act --and true, it's a wonderful thing-- but one would have to become medically indigent in order to be taken of. And this is what we keep arguing. What about the thousands of people who are still able to paddle their own canoe, so close to being indigents? Surely we must consider these people.

The Social Allowances Act now takes care of, I don't know the exact number, it was 10,000 people I believe, 20,000 have Medicare cards. But what about the private plans? I just came from seeing a lady today --and I've said this before in this House, she's over 80 and she's getting older year by year, like the rest of us-- and out of her \$75.00 per month she is, because she's living with relatives who are good to her, she's able to pay into the MMS-- being one of the pioneering stock and wanting, as I said before, to paddle her own canoe. Out of her \$75.00 she pays a premium of close to \$15.00 per quarter. Her main need at the present time is drugs and these drugs --she showed me a bill that cost her \$28.00 in one week. As I mentioned at the last Session in a similar speech, that for the first time in history the cost of drugs in United States exceeded the cost of medical services. Now surely there must --no one could argue that this MMS scheme that this elderly lady is subscribing to is adequate for these times.

Let me give you my own case, Madam Speaker. I happen to be very fortunate and blessed with good health and have never required medical attention. I work for a company that has a scheme which is second to none in Canada for protection. My wife had the misfortune a few weeks ago to slip and break her wrist and I had to take her to the nearest hospital which was in the Town of Selkirk to get a cast on it. And after paying all these years through Blue Cross and so on, all these high premiums, Madam Speaker, I found out that my wife couldn't get a cast on her wrist. This is the first requirement that I had made. I can't bolster up a lot of enthusiasm for a scheme like that; and they try to make us think that we are protected by all these things. So I got a \$25.00 bill for the application and removal of a cast, just because my wife wasn't hospitalized. Now, is this comprehensive health care? I can't subscribe to the idea that it is.

The private plans are certainly not filling the bill at all. What about our doctors, Madam Speaker? And right here I think it's a good time for me to pay tribute to our doctors because much was said about the affair in Saskatchewan. I can't help but think that we have some of the finest doctors in North America right here in Winnipeg. And I can't help thinking that they attend school for 20 or more years, working hard at school, to find themselves into a world now full of tension, where they have to work endless hours under great tension in order to provide enough for an old age that many of them will never see because of the strain. I think that with the system that they have now in Saskatchewan that they are beginning to realize that some of this tension will be taken from them.

(MR. WRIGHT, cont'd).....

I want to refer back, Madam Speaker, to a meeting we had with the doctors of Winnipeg, about a year and a half ago, I believe it was. We were invited to their headquarters up in the Medical Arts Building and after treating us to a nice meal there we discussed comprehensive medical care, particularly as they had it in Britain at the time. And I must say, to their credit, Madam Speaker, they showed us a film about the British Plan that they had not seen themselves and it was a most enjoyable evening because as we sat around watching the film, I sat with a very prominent Winnipeg doctor, and when he would see a point on the screen that would enhance his argument he would give me a nudge and say, "There you are, Art, you see the long line-ups at the doctor's office". And then I would wait my turn and when I saw the young doctors making the trips out into the country to attend the old people, many of whom would never have received attention had this system not been adopted, I would give him a nudge. But we did spend a most enjoyable evening and my leader as usual made a case for our philosophy and one of the doctors, chief of the Medical Association in Winnipeg, did likewise. But I think we did close a gap to a little bit better understanding. Now since then much water has gone under the bridge, especially in Saskatchewan. We are now finding out the doctors are while not completely happy, they certainly are working together with the government. Now I was fortunate in picking up this out of I think the last issue of Look Magazine. It's an article by Jack Star who is senior editor of Look. "Two And A Half Years Later", the article is called "Canada's Doctors Strike. The surprise ending to Saskatchewan's bitter battle over socialized medicine." Madam Speaker I'll take just a few minutes to put some of this on the record. The headline - "Regina, Saskatchewan", and it says, "In the summer of 1962 this Canadian prairie province seemed to be heading for certain catastrophe. Most of Saskatchewan's 700 practising doctors were angrily striking against a medicare plan that had just been installed by the provincial government. Two-thirds of the hospitals were closed as strikers provided emergency care only at the larger centres. The government hurriedly acted to fly strike-breaker doctors from England. We will never practise medicine here again if it means we are really nothing more than employees of the Provincial Department of Public Health, vowed the strikers and some of them actually moved out of the province, but after three bitter weeks a compromise finally settled the walkout and today the battle seems remote. Saskatchewan's 940,000 residents are generally enthusiastic about their medical plan and even the doctors who earn more money than before, are not too unhappy over what's happened. There's no use in rechewing an old cud, says a leader of the physicians Dr. B...., who until recently headed the Saskatchewan College of Physicians and Surgeons which negotiated the compromise. The all-powerful college not only licenses doctors but sets their fees, disciplines them and serves as their professional and scientific society. Dr. B..... says, and I quote, "A system of Medical care has been installed and we are living with the system. It's a political fact of life, no one is going to turn the clock back overnight. Saskatchewan's Cooperative Commonwealth Federation Party which for 20 years was the only Socialist government on the North American continent has been voted out of office since the adoption of the medical plan but it's successor the Liberal Party did not even consider repealing the measure." And that's important, Madam Speaker. Just as the Conservative Government of Britain had no intention of throwing out the scheme there put in by the Labor Party neither do the Liberals in Saskatchewan even give it a second thought. I go on to quote, "Instead the Liberal leaders are thinking of extending coverage to pay for major drug costs", because, Madam Speaker, they know that the cost of drugs today exceeds the cost of medical service. "The Royal Commission goes farther and suggests that plans like Saskatchewan's be enlarged to provide free dental care and eye glasses for children and other benefits as well. Saskatchewan has been a leader in medical care. It was the first Canadian Province to provide hospitalization for its citizens. In 1947, three years after the Socialist Government took office, the province began requiring its residents to pay a hospital insurance tax. This together with other revenue covered most hospital bills. All of the other Canadian provinces have since enacted similar hospital insurance laws with the national government paying half the province's cost."

Madam Speaker I'm not going to burden the records with more, there's another couple of pages on this, but I did want to point out that this is what other people are thinking about the situation, who have been removed from all the heat of battle.

Now the Royal Commission, the Hall Commission on health services made some 200 recommendations, Madam Speaker and I don't intend to start reading 200 recommendations but I would like to point out some of them. It recommended comprehensive health services program

(MR. WRIGHT, cont'd). . . . . financed by taxes and premiums, that everyone gets the benefits without a means tax. It's a system based on free choice. I'd like to emphasize this, Madam Speaker, because much controversy was about this one point. A system based on free choice by patients of doctors and dentists who are free to accept or reject patients. The provinces launch and administer the program. Ottawa pays half the cost. The provinces administer care to Indians and Eskimos providing health care in the same manner and quality as those enjoyed by other Canadians.

The scheme includes all medical services, diagnosis and treatment of all physical and psychiatric conditions in home, hospital and office. Emphasis on preventive measures are included because, Madam Speaker, once all of Canada has this comprehensive medical scheme, the victory will not be over until we launch into a comprehensive scheme of preventive medicine.

One other item is that it includes prescribed drugs --the patients pay the first dollar on each prescription; 11% Federal Sales Tax removed from drugs; free dental service for children under 18, expectant mothers and welfare cases; hospital insurance coverage for mental and tuberculosis patients; eye care and glasses for children under 18, prosthetic services, artificial arms, legs, etc; fluoridation of all community water systems to prevent tooth decay; home care services for the ill; organized care of crippled and retarded children; experiment giving drug addicts narcotics under supervision; air ambulances. Madam Speaker, you will recall a resolution that I sponsored in this House some years ago, and after listening to the Honourable Member for Churchill and he talked about the isolation of his area, and I was wondering whether he would subscribe to this recommendation of the Hall Commission about air ambulances Medical depots and nursing stations in remote areas; crash training program for specialists aided by federal grants; six new university medical schools and expansion of existing ones; and encouragement of group practice of medicine through the provision of long-term loans. I might say one of the bones of contention still in Saskatchewan is the fact that with the strike of the doctors, the group practice of medicine was started. I imagine we are going to hear a lot more about it. The nurses' training cut to two years from three and ten new university nurses' schools; grants, bursaries, to send graduate nurses to university; four new university dental schools and expansion of existing ones. Ottawa pays half the construction cost of new medical and dental schools. Now Madam Speaker, I've only given you a few of the 200 recommendations made by this commission and, as I said before, it was quoted by the author of this article as being one of the finest reports of any Royal Commission in the history of Canada.

What about the cost of this Madam Speaker? A lot of people have said that it would bankrupt the country. Well the Commission has something to say about that too. It says that the government sponsored Medicare program covering all Canadians would cost \$446 million a year and this is split 50-50 between the provincial and the federal authorities. Now the present health services are costing \$178 per person. This is important Madam Speaker. Adding another \$20 would pay for the complete medical plan as envisaged by the Hall Commission. In other words, this represents \$198 per capita. I spoke about a pharmaceutical bill of this old lady that was almost \$30 and when one considers that for \$20 more per year we could have a comprehensive plan that we could be proud of.

Now the Commission is convinced that Canada's expanding economy can afford to devote 6% of its gross national product to health services by 1971 and between 6 to 7% by 1991 without in any way affecting detrimentally the requirements of the Canadian people for other goods and services to build up a stronger economy and to achieve a higher standard of living. The Commission rejected coverage through private plans which would, they calculate, cost 22% more than the government scheme.

I think that it's pretty conclusive, Madam Speaker, today that we certainly can afford this. I think that we have much in the way of dividends to pick up in the future if we embark on this plan as soon as possible. I'm not unmindful of the progress that has been made in Manitoba over our larger school divisions and the money we are spending on education, our wonderful Grand Rapids project and even the Winnipeg Floodway. I think we have to wait to see the benefits of some of these things and it's with appreciation that I mention them but I do think that we cannot put off the day when we must embark on this worthwhile cause of comprehensive medical care. I've just finished reading a book, Madam Speaker, by the veteran economist Stewart Chase a book in our library here. It's called "Money to Grow On". He says that a high energy society like our own can afford anything it can produce and I submit Madam Speaker in asking for support for this resolution that we can produce this comprehensive medical scheme of which I talk, and which has been shown to be a practical reality by our sister province to the west.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND, (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James that debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, I would like the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. GROVES presented Bill No. 55, an Act to amend an Act to Incorporate the Ice Club of Greater Winnipeg for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GROVES: Madam Speaker, I'll try to stay within the 40 minutes allowed on second reading of a Bill --(Interjection)-- Thank you. But the net effect of the amendment to this Bill Madam Speaker is to change the name of the Ice Club of Greater Winnipeg to Winnipeg Figure Skating Club.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Have this matter stand Madam Speaker please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, on the assumption that the Leader of the Opposition does not wish to proceed this afternoon, I move the Committee of Supply that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty and my seconder is the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . . . motion I would like to deal with a matter which I consider to be of general interest to the people of Manitoba and that is the matter of family debt counselling. I think the time has come in Manitoba when we must take some steps in this direction. We have --I beg pardon?

MR. ROBLIN: Does the subject matter you are discussing. .

MR. HILLHOUSE: Family Debt counselling.

MR. ROBLIN: Thank you.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I think the time has come in Manitoba when we must take an active interest in this subject. Up until a few years ago, about a year ago, we did have what was known in Manitoba as an Orderly Payment of Debt Act. That Act was held to be unconstitutional and it was repealed. At the present moment, according to the advice given to us by the Attorney-General, there is an effort being made at Ottawa to amend The Bankruptcy Act to make a provision therein something similar to the provision which was previously contained in our Orderly Payment of Debt Act.

Now, in the United States, they have succeeded in a number of cities in setting up voluntary organizations which deal with debt counselling. At the outset Madam, I would like to say that the only people who can get out of debt are those who get into it. But in some instances they require help, but not the type of help you hear advertised daily on the radio and TV by those altruistic philanthropic lending institutions who catch debt-ridden suckers by the simple gimmick of extolling the virtues of debt consolidation by further borrowing. To me, debt consolidation by further borrowing simply means pyramiding your debts and making it all the more difficult to get out of the difficulties in which you have found yourself. In my opinion, the help that these people require is help in the nature of family debt counselling. And I think that the best service which this government could render these unfortunate people would be to approach these various lending institutions, including all merchants, departmental stores, and other institutions selling goods on credit or a budget plan, with a view to setting up such a service, and being responsible for the cost of operating it.

Now I do not suggest that the service to the debtor be free. I suggest that a small nominal charge be made to the debtor who takes advantage of it, but I do suggest that the initial cost of setting up this service, providing the secretarial staff, should be done voluntarily by these various organizations. As I stated at the beginning, this type of service has been tried in

(MR. HILLHOUSE, cont'd). . . . . other jurisdictions and I think that it should be tried here. To me the burden of debt is not only an economic problem, but a grave social problem. And anything that we can do to curb this menace and try to teach people to live within their means, would in my opinion be much more beneficial than all the help which we are forced to give these people in the form of welfare and social assistance.

The family debt counselling service which I have in mind should, if they can be induced to do so, be set up by these various lending and credit institutions. A permanent stenographic staff could be retained but the counselling could be done on a voluntary basis by various individuals qualified in the field of credit and known to the business world. To the person seeking the service it must be made abundantly clear, first, that he alone can get out of debt; secondly, that a plan can be made for his debt retirement, but that during said period no further debts should be incurred; thirdly, that it will not be an easy process but a long hard grind and pull; fourthly, that a change must be made in his mode of life; fifthly, that he must accept a new viewpoint of what is convenient or nice to have, and what is a real necessity; sixthly, he must keep his word with his counsellor and must strictly adhere to the plan of debt payment set out and arranged by his counsellor; and seventhly, that person should be induced to open a bank account out of which he would monthly pay over to his counsellor the various payments being made to his creditors under the plan of arrangement made by his counsellor.

In other jurisdictions the cost of this service to the individual debtor usually runs around an initial fee of \$5 for listing the names of his creditors and his assets, etcetera. Then there is usually a monthly fee of \$2 to cover the monthly services rendered. Now the above low cost to a debtor can only be achieved if the various financial and lending institutions and credit institutions are prepared to co-operate. And I think, Madam Speaker, that it would be in the interests of these various institutions to co-operate, because I am afraid that if they do not co-operate that there may be legislation passed in this House or in the Federal Parliament which might be more restrictive than something which they could do voluntarily without that legislation.

Now in the United States such counselling debt services are growing tremendously. And I would suggest to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and I would also suggest that this being a social problem, that he work in conjunction with the Minister of Welfare, that you get in touch with the National Foundation for Consumer Credit at 1411-Kay Street, NW., Washington, D. C., and they will be prepared to furnish you with any information which you wish regarding the operation of this plan in the United States.

I believe that such a program should be instituted in Manitoba without delay for in my opinion there are far too many families here who are not entitled to easy credit, too many who are over-extending themselves in that field, all of which results in increased credit costs to those people who do not abuse that privilege. Easy-to-get credit has helped millions of people to obtain the amenities of life. Usually it works out well for all concerned, but in a minority of cases families do not realize that they are over-extending their resources until it is too late. That is why business and financial groups in the United States are now trying to show them a way out of their unforeseen troubles. In Manitoba, the Tallin Commission was established to investigate unconscionable mortgage transactions into which people had been forced through desperation. And regardless of what legislation we pass in this House arising out of the Tallin Commission, we will never be able to legislate so that imprudent people become prudent, or improvident people become provident. But I do believe Madam, that by instituting a voluntary system such as I have suggested, that it would be a great boon to these people who now find themselves deeply in debt and sincerely try to extricate themselves.

I believe too, that such a system would not only benefit the debtors in question, but would also benefit the lending and financial institutions which I am asking to help, because it would establish for them additional information as to credit rating which is so essential in the business world. I believe Madam, that this venture could become a venture in prudence and thrift. And not only would it be of inestimable service to the debt-ridden, but could also act as a great service to the lending institutions and financial houses of this province. I therefore, Madam, respectfully urge all members of the House to give this matter their sincere consideration, believing that it is the right type of step to take in this particular instance.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre please take the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. First Minister. . . . .



MR. ROBLIN: . . . . the committee would agree to go back to Treasury and finish that or make some progress in it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go back to Treasury. Resolution No. 8 1(a) passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think there were some questions outstanding there were there not?

MR. ROBLIN: I think the only ones I have outstanding Mr. Chairman, are ones with respect to an amusement tax, which I had given my honourable friend, and a request by the Honourable Member for Rhineland for some information about Item (a) 1, (b) 3, Other Loans and Investment Income. This is made up of the interest on the investment of funds temporarily available from cash balances from revenue accounts, and from capital accounts beyond immediate day to day requirements. The funds are invested under Section 21 of The Treasury Act, largely in Government Securities of Canada and the Province, which are of a relatively liquid nature, in trust company certificates and bank deposits. The item also includes interest on money advanced to the following Crown agencies: The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, \$777,000; the Manitoba Water Supply Board, \$240,000; and Manitoba Development Fund, \$143,000.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, it then does not involve funds such as the Horned Cattle Trust Fund, those are not involved in this case?

MR. ROBLIN: Well, if the Horned Cattle Fund or any other fund has some unused monies they deposit it with the Provincial Treasurer and the Provincial Treasurer invests it in something that will earn a return, and that holds good for all the various funds that we handle.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask under the same heading, No. 2, the Manitoba Hydro, I notice that the expected revenue from the Hydro is almost \$2 million less than a year ago. What is the explanation for this?

MR. ROBLIN: The explanation is that some of the money that the Hydro have borrowed from the province in the past is being repaid by the Hydro, and is assumed by them under the guarantee, rather than under the direct provincial borrowing.

MR. CAMPBELL: Wouldn't it still show up in here though under the guarantee?

MR. ROBLIN: No, it wouldn't.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, no, that's right. Well Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask another question on that page. In the budget speech, the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer points out that the interest cost, or the cost of our debt to the province, in the year, the net cost, is the total of those two figures of 5,911,000. plus and also the amortization of debt discount the last item on that page. Now, those two together total 6,600,000 odd, and the other day when the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer was delivering the Budget Speech he referred a great many times to a comparison between 1958 and the present. As a matter of fact I didn't make an actual count but it struck me that he referred to '58 about 58 times, and the one place that I was hoping he would refer to it, was on this comparison of debt payment, net debt payment. My honourable friend may not have the figure before him, but would he agree with me after he checks it, that the debt payment, the interest payment here, the interest on debt that he quoted from his Budget Speech is now more than 850 times as large as it was in the first estimates that he put into this House? I suppose he doesn't have that figure in front of him, but I think this is --when we give a comparison of the situation financially between 1958 and the present time, it is worth recalling that the Honourable the First Minister, Treasurer in this case, paid a lot of attention to this figure and I just want it to be known how it compared with the first Estimates that he put in. Well those first estimates were paying what might be called the interest on the net debt of that time which he had inherited from the predecessor government and in that connection perhaps it's of interest to mention that this one now is 850 times as much as it was then. Does my honourable friend disagree with that?--(Interjection)-- No? Well I'm glad to get my honourable friend's. . .

MR. ROBLIN: I'll naturally, I may review my honourable friend's arithmetic but it is a fact that there has been a very big change in that connection. I don't try to disguise that at all.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well this is the point that I would like to record that if we had 58 references in the speech, the Budget Speech the other day, to the comparison with 1958 then I'd like to make the 59th reference to it the fact that this figure is more than 850 times as big as it was in 1958.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a) passed.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have some more questions. I think under this item we can also discuss the Dominion-Provincial amount that we get from the Federal Government. I

(MR. FROESE, cont'd). . . . wonder if the First Minister would care to give us some report on this meeting. I know in past years we received a statement from him which I appreciated and have read and perused. How come that Quebec could go away from that conference, from the fiscal arrangement conference, with I think some \$84 million and we had only a very small take. I wonder if the Minister could enlarge on that?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think that anything that I have to say about those conferences has already been said in the Budget Speech which gives the results of the conferences. I think that one would have to take note of the fact that each province gets a different actual cash amount in the changes because it's related to the question of population and income in the province and therefore it differs; and if you have a province, like Quebec, that is so much larger than our own, you get a different figure as to what their take is. And then, don't forget this, that in some instances Quebec is taking a cash allowance in place of services that we get instead, on account of the contracting out theory. I wouldn't like to pursue this argument off the cuff very far with my honourable friend but I don't really know the point he's driving at.

MR. FROESE: Has the formula been changed in any way?

MR. ROBLIN: Not as between the various provinces. We're all on the same footing that we were before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1(a) passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I had one other matter that I wanted to discuss with the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer and it again relates to 1958. Would my honourable friend agree with me when I say that if we took the method that my honourable friend now employs for showing the net debt of the province, to show the net debt under his administration, would he agree that using that system, that we had no net debt in 1958?

MR. ROBLIN: I agree with my honourable friend because that's exactly what our budget showed when we brought it in '58 that there was very little net debt. I think there was a small sum.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's the agreement I wanted to get.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1(a) passed; 1 (b) passed; 1 (c) passed;

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, on 1(c) I would like to draw the Honourable Minister's attention to a newspaper article which appeared in The Tribune this morning reporting on a statement made by the Alberta Highways Minister referring to insurance premiums, and the first paragraphs read: "Canadian Insurance Companies have been getting together for years to set exorbitant automobile insurance rates."

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . under Insurance Branch

MR. CHERNIACK: Well I'm dealing with insurance premiums which is item 1(c) and I would like. . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . my honourable friend realizes that's government insurance premiums and not the general subject of insurance premiums.

MR. CHERNIACK: As I understand, this is the item where the government pays insurance premiums for insuring the fleet of automobiles owned by the government and I without interruption can make a quick question by asking for information, not necessarily immediately, as to the number of vehicles covered, whether or not the rates have gone up substantially and if so to what extent, or whether it's a case of more vehicles covered at the same rate. I would also like if the Honourable Minister could in due course give us information as to the method by which these insurance policies are obtained, written, whether it's on tender or quotation; and how the business is distributed among the agents.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I'll try and answer my honourable friend. The fleet that is covered now totals 1,728 units. That does not include the telephones or hydro, of course; it includes our own government fleet. That's the number of units covered. There's an increase of 89 over the previous year which accounts for the major part of the changed price if not for all of it.

The insurance premium, the insurance policy is negotiated and is now placed with Armstrong and Taylor Limited and they in turn reinsure the business through 12 other agencies. The company underwriting the risk is The Canadian Indemnity Company with head office in Manitoba. And our liability is \$35,000 inclusive in connection with claims that arise. I hope those are the questions that need answering.

MR. FROESE: How many claims were made under that policy last year?

MR. ROBLIN: Beg pardon?

MR. FROESE: How many claims were made under that policy last year?

MR. ROBLIN: I haven't got that information, I'm afraid.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed with the general items of Treasury, I'd like to get some clarification from the Provincial Treasurer with regard to a table in the budget recently delivered, and this is under the financial statistics. It is not numbered so I can only provide the heading. It's Province of Manitoba Public Debt, and it gives in table form, is a graph type, the public debt of the province broken down into Gross Public Debt, that's Telephone System, Manitoba Hydro Board and all others, and against that at the bottom of the table we have the Debt Retirement Funds, Sinking Fund re Utilities, and then, All Others. As you look at the graph, Mr. Chairman, starting back here in 1958, there's a very substantial increase in the debt picture. On the other hand, the Debt Retirement Funds have barely increased, they're by relationship to the total certainly not at all in the same percentage position as they were originally. There's, I would guess, although the figures aren't listed here, but just guessing from the graph, an increase of less, substantially less than \$20 million in those, and yet the debt picture has increased by some \$250 million. Now...

MR. ROBLIN: I'll try and explain that. I think my honourable friend should recognize first of all that the sinking fund provisions remain unaltered. They have been exactly the same for a number of years and I think it's three percent in the case of the provincial debt and one percent in the case of utility debt and they earn interest at better than four percent. So that there's been no change in the policy of providing money for the Sinking Fund purpose. Why then, does it not grow faster? The answer is of course that it's used to pay off debt and as debts become due we call on that fund to pay off and as honourable members will notice the net position on the debt has been fairly static for the last little while and one reason for that is of course is that we're paying off debt every year. So we call on our Sinking Fund to pay off debt which reduces the Sinking Fund column, and at the same time holds the other column relatively steady.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the relationship, back in 1958, the Sinking Funds would be roughly, well they'd be in excess of \$50 million I would guess as against a debt of some \$220 million and yet.....

MR. ROBLIN: That all depends on the incidence of the payoff. It just so happens that a good deal of the debt is maturing at a particular time which makes for what you might call heavier demands on the Sinking Fund itself and in a period probably which we'll see materialize in the next few years when the payoff declines, then the Sinking Fund builds up again.

MR. GRAY:.....Can the million people of this province, including children and adults and old ages who are not contributing directly afford to pay to people that don't do anything and they are most of the time in Florida or Jamaica, to pay so much every year on interest. Wouldn't it be possible at all either to raise the money in Canada or in the province for less interest and less responsibility, or is there any way to guide our future generations, that we are wasting millions and millions of dollars for what? For the interest on the money which they have accumulated -- I don't know which way.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I can allay some of my honourable friend's fears because in recent years our borrowings for provincial purposes, direct provincial purposes, have been through the Manitoba Savings Bonds. Now those are bought and purchased by the people of Manitoba and there is a limit to the amount that anyone can purchase. The average amount of bonds that is bought is about \$1,000.00 worth, and this is widely distributed among thousands of our citizens, some of whom are not exactly rich. So this money is paid back to our own citizens who have lent it to us and as our provincial borrowings since we started the savings plan have been through savings plan receipts, I think that's not a bad arrangement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I can't place my hands on it at the moment, but somewhere I saw the amount that was redeemed or called upon last year on the parity bonds. Can the government indicate any reason why so much of these bonds are cashed in in a given year? It seems to me I saw the figures somewhere as between eight and nine million. I don't know if that is correct or not. I haven't got the information.

MR. ROBLIN: I gave the figures the other night. I think it's somewhere -- about 92 million bonds and 23 million cashed in, grand total. Now the reason for cashment is first of all because people want money and sometimes it's because they can make a better investment some place and they cash in for that reason. So you simply have to expect a turnover on these cashable bonds. Now the question is, is the turnover reasonable under the circumstances. We've compared our situation with that of other governments and we are perfectly satisfied with the ration that we get.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 (c) passed.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, before going on further, I wonder if the First Minister would undertake to provide information as to the number of claims paid out by the insurance companies covering the fleet, the fleet of cars owned by the Province of Manitoba.

MR. ROBLIN: I'll get that for you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1(c) passed. Resolution No. 8 passed. It is now 5:30 . I'm leaving the chair until 8:00 o'clock.