

Name	Electoral Division	Address
ALEXANDER, Keith	Roblin	Roblin, Man.
BAIZLEY, Obie	Osborne	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
BJORNSON, Oscar F.	Lac du Bonnet	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
CAMPBELL, D. L.	Lakeside	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARROLL, Hon. J.B.	The Pas	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
CHRISTIANSON, John Aaron	Portage la Prairie	86-9th St., N.W., Ptge. la Prairie, Man.
CORBETT, A. H.	Swan River	Swan River, Man.
COWAN, James, Q.C.	Winnipeg Centre	512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
DESJARDINS, Laurent	St. Boniface	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
DOW, E. I.	Turtle Mountain	Boissevain, Man.
EVANS, Hon. Gurney	Fort Rouge	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORBES, Mrs. Thelma	Cypress	Rathwell, Man.
FROESE, J. M.	Rhineland	Winkler, Man.
GRAY, Morris A.	Inkster	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
GROVES, Fred	St. Vital	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
GUTTORMSON, Elman	St. George	Lundar, Man.
HAMILTON, William Homer	Dufferin	Sperling, Man.
HARRIS, Lemuel	Logan	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
HARRISON, Hon. Abram W.	Rock Lake	Holmfield, Man.
HAWRYLUK, J. M.	Burrows	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
HILLHOUSE, T.P., Q.C.	Selkirk	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
HRZHORCZUK, M.N., Q.C.	Ethelbert Plains	Ethelbert, Man.
HUTTON, Hon. George	Rockwood-Iberville	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
INGEBRIGTSON, J. E.	Churchill	Churchill, Man.
JEANNOTTE, J. E.	Rupertsland	Meadow Portage, Man.
JOHNSON, Hon. George	Gimli	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg
JOHNSON, Geo. Wm.	Assiniboia	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
KLYM, Fred T.	Springfield	Beausejour, Man.
LISSAMAN, R. O.	Brandon	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
LYON, Hon. Sterling R., Q.C.	Fort Garry	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MARTIN, W. G.	St. Matthews	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
McKELLAR, M. E.	Souris-Lansdowne	Nesbitt, Man.
McLEAN, Hon. Stewart E., Q.C.	Dauphin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MOLGAT, Gildas	Ste. Rose	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
MORRISON, Mrs. Carolyne	Pembina	Manitou, Man.
ORLIKOW, David	St. John's	179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9
PAULLEY, Russell	Radisson	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
PETERS, S.	Elmwood	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15
PREFONTAINE, Edmond	Carillon	St. Pierre, Man.
REID, A. J.	Kildonan	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15
ROBERTS, Stan	La Verendrye	Niverville, Man.
ROBLIN, Hon. Duff	Wolseley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SCARTH, W.B., Q.C.	River Heights	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
SCHREYER, E. R.	Brokenhead	Beausejour, Man.
SEABORN, Richard	Wellington	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
SHEWMAN, Harry P.	Morris	Morris, Man.
SHOEMAKER, Nelson	Gladstone	Neepawa, Man.
SPELLIE, Robert Gordon	Birtle-Russell	Russell, Man.
STANES, D. M.	St. James	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
STRICKLAND, B. P.	Hamiota	Hamiota, Man.
TANCHAK, John P.	Emerson	Ridgeville, Man.
THOMPSON, Hon. John, Q.C.	Virden	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WAGNER, Peter	Fisher	Fisher Branch, Man.
WATT, J. D.	Arthur	Reston, Man.
WEIR, Walter	Minnedosa	Minnedosa, Man.
WITNEY, Hon. Charles H.	Flin Flon	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WRIGHT, Arthur E.	Seven Oaks	4 Lord Glenn Apts. 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, February 20th, 1961

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

MR. W. G. SCARTH, Q. C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the University of Manitoba Foundation praying for the passing of an act to amend an act to incorporate the University of Manitoba Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. J. D. WATT (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of John James Norris and others praying for the passing of an act to incorporate the Manitoba Automobile Museum Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees
Notice of Motion
Introduction of Bills

Mr. Lyon introduced Bill No. 6, an Act to facilitate the Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments.

Mr. Lyon introduced Bill No. 7, an Act to facilitate the Enforcement of Maintenance Orders.

Mr. Hutton introduced Bill No. 5, an Act to amend the Fruit and Vegetable Sales Act.

Mr. Molgat introduced Bill No. 18, an Act respecting the Rural Municipality of Whitewater and The Minto Cemetery Company.

Mr. Reid introduced Bill No. 21, an Act to amend The East Kildonan Charter.

Mr. Stanes introduced Bill No. 17, an Act to amend an Act respecting The School District of St. James, No. 7.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Public Welfare) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Education that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of The Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions standing on the Order Paper in my name.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member for Wellington please take the Chair.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): It's the Member for St. Matthews, Mr. Speaker who is the Chairman of the Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry, the Member for St. Matthews please take the chair.

MR. GEO. JOHNSON: The Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter for the proposed resolutions recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting The Department of Health and to provide, among other matters for the appointment of a deputy minister and other staff of the department, and for the payment of the remuneration of persons so appointed. Shall this resolution be adopted? Then it is passed.

Resolution No. 2. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the Department of Welfare and to provide, among other matters, for the appointment of a deputy minister and other staff of the department, and a Welfare Advisory Committee and for the re-appointment of The Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons' Allowances Board, and for the payment of the remuneration and expenses of persons so appointed. Shall the resolution be adopted?

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I take it that this is just in pursuance of the notice that was given in the Speech from the Throne, that it is the intention to divide the Department into two. Will that divide the length of the speeches into two?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, these resolutions are simply in line with the announcement from the Speech from the Throne that the Department of Health and Welfare

should be split into the Department of Health and the Department of Welfare. In describing the activities of these two departments I could challenge the Leader of the Opposition into quite a lengthy talk because the activities as you know of these two departments have become very great and while personally concerned to see these departments split in one sense, it certainly is I think, in the opinion of this side of the House that in the public interest it would be far better to see a minister in charge of Welfare matters and a minister in charge of health with the introduction of the Hospital Services Plan and the concept of the department now changed so greatly in that care activities and sick people are now a direct concern of the department that the scope of their responsibilities is now very very great. I think anyone should be most happy to serve as minister to either one of these departments, the deputy ministers and staff of whom, I think, are unexcelled in the Dominion of Canada, and I mean that. I think that the Province of Manitoba is very, very fortunate to have the calibre of men that we have in our various departmental heads and throughout the department as a whole, and I think some measure of congratulation should be given to the former government also for their role in this area, in getting these people. That's really all I have to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. The Committee of the Whole has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that the report of the Committee be received.

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

Mr. Johnson (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 16, an Act respecting the Department of Health.

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

Mr. Johnson (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 15, an Act respecting the Department of Welfare.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay on the table of the House the report on the financial estimates of the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan for the years 1960, 62 and 63.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to inform the House that today a team of examiners with necessary equipment is leaving to give tests to bus drivers - school bus drivers and school buses throughout the Province of Manitoba to ensure that these vehicles are in good condition and that the drivers are fully qualified to drive them.

MR. MORRIS A GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day and on a point of privilege, may I make a very brief statement. All over the western world, Brotherhood Week is celebrated during the month of February. This year the week designated for the purpose began on February the 19th. In view of the turmoil in the world these days I think perhaps it would be advisable if the three leaders in the House would make some comment on the significance of Brotherhood Week. It maybe sound like said irony to speak of Brotherhood in a world of strife and turmoil in which the most horrible weapons of mass destruction are poised to wipe out millions of innocent lives at a moments notice. But maybe Brotherhood Week has assumed a deeper meaning than ever before just because of this pathetic situation. Let us all remember that Brotherhood of all mankind is based on the Fatherhood of God for all mankind. Maybe these reflections of the occasion of Brotherhood week will help us to progress through its mutual understanding rather than over its mutual destruction.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if I may just follow my honourable friend on this important subject, I should like first of all to thank him for giving me notice that he intended to raise this matter this afternoon, and to express my appreciation to him that he has done so. Throughout a long and distinguished career as a citizen, as a member of this House, the Honourable Member for Inkster has made this one of those matters closest to his heart and I think it is entirely right and commendable that he should on an occasion such as this, bring this matter to our notice, as I am sure that everyone in this House will agree entirely with what he said. Peace in the world must begin in the hearts of men. Governments may negotiate and we may pass laws, but it is the reactions, the attitudes, the determination of individual people that decide these great issues over the long course of the ages, and I have nothing but appreciation

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)for my honourable friend's action in bringing this to our notice, and in saying on behalf, I am sure, of everyone here, indeed of all the people of the province, that we hope that the observance of Brotherhood Week again this year will strengthen and confirm those feelings which he so well expressed when he spoke to us a minute or two ago.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, like the honourable, the First Minister, I think that it is very appropriate that in these days of tenseness and trouble and very uneasy peace in so much of the world, that it's appropriate for the honourable, the member for Inkster to remind us once again of the fact that there is an active association sponsoring in this country what is called Brotherhood Week; because surely all of us would agree, Mr. Speaker, that what is needed more than anything else in the world today is some spirit of brotherhood rather than of misunderstanding and suspicion. I commend also the Honourable Member for Inkster who through many years in this House as a representative of a group of people who have known through the centuries what it is to be not considered in different countries as bretheren, that that representative should continue to remind us in Canada here of the appreciation that they and other groups and religions and races, have for the freedoms that are enjoyed in Canada, and I think the thought that all of us need to have in these times is that those of us who are cast for the time being in positions of responsibility should endeavor to see that we so conduct ourselves and that public business is conducted in such a way that those freedoms as well as the responsibilities that attach to them should be safeguarded and enshrined in Canada for all time to come.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleague in this brief pause in our deliberations to consider Brotherhood Week. When we look around the world at the various corners, look at Congo, Africa, Laos, Cuba, even indeed in that great democracy to the south of us, we can see and find out how in many quarters of the globe we have forgotten to live as brothers. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that even we as Canadians today, should not take the attitude that we are pure. We have many and great problems that we have to solve here in our dominion, and indeed in our own province. We only have to consider many aspects and conditions under which our Indian and Metis friends are living to pinpoint to us that we have as yet not reached a goal of true brotherhood. We find in some parts of Canada that even our negro friends are subjected to persecution today. I think this is an admirable time for us to reassess as Canadians and as Manitobans that we have a job to do ourselves. I am happy to join with the First Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in this observance and in doing so, may I commend that Mr. Speaker to all of the members of this legislature, that we reassess our own position and that we go forth in true brotherly love to all of those who are our brothers of humanity irrespective of their color, their race of their creed.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, may I ask the honourable, the Minister of Health and Public Welfare, if there are copies for all members of the report that he tabled a few minutes ago.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I left copies with the Clerk of the House and they will be distributed forthwith for all members.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplemental question to that of the Leader of the Opposition? The Minister, speaking on Friday last, mentioned the setting up of a committee to peruse the report and to hear representations of the administrator, I believe, of the hospital scheme and others in connection with it. Could the honourable the Minister inform us as to when a resolution, if that is the intention, will be introduced setting up the committee and when does he anticipate that will be done in the committee to meet.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I anticipate we will proceed to this very shortly.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities & Minister of Labour) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Manitoba Telephone System for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1960, together with a copy of the progress report for the year 1960.

MR. GRAY: Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Public Welfare. About a week ago I asked the head of the Social Allowance Act to give me certain figures of the number of recipients, the amount and so on. He advised me to apply to the Deputy Minister. When I phoned the Deputy Minister he left a message at the CCF office here that he is going to give it in the afternoon. Then a message was received that I should get it through an Order for Return. I also

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) telephoned the secretary of the Honourable Minister to remind the Minister about it. Now I see that the Old Age Pension resolution is in the order paper for today. The information which I had asked for, is important in my submission of the resolution. My question is, has an MLA or a member of the legislature a right to phone a department for certain information which is not high top secrets?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I thought the First Minister explained the other day that -- I'm rather green at certain procedural practice, but I understand that if an Order of Return is submitted we'd be glad to get this information. I don't think the staff have relegated in their duty. They simply brought it to my attention that the honourable member had spoken to them about this information. The information is being obtained. I'll take notice of the particular information he requires and give it to him. I just wonder if he wishes to make that an Order for Return or

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker. that will take time.

MR. ROBLIN: I wonder if I may just make a brief comment on the situation, Sir. I'm sure we'd be willing to allow the honourable member's motion to stand. -- It's very early in the session -- until he does get the information so that when he speaks he will have that available, but I would suggest that an Order for Return is the right way under present circumstances -- the House is sitting that's the way to do it -- I suggested that the other day. We'd be happy to give the information, and happy to let the resolution stand until it is provided so my honourable friend is not placed under any handicap.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Mr. Johnson (Gimli) presented Bill No. 3, an Act to facilitate Cornea Transplants from the Bodies of Deceased Persons to Living Persons, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Minister of Education return to his seat until I put the motion?

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, the basis of this Act is that it is really a model Act approved by the Commissioners on Uniformity in Canada, and during the past four years apparently the Canadian National Institute for the Blind in consultation with the Canadian Ophthalmological Society have been endeavoring to develop an Act acceptable to the profession and one which can be recommended to provincial governments. In May of 1959 a Conference of Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation in Canada was held in Victoria, B. C., and a draft bill developed in Ontario was submitted for consideration, and further to this a meeting of all Canadian National Institutes for the Blind superintendents held in Toronto in June of last year. Reports were made on negotiations with provincial governments at that time and in most provinces in Canada this Act is now before the legislatures as it is written here and also in the province of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island it is already passed. It's already passed the Ontario legislature and it has passed in Alberta and all other provinces are now entertaining similar legislation and the number who have dealt with the matter plus those who have contemplated the legislation have apparently indicated to the CNIB that they expect no difficulty in its passage. There is one little addition to our bill here respecting the procedure to be adopted in the last part of the bill: we make provision for certain regulations, should we require same.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable the Minister has pointed out, this is very interesting legislation, and I am sure, very important legislation. I just wish to ask for an amplification of what the minister said with regard to the other Provinces. Is it strictly a uniform act that is being proposed in all legislatures? I understood him to say that two or three have already passed it; and an exactly similar act, I suppose, is being presented to every legislature. Is that correct?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli) Mr. Speaker, that's the information that has been given to me by the Deputy Minister of the Department, and in talking to this CNIB, this was their strong point they felt they didn't want us to amend this in any way because it was pretty uniform and has been approved by all bodies. One matter which we felt here there should be a slight change in the bill by way of an addition, was respecting the procedure to be adopted where under this new act as this act stands, the eyes of a person are to be removed and furthermore his body delivered to the Department of Anatomy under that Anatomy Act. There's a slight variation there, but otherwise it is identical with the legislation passed in four other provinces and as anticipated will be passed in the remaining provinces.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 10 - the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare.

Mr. Johnson (Gimli) presented Bill No. 10, an Act to amend The Marriage Act, for second reading.

Mr. Hutton presented Bill No. 4, an Act to amend The Water Supply Districts Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that Bill No. 4, an Act to amend the Water Supply Districts Act be now read for the second time. Are you ready for the question?

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, this is a relatively simple amendment in terms of words, but I think most of the members in the House will know that at the time that the Water Supply Districts Act was passed, it limited the powers and the duties of the Commissions and Water District Boards such as the Lower Red River Valley Water Commission to the consideration of water supplies for potable usage only. Now it is becoming crystal clear that because water has so many uses and because any community has so many different requirements for water, that it is in the public interest that Boards such as this should consider the overall requirements of a community for water supply. As a matter of fact it was the Lower Red River Water Supply Water Commission that brought this matter to my attention and we are in agreement that it is desirable that the people in the communities affected should be permitted to consider the overall requirements of their community rather than be confined to one consideration. I think that covers the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Arthur for an address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his Speech at the opening of the session; and the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition: "But this House regrets that Your Honour's government with many of its pre-election promises unfulfilled, has greatly added to the burden of the Manitoba taxpayers, both provincially and municipally, and at the same time has drastically increased the provincial debt"; and the proposed motion in further amendment of the Honourable Leader of the CCF: "Has not taken the initiative in proposing a Provincial or a Federal-Provincial comprehensive plan for Health Insurance to provide for the mental, physical and social well-being of the citizens of our province." The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend to you my good wishes as you again resume the duties of your high office. I also offer my congratulations to the Honourable Member for Arthur and the Honourable Member for Cypress for the very able way in which they moved and seconded the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. May I say welcome to the Honourable Member for Pembina. I think this house should have more lady members and I apologize for this side of the House in its failure to elect similar capable representatives, in spite of the fact that we have many, should I say, self-styled ladies' men in this side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker in the last session I made the prediction that the big issue in the next Provincial election would be Compulsory Comprehensive Medical care. The CCF Government in Saskatchewan staked its future on this issue and scored a resounding victory, despite powerful opposition on the part of the Saskatchewan Medical Association. It is no accident that Health Insurance should be so much in the public mind. There has, without a doubt, been a much greater preoccupation with good health and health care in the last generation than any time in human history. The reasons for this are not hard to find. The last generation has seen a phenomenal development in the Medical Arts. Medical knowledge and skills have increased to a degree unimaginable, even a half century ago. Great discoveries have been made in medical techniques, in the development of new drugs, in the control of disease and in the relationship between environment and well-being. The improvements in living standards which have taken place during and since the last war have also played their part in making people realize that good health is a practical objective. Higher incomes, a greater degree of leisure, the availability of goods and services which make for a more comfortable life, have all underlined the importance of good health. For of what value are the good things of life, if good health which makes their enjoyment possible, is lacking? Good health is part and parcel of a good standard

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.). . . . of living and now that people are aware that there is this knowledge that can make good health a possibility, they are inclined to look askance any artificial barriers which stands in their way of getting it. There are such barriers now and they are unnecessary. Furthermore the experience with insurance techniques has by now made it clear that there is no longer any need for anyone to have to rely exclusively on his own limited resources to protect himself against the hazards of illness and accident.

What we are concerned about here, is not so much whether good health care is to be had, but in what context. In large measure it is the institutional framework within which medicine is to be practiced that matters, as well as its availability. It is not the insurance principle alone we are concerned about. Removing the fear of the cost of illness is important and for that reason alone, Health Insurance could be justified. But merely to superimpose a procedure of pre-payment on the status quo would be to betray the health needs of the people. The economic burden of ill health might be taken care of but the degree and quality of medical care would remain unchanged. In our estimation, the emphasis in the term Health Insurance is not so much on the insurance as on the health aspect. Since our emphasis is on health, Mr. Speaker, we feel we owe you a definition of what constitutes good health. We can do no better than to quote the definition of the World Health Organization Constitution, Article 1, which reads: "A state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity". This definition may appear to go beyond what we hope to achieve in the near future, but we submit that this is the kind of goal every government should seek to achieve. In the words of Sir Arthur Newsholm -- this was taken from the booklet, "Medicine and the State -- the Relation Between the Private and Official Practice of Medicine". -- Sir Arthur says: "The health of every individual is a social concern and responsibility and as following from this, medical care in its widest sense for every individual is an essential condition of maximum efficiency and happiness in a civilized community." We assert that it can and should be the right of every citizen, without regard to his social and economic status to have access to all those services and facilities which are or should be available to keep him in good health, as long as possible and to aid him in recovering his health when he is struck down by illness or accident. In other words we believe that the fullest possible range of health care should be available to the citizens of this province as a right by virtue of legislative action. It is to some extent an anomaly that we should, during the latter half of the 20th century, have to appear before such a body and seek to justify something like health insurance. We would be disposed to argue that it should be on the other way around. Cause should be shown for the failure to have introduced health insurance earlier. Canada introduced hospital insurance relatively late in the day, largely as a result of the example set by the Province of Saskatchewan, and it is in effect throughout Canada, but so far as health insurance as a whole is concerned Canada remains one of the few countries of the world which does not have a public program of health insurance.

In perusing through the book, "Social Security Programs Throughout the World", published by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, in 1958, we find eight countries had enacted legislation prior to 1900 and forty-four countries have followed suit at various times up to 1957. Such countries, Mr. Speaker, as Germany, 1883, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, 1888, Denmark, 1892, Norway, 1909, just to name a few of the countries having introduced it prior to that. It will be seen from the foregoing that Canada and the United States remain in splendid isolation as the two richest countries in the world still without health insurance. The list indicates that health insurance was introduced in some of those countries as far back as 77 years. It does not, of course, tell the whole story. It is simply an indication of the extent of legislation in the health insurance field. We do not for a moment suggest that all the existing legislation is of the same standard nor would we undertake to endorse all of them as being what we desire -- some are very good, others much less so. We are simply making the point that there is nothing novel in the proposition of health insurance for Canada or any of its provinces. Its introduction is at best a belated effort to catch up with what is now commonplace in many parts of the world. It would be hard to claim that health insurance, even apart from this recital of its existence elsewhere is a novel proposition in Canada at this time. Not only has it been a subject of political agitation but it has actually been on the agenda as a matter of serious consideration by the federal and provincial governments. We refer to the so-called green book, "Proposals of the Government of Canada at the Dominion-Provincial

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) . . . Conference on Reconstruction in 1945." In this document the Federal Government stated and I quote; "Health insurance has been widely adopted because it is regarded as the best means of meeting and of distributing fairly the cost of illness and in conjunction with preventive services of improving the general health of the nation."

It is worth recalling that the Federal Government's proposal for a first stage of the introduction of health insurance included general practitioner's services, hospital care and visiting nursing services. Subsequently the government proposed to substitute laboratory and radiological diagnostic services or nursing services in the first stage. Accordingly, fifteen years after this proposal we have just reached the stage of hospital care. The rest is yet to come, Mr. Speaker, as it is just as inevitable that comprehensive medical care will come about as it was that hospital insurance was to become a reality. A reality despite the fact that most Provincial Governments were loath to accept it at first. I well remember a conference of the Urban Association at Selkirk in January, 1956, when the idea was so bitterly opposed, especially by the Liberals. I'm not convinced that either of the old parties were happy over hospital insurance becoming a reality, but when it becomes a matter of political expediency in trying to give the people something they really want, there is never any hesitation about grabbing planks from the CCF platform to mend their fences. I need only to refer you to the last Liberal convention when comprehensive medical care was so eagerly adopted as party policy.

An editorial dated February 20th, 1960, in the Toronto Star Weekly, quotes Premier Douglas of Saskatchewan as predicting that: "National health insurance will be a fact by 1970." It goes on to say that; "If Saskatchewan adopts medical insurance it will spur demands for similar legislation across Canada, just as hospital insurance did when it was introduced in 1947." Because hospital insurance lived up to its advance promises it can be hoped that the appeal of medical insurance will spread at an accelerated pace.

A recent study of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics of urban family expenditures for health, made in seven cities, showed that the costs of physicians services and drugs have risen rapidly. In 1955 the average family health expenditures were \$193.00. In 1957, which was the latest sample year, they were \$288.00 -- an increase of 18% in two years, and they are still climbing. Findings just published by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, show that in 1958 Americans spent 4.4 billions of dollars for drugs and 4.3 billions of dollars for physicians services. Mr. Speaker both figures are a record, but for the first time drugs are costlier. Rising medical costs should help persuade the medical profession that it will serve itself and the public interests best by helping governments devise the best medical insurance plan possible. In any event such insurance is inevitable.

I would like to read, Mr. Speaker, from the journal here, the official journal of the Canadian Labour Congress, an article here saying that "MDs should participate". Doctor E. Kirk Lyon, Deputy to the President of the Canadian Medical Association told a Montreal meeting of the College of General Practice of Canada, and I quote: "I sometimes have difficulty trying to determine what the doctors of Canada want. Discussing the relationships between government and the profession," Dr. Lyon asked, "would we go back to the days of poor public health measures, to the days of no government assistance to hospitals or to medical education? I think not." I'm still quoting Mr. Speaker, "Call it co-existence if you will, but it is here to stay and we would be better occupying our time bending our efforts to guiding, assisting and directing all measures genuinely designed to improve the health of the people of Canada, than opposing new ideas simply for the sake of opposing them or because we have not tried them." Few Canadians are so rich that they can escape a haunting fear that sickness or accident might burst a landslide of medical bills on top of them. No matter how thrifty, most cannot save enough to guarantee against all medical emergencies, or if they have a nest-egg put by for old age it can be wiped out in a month by sudden illness. Medical insurance banishes this fear; we all pay a small sum and when a few of us fall sick our expenses are covered. The magic of a verages comes to the rescue of millions. As well as being humanitarian it is also financially possible, without ruinous taxation -- a conclusion drawn in a study two years ago by the reputable Canadian Tax Foundation. Our record here Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba regarding the acceptance of new ideas is not particularly bright but I hope some of the daring and the willingness to try when there seems to be so much to gain and so little to lose, will rub off on us here in Manitoba from our neighbors to the west. Because in Saskatchewan today the banner

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) "humanity first" flies proudly from the masthead. Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the debate be adjourned.

MR. ROBLIN: Before you put the question I wonder if we might inquire if there are other members who wish to speak this afternoon in view of our new rule.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this if I may. May I first offer my congratulations to you on your occupancy of your high office. In doing so Mr. Speaker, I recall those rather hectic days for yourself during the previous legislature in 1958 and 1959, when, if I may be so bold as to say, you earned your laurels and the respect of every member of this House. I was very interested to hear the Honourable Leader of the Opposition state that fairness is probably the main qualification for the Speaker of a legislature, and I was also very interested to hear him say -- supported I believe, by the Honourable Leader of the CCF that he considers or they consider you, Sir, to be one who makes a sincere effort to be fair. This I think is congratulations indeed and with these thoughts in mind I do wish you Sir, a long tenure of office. May I also offer my congratulations Sir, to the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Both have shown their abilities in their contributions to the debates in this House. May I also Sir, congratulate the Honourable Member from Pembina for the well deserved honour that she was payed by her constituents in being elected to this Legislature. We on this side of the House are most fortunate in many respects, not the least of which is to have the Honourable Members from Cypress and Pembina to help us in continuing the forward thinking, aggressive, and responsible government which our Province of Manitoba is receiving today, but unfortunately deprived of for so many years.

The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in moving his amendment and the Honourable the Leader of the CCF in moving his amendment to the amendment laid great stress on the seriousness of the present unemployment situation. I am quite sure that every member of this House would agree, and the government has again repeated its earnest desire to relieve the situation by including this matter and stressing this matter in the Speech from the Throne. It is a very serious and important liability to our society and our economy which is having far reaching effects. I believe that it is so important that any relief, however small, should be gratefully received. The fact that the government, with the help of municipalities and other various bodies have been able to create relief to the extent of one in approximately every four people is something which is considerably helping the situation. I am sure that all of us would like to see a greater result, but this is an improvement on that which has been achieved in the past. This is a problem effecting almost every corner of our country, involving every local government, but of course the chief responsibility and power rests with the Federal Government who have, and are making every effort to relieve the tragic situation. Destructive criticism in my opinion of a partisan political nature will surely be realized in its true light and rejected by the many thinking people of this province, of whom we are greatly blessed. It is so easy, Mr. Speaker, to talk around and about these problems, but is another thing to make suggestions after their cure. Maybe that this is the correct political approach, but I personally feel that this matter is of such importance that airing of views in this matter will tend to help to find the solution.

In the case of the construction industry which I would like to briefly mention, which as you all know is one of the largest employers of labor and one of the hardest hit in this winter unemployment, the main causes of unemployment in my mind are two-fold: Economic and human nature -- and both really have been created to some extent, in fact to a large extent, by our present level of prosperity. Economic: The cost of construction during the winter months are considerably higher than those at any other time of the year. Many of the materials such as sand and concrete cost more. Productivity per man hour is less and therefore production costs more or construction costs more. Methods used to make winter construction possible, such as a cocoon method of building, are an additional expense, and there are other various reasons probably familiar to most of the honourable members which increase the cost of construction in the winter period. Against this increased cost must be added the fact that more skilled labor is available, and of course the sooner a building is completed the sooner it is producing revenue

(Mr. Stanes, cont'd.) in cash or in kind. However, Mr. Speaker, from the information I have received, and I think is available to most of the honourable members, the increased cost still outweighs the advantages, and I cannot see any other solution to this problem except in reducing costs -- and among these costs is, of course, the cost of labor. Surely a man is better off to be working at a reduced rate per hour during this period than sitting around at home. His family are better off; everybody is better off. I cannot see why it should not be easy for agreements to be brought about and to be agreed upon by the various parties, at the same time respecting and guaranteeing the principles of all parties.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the CCF group stated: "We do not need reduction in wages, but an increase to put more purchasing power in the hands of labor." Any increase will widen the gap in this question of the unemployment in wintertime and in fact the economy throughout the year, and also bearing in mind the export economic problem. It is quite untrue that increasing wages increases the purchasing power because there is an inflationary step which reduces the value of the dollar, and in some cases one can finish up worse off. I've said before, Mr. Speaker, in this House and I repeat again, it does not matter what a man takes home in his pay packet; what does matter is what that money will buy. It must also be remembered that all these inflationary tendencies by increasing the costs put an additional burden on those who are within a fixed income and drive them nearer to assistance at public expense, which we all have to pay for through one tax or another. The same economic philosophy applies to our economy the year around and also to our export business. I believe that the Honourable Leader of the CCF stated that we should not worry about costs but look for new markets. I have never yet found a customer who is not interested in the price of the product and I think that this is universal throughout.

The other factor, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned is the human element and I would like to read if I may, a little article here which many members may have had from the CMA in the Article "Industry" which refers to a letter that the Hon. George Nowlan, Minister of National Revenue received. The essence of it is in this letter. "This person felt he knew me so well that he called me "Dear George". He said he started working last spring, worked all the summer and last fall, then he said --"Last week I went to the unemployment insurance office and asked for my unemployment benefits. What do you suppose they did to me, George? They offered me a job. Dear George, why did they play this dirty trick on me? You have to do something about it." I know these are isolated cases, Mr. Speaker, and many of us have heard cases - I have several I could repeat right here -- but it is a factor, and with the increasing of our costs this factor becomes larger.

Now before closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment very briefly if I may, on the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. He stated that he was surprised that there was no mention in the Speech from the Throne regarding the Metropolitan Council and its progress. I am sure that the honourable gentleman does not wish me to remind him, Sir, that this legislature set up this body and the people duly elected their representatives on this council, and as far as the initial work is concerned the work of this legislature has been done -- and in my own personal opinion, well done. I personally feel that they are making haste a little too fast. I also feel that perhaps the salaries are a little too high, but surely this is a matter for those elected by the people, and I do not personally feel that this is a matter that should be debated in this legislature. If on the other hand, perhaps some members feel that there should be an airing in this matter, then surely it should be by form of committee, and those who are elected should be in a position to answer the questions.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not wish to interrupt my honourable friend while he was speaking, but it is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of the committee on rules which was held last year, that it was agreed upon that we would hold to the rules themselves which states in rule number 30 on page 15, "that the speeches shall be direct to the question under consideration." I think Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me that we agreed on that. The members of my own Caucus have been informed that the subject under consideration is that on the amendment which I raised myself dealing with comprehensive health insurance. As I say, Sir, I did not wish to interrupt my honourable friend at the time he was speaking. May I suggest to you Sir, that any further debate be pertinent to the motion before the House.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, speaking also on the point of order, I recall as well the discussion that we had in the rules committee last year. This matter was considered by the House -- I don't think the Press were present one day but there was a general discussion to the effect of the problem that the House got itself into when the amendment was not couched in wide enough terms to permit of a general discussion -- and by alluding to this discussion that we had in committee, I am not casting any barbs at my honourable friends opposite at all. I think we all appreciate the point of order that he raises. I think we also all appreciate that what I am told and what I have been able to observe from the Journals of the House, and what I have heard from other senior members of the House, such as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, it has been for many years the custom and the practice of this House to permit very great latitude in the debates even on the sub-amendment or on the amendment itself.

I would refer -- and I am sorry I don't have them in front of me -- I would refer, however generally, my honourable friend and you, Sir, to the debates of the senior parliament of this country, namely the House of Commons, wherein one will find not only the leader of my honourable friend's party but indeed all members of the opposition flinging about quite wildly in general statements and general debate, on the sub-amendment and on the amendment itself, and I am not saying that if the House of Commons at Ottawa is wrong that that is any reason for us to be wrong here, Sir. But I do suggest that the general interpretation that has been given by Mr. Speaker at the House of Commons and indeed, Sir, by yourself on other occasions and by your predecessor, has been one of considerable latitude in allowing members to address themselves generally to matters which have been raised during the course of the amendment and the sub-amendment. I appreciate my honourable friend waiting until the Honourable Member for St. James took his seat because one can more or less anticipate now that this discussion will arise annually and all I am attempting to do at this time, Sir, is to state what I believe to be the general approach that has been taken in the past and while acknowledging the technical point made by my honourable friend the Leader of the CCF party to suggest to you, Sir, that in your wisdom you see fit to permit a certain amount of latitude in this debate as otherwise all members of the House whether they be government members or opposition members, are going to be inhibited and restricted to a considerable extent until we pass over this sub-amendment and move on to the first amendment which is of a more general nature. Now I make these rather gratuitous statements, Sir, and I hope that they will be of some help to you in reaching your decision.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may just briefly in answer to the Honourable the Attorney-General, I appreciate the fact as he states that it was the former practice that this be permitted under the sub-amendment, but it is my interpretation and recalling the deliberations which took place in the committee which established the present rules, that that would apply generally to the first amendment offered by my friend the Leader of the Opposition, but when we came to a specific item such as we have before us this afternoon as the sub-amendment, then on the sub-amendment topic these speeches would be held completely within the confines of that amendment. I don't know if my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition would substantiate that in general but that was my understanding, Sir, of the agreement at that committee, and following that Sir, and on that understanding, when my colleagues in my own party were going to take part in this debate I suggested to them that they should speak strictly relevant to the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, in an effort to assist you in recalling what happened at the committee in which you were I think present on every occasion, I would like to give my remembrance of the situation. It is the same as that of the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party that we had quite a discussion on this question. We admitted that there had been a great deal of latitude in the past and I thought that we resolved by unanimous agreement that from now on that the rules of the House would be enforced, and I thought that was one of the reasons that we changed the very first general rule. Where we had previously said that if our business would be conducted in accordance with the rules, orders, usages and custom of this House, and to get away from that usages and customs of this House, we left that part out and said quite specifically in the new rule that proceedings in the House and in all committees thereof shall be conducted in accordance with the rules and with the sessional and other orders of the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....Assembly. Then sub-section 2 of that rule, in any case for which provision is not made in the rules or by session or other orders, the usages and customs, not of this house, Mr. Speaker, but the usages and customs of the House of Commons of Canada, as in force at the time, shall be followed so far as they are applicable in the Assembly. I thought that the reason that we were doing that was to specify that we were getting away from those old usages and customs that we admittedly had here. And so I submit, as the Honourable the Leader of the CCF party has, that under Rule 30, which he has already quoted, speeches shall be direct to the question under consideration or to a motion of order. I think under that, which is our own rule, that there is no question -- here I am arguing the case, I think, for the government rather than for the Opposition, because surely it's to the advantage of the government that the discussion should be relevant at all times. If we are allowed to debate it, every subject on every amendment and sub-amendment, then I think the debate is bound to last longer than otherwise. I thought that there was an agreement from this side as well as the government's side that from now on we would try and observe the rules exactly as they appear in our little red book -- our new little red book -- and like the Honourable the Leader of the CCF I certainly didn't want to raise the point when the Honourable Member for St. James, who was a comparatively new member, was speaking. But I think it is better for all concerned that we get it settled now. Let's understand what we are going to do and then we won't have to have this situation arising many times. Mr. Speaker, I know that you are conversant with the situation generally, and anything that I have said here -- I do not pose as an expert or even proclaim my long acquaintance with the proceedings of the House, because after all, we can all make mistakes and we can all forget what happens. But I think we should try now, under our new rules, following a committee that worked very hard at it and had a good deal of unanimity, to try and arrive at exactly what they are and then abide by them.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, while we are on the subject under discussion, I might say that I agree with the Attorney-General that some flexibility should be given, especially in cases like myself where I am unable to make any amendments of my own to the Throne Speech, yet I would like to have a wide range in order to speak on the debate. Therefore, I feel that my situation is not covered under the rules and some flexibility should be given.

MR. SPEAKER:observation on the point of order?

MR. R. G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correct, when the committee was discussing this particular matter there was considerable discussion about the draughting of the amendment and the sub-amendment, and there was substantial agreement by the members of the committee at that time that the amendment and the sub-amendment should be draughted as closely as possible to give great scope to the range of debate and -- (Interjection) -- no, the amendment and the sub-amendment, and I agree with you, the Honourable Leader of the CCF, that at that time we did agree that the rules of the House we would try and enforce, but on the understanding that the amendments and sub-amendments would be of such a nature as to allow great latitude in the debate. I think that was the understanding of the Committee at that time.

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q. C. (River Heights): I have not the advantage of having attended on the committee, but it would seem a remarkable rule if, say opposition members -- the leaders of the opposition members could bring forth point after point after point against the Throne Speech, and then other members were restricted from even bringing up the points which they brought forward. That would seem to me to be mostly a one-sided debate, Sir, and all that a member would have to do is get up in the opposition groups, slap the government from every side and then say no, you of the government ranks must deal absolutely strictly within what is contained in my amendment. I cannot understand that interpretation of any ruling, Sir.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood):of this situation is this, that under the sub-amendment, you deal with the sub-amendment, you deal with the sub-amendment only and when you come to the main amendment then you can deal with anything that you want. Therefore, the government members would have every opportunity to have their two cents worth.

MR. SPEAKER: I must say that the object of rules are, of course, to bring order into

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd.)....debate and we also are a democracy and we don't wish to restrict debate too much. I am of the opinion that possibly I might take another look at this and let the debate continue this afternoon. I think that we should come to some definite arrangement and stick to it, because we can't allow one man to have one set of rules and another man another set of rules. I'll take a very careful look at it and report to the session tomorrow, and, in the meantime, the debate will continue on the amendment to the amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: Specifically or broadly?

MR. SPEAKER: Broadly. Some latitude will be given this as was given the last speaker.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): In rising, I would like to congratulate you on being in your seat again. I'd also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder on the Speech to the Throne for their contribution to the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I did not expect that I would be speaking on this amendment at such an early time. I would have thought that at least the member for LaVerendrye who, according to the Press, is going to try to give a new direction to the Liberal Party would have paid some attention to the deliberations of the National Convention of the Liberal Party held recently, and would have at least arisen by now to express his opinion of the amendment which we have presented. It may be, of course, that like most Manitoba Liberals he has not yet read of the deliberations which took place in Ottawa, and I want to take a moment just to quote something of the resolution which they passed, with the hope that if he hasn't heard of it until now that he will give it some thought and possibly he, at least, will vote for this amendment. I want to quote from an article which appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune, February 3rd of 1961, headed: "A \$750 million Liberal promise". Here's what the article says: "The principal plank in the Liberal platform for the next Federal election will be a national medical insurance plan. Liberals promise a medical plan covering doctor's bills and prescribed drugs. It looks as though the Liberals are talking about an initial medical plan. Dental, optical and nursing services are promised for later, costing in the area of \$750 million a year." Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Liberals really meant what they were talking about at Ottawa, there is no reason why every member of the Liberal group in this House ought not to vote for the amendment which we have proposed. And, Mr. Speaker, the great white father in Ottawa, Mr. Diefenbaker, not to be outdone, has already announced the appointment of a Royal Commission to study the whole question of Health Insurance, to be headed by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that some of the members opposite ought to give serious consideration to the support of our amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the speech of the Minister of Health and Welfare was typical of the speeches which he has given with regard to this resolution. He almost ignored our amendment completely. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Minister ought to give some real thought to it, because in 1962 the Province of Saskatchewan will institute a program of Health Insurance and when they do that, Mr. Speaker, this province and this government, like the government of every other province in Canada, will have to start considering Health Insurance seriously, just as they had to consider Hospital Insurance seriously; and just as from 1947, when the Province of Saskatchewan began their hospital plan, until 1961, every other province in Canada has adopted a form of Hospital Insurance. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to comment just briefly on the speech which the Minister made with regard to hospital costs. Somebody once said that if you have a poor case you are apt to make a long speech, because in the long speech and in the figures you use, people will possibly forget that you have a weak argument and that, Mr. Speaker, is precisely what the Minister did. The Minister suggested that the rise in premiums which this government instituted within this last year was due in part, at least to the poor planning of the former government. Mr. Speaker, I don't know that it is necessary for me to defend the former government. I only want to make this comment about that part of his speech. I understand that the former government used as their chief advisor in setting up of the Hospital Insurance Plan, Dr. Malcolm Taylor, and I am told that Dr. Taylor not only helped to institute the plan in Manitoba but that he was the advisor in Saskatchewan and three other provinces, including the Conservative Government of Ontario. Incidentally, I notice that the Minister made some complimentary remarks about the plan in Ontario. Well the plan in Ontario was set up with the same advisor as the plan in Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we in this group are not surprised that the cost of hospitalization is

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) going up. We are not surprised because we always said that the former methods of paying for hospital costs, the Blue Cross Scheme, a voluntary scheme, was not adequate; that it did not provide for the proper utilization of hospitals. And when we see the costs going up, as they are going up, we are not surprised because we recognize and we accept the fact that hospitals are now being used in the amount required rather than on the ability of the people to pay for the plan as before. But, Mr. Speaker, I do want to make some comments about the method used and the amount of the increase. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there is anything which I could say which could put the case better. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, nothing the Minister said in his speech on Friday answers the case which was made to the government in a brief submitted to them by the Manitoba Farmer's Union on July 11th, 1960, and I want to quote from the brief made by the Manitoba Farmer's Union and I want to say that the people I represent, the people in the cities and the labour organizations, can endorse the criticisms made of this government by the Manitoba Farmer's Union one hundred percent. And I want to read some of the things which they said.

MR. G. JOHNSON (Gimli): every bit of that brief? Did the honourable member say that all of that brief is accurate and that they endorse it as it is written? I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that that brief was a little misinformed. At one point they mentioned that we were loading T. B. and other things under the premium system. Does he believe that?

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I will read the parts of the -- I'm not saying that I agree with every word, that I would cross every t and dot every i, I'm saying that I and the people I represent, the organizations such as the Manitoba Federation of Labour, endorse the major points made in this brief completely and the major points, incidentally, which were ignored almost completely by the Minister in his speech on Friday. Here's what they say, Mr. Speaker. "It has been the policy of the Farmer's Union to support a comprehensive hospital insurance program. Therefore, we were pleased when our government implemented such legislation in order that all people in our province may be assured of adequate hospitalization whenever required. However, we believe that both individual and family contributions into a hospitalization program should be set at a level which would not embarrass people in the lower income groups and yet, at the same time, not leave a feeling that they are getting something for nothing. We fully recognize that hospital care must be paid for, but we question that the exorbitant increases in hospital administration costs in our province have been fully justified, not to mention the 50% increase just recently effected in the premium rate in our hospitalization program. Any family living on less than \$3,000 annual income will find it impossible to pay these increased rates without lowering their present standard of living to subsistence level. We are sure our government is aware that a vast number of our farming population fall into this category, and in view of the critical economic position the farmer finds himself today, he will find it an extreme hardship to meet these increased premiums. The rather abrupt announcement of increases in premium rates has raised a storm of protest and much criticism. We had our twelve district conventions across the province at which over 800 delegates unanimously too took a strong stand opposing the drastic increase in hospital premiums. The increase in premium rates effective now places Manitobans in a position where the hospital premiums are the highest of any province in Canada, in some cases more than double that of other provinces. On the basis of information concerning premiums charged in other provinces, we question whether a 50% increase is fully justified in Manitoba." Further they say, Mr. Speaker, and I quote again, "The Manitoba plan operated in 1959 with a surplus of \$175,000. To show this position the Manitoba Government only required to contribute \$3,000,000 from general levy. Publicity to date indicates that your preliminary survey showed costs for 1960 to be over last year by an estimated \$1.8 million. Even if such higher costs should materialize the increased rate the government has put into effect will be far higher than required to take care of any deficits. We are informed that the increase to single premium payers, an additional \$1.6 million will be raised from 139,000 ratepayers in March; and under family premiums, an additional \$4.4 million will be raised from 193,000 ratepayers. This means that the increase in rates will produce an additional \$6 million for the program to cover an anticipated increase of 1.8 million dollars. In our frank opinion we believe there is no justification for such a heavy tax load being placed at this time on the Manitoba public. We do not believe that hospital operating costs in Manitoba are any higher than they are in Ontario, and yet indications are

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . that the Ontario Government is anticipating only a ten percent increase in rates.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this argument is valid and it was not answered at all by the Minister. Mr. Speaker, we have said and we will continue to say that to charge almost the entire cost of the province's share of hospitalization to the consumer, as we are doing in Manitoba, is wrong in principle and wrong in practice, because this method does not differentiate between those who can afford to pay and those in the lower income brackets. Only a system whereby only part of the cost is paid through premiums and part through the general revenues of the province would be fair. This is already done by other provinces. This government should not shirk its responsibility; should not be blaming the Legislature; should not be asking the Legislature to face the responsibility which is the government's one for devising a plan along this line. It is suggested by the Minister that the increase of almost 50% in hospital premiums was made necessary by increased costs. The increase in premiums will bring in about \$6 million annually, as already pointed out, to cover a deficit this year of \$1.8 million. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this House and the people of Manitoba will only know the real increased costs when we see how much money the Federal Government will pay as their share of the costs for 1961 as compared to what they paid in 1960. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the real reason for this tremendous increase in the rates is the desire of this government to avoid another increase in 1962 and another increase in 1963, by which time of course they hope that the electorate will have forgotten the tremendous increase and by which time the election will be over. That's the real reason for a 50% increase on the part of this government; an increase which we have not seen in any other province in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal in some detail with our amendment, calling for a comprehensive system of health insurance. The World Health Organization has said that the highest standard of health is the inalienable right of every individual. Health is not merely the absence of disease but is the achievement of the highest standard of physical, social and emotional well-being of which the individual is capable. Money spent on health, Mr. Speaker, by a provincial government, is money well spent. In 1958 the Province of Saskatchewan spent 28% of its budget, over \$38 million on health, while we in Manitoba were spending only 11% of our budget, a mere \$11-3/4 million. Saskatchewan's infant mortality rate in 1958 was only 25 per 1000, down from a figure in 1950 of 30 to 1000; while Manitoba's infant mortality rate was 30 per 1000 down from 35 per 1000 in 1950. Saskatchewan was spending \$43 on health in 1958 per capita, while we in Manitoba were spending \$14 per capita. Now it's true that we've increased our expenditure since 1958 but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we still have a long way to go.

It has been argued, Mr. Speaker, that medical care of high quality is available now in this province and that a government sponsored program is unnecessary. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that there are many people who do not seek medical care, which they need, because of the high cost involved. A Canadian sickness survey conducted by the Federal Government in 1951 pointed this out quite clearly. It showed that the low income group were found to have more illness and days of disability than did the higher income group. On the other hand, the volume of medical care received by the low income group was much less than that served by those in the higher income brackets. Provision of medical care presents a recognized economic problem because no individual or family can know in advance when he or she will be ill, or for how long. We can be sure that the cost of illness will be very evenly distributed. The majority of people will have only minor illnesses in any one year and the cost for them will not be beyond their means. A smaller group will have more illness and substantially higher medical bills, while a few will find the cost of medical care so high that the financial consequences will be a catastrophe for them. Insurance against illness frees the individual of the uncertain prospect of medical bills that may never amount to much but may reach staggering proportions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be too critical of the voluntary plans which we now have. Voluntary plans have been fine for a large number of people and they are fine as far as they go but, unfortunately, they do not and they cannot cover the entire population. The Manitoba Medical Service, which is one of the better plans and for which I think the medical profession of Manitoba may well be congratulated, covers substantially less than half the people

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.). . . . in this province, and if you ask yourself who is left out, you will see that the people who are left out, Mr. Speaker, are those who need it the most. The old people are left out; the sick people are left out; people on low incomes are left out; the farmers are to a large extent left out; and, in fact, if any person or persons has too big a medical bill means will be found, if they can be found within the legal provision of the M. M. S. regulations, to get rid of those people. I have a friend, Mr. Speaker, who belonged for a number of years to a group. No questions were asked about that group but, lo and behold, when he ran into some very serious and continued illness in his family, an examination was made and it was decided that this group was not a legitimate employee group, with the result, Mr. Speaker, that the group was dissolved. More than that, this man was not permitted to join the M. M. S. except on the "H" coverage plan, which means he would only have medical coverage when he or his family are in the hospital. Well, fortunately for him nobody is in the hospital; but unfortunately for him, his wife has an illness which required her to see the doctor twice a week. The doctor spends from half an hour to an hour with her each visit. I think the doctor is being pretty reasonable by his standards, but the doctor bill to this man for his wife alone is running at \$50 a month. The man has three children and he estimates that the cost of their medical bills is between \$10 and \$15 a month. So there you have, Mr. Speaker, a doctor bill for one man running between \$60 and \$65 a month. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are very few of us who can afford to remain solvent with this kind of medical bill. I'm not blaming the M. M. S. They have to protect the people who belong. They have to protect the rates as they exist, but because they cover a limited group they cannot afford to carry the people who really need the service. And so, Mr. Speaker, the voluntary plan, as good as they may be, simply doesn't meet the needs of the people of this province or of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a government sponsored plan must be built on a pre-payment principle. Paid for on an insurance basis doesn't mean that collectively the people would pay less for medical service. It does mean that the costs would be spread over the entire population instead of being borne as they are now by those unfortunate enough to be ill. Medical care plan must have universal coverage. Every person must be covered, the good risks as well as the bad, so spreading the cost over the entire population. There must be a high quality of service. Quality of service can and should be improved and a better distribution and availability of care needs to be accomplished. Medical personnel in rural areas is inadequate at the present time. A government plan, applicable to every person in the province, which would encourage group practice both graduate work and refresher courses could, with government participation in health insurance, insure adequate care for people in rural areas. Present voluntary plans do not and cannot permit integration of curative and preventative services. Medical programs need to be concerned not only with curing people after they get ill but also with the more desirable objective of keeping people well. A government sponsored program must be administered by a public body responsible to the government. If people's money is to be used to provide medical services then government must take the responsibility for how the money is spent and for the administration of the program.

Mr. Speaker, I reject completely the suggestion of some people that all we need to do is to have the government pay into M. M. S. the money for the people who cannot afford to belong to M. M. S. When the government is paying for people then the government should administer the service, and the government would be responsible to the people; and if the government didn't do a job the people could take care of it at a subsequent election. A government plan must be in a form acceptable to those providing the service, which means the doctors, and those receiving it. But this can, Mr. Speaker, be done. Between 20 and 25% of the doctors in Canada are already working on a salary and there is no reason why, either through a salary plan or through a per capita plan, we cannot devise a plan to meet the needs of the people of Canada as have other governments in other countries. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this has already been done in a pilot project in the area of Swift Current, and I want to read, Mr. Speaker, a few excerpts from an article which appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune on June 6, 1960 written by Don McGillivray headed "Dull Weather for Medical Insurance". Here's what, in part, Mr. McGillivray said and I commend it to the members of the House if they haven't seen it till now, and I quote: "What Swift Current has done today Saskatchewan may have next year; the rest of Canada may have within a decade. What do the 52,000 farmers, ranchers, businessmen,

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) housewives, school children and toddlers in the region get, and how much do they pay for it? They get more than is provided in most voluntary medical care plans. They get the services of the 42 doctors in the region and payment of specialist fees for treatment outside the region as required. They get x-rays, laboratory work and physiotherapy, all paid for by the region. There is dental care for children up to the age of 12. There are no waiting periods, no maximum liability by the region, no exclusions for pre-existing conditions or age. What do they pay? There are three kinds of payments. One is a personal tax of \$24 for a single person; \$40 for a family of two; and \$50 for a family of three or more. Another source of revenue is the property tax which raises about \$250,000 a year, and there are deterrent charges which the doctor may make on each home or office call. The fact is, though, that relatively few doctors make a practice of charging deterrent fees unless a patient is making a nuisance of himself. It all works out to about \$19 per person or an average of about \$50 per family. For this amount of money some residents have received an enormous amount of medical care; others have received practically nothing. Last year, for example, 19% of the insured population didn't have to visit a doctor; but this is a feature of any insurance scheme. Some of the other disadvantages, which are supposed to dog any health insurance scheme, either haven't shown up or have been successfully controlled by the Swift Current region. The doctors haven't deserted the scheme en masse. When it started there were 19 doctors in the region. There are now 42, a growth that parallels the increase in the profession in other parts of the province. There has been a fairly big turnover of doctors, only three now practising in the region when the scheme started, but the average income of Swift Current doctors is above that for doctors in other parts of the province. Nor is there any evidence of a decline in the standards of medical care or of interference in the doctor-patient relation. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is an example of what can be done when government decides that the job needs to be done. Now, Mr. Speaker, health insurance instituted by governments can assure the right of every citizen, without regard to his social or economic status, to have access to all those services and facilities which are or should be available to keep them in good health as long as possible, and to

MR. CAMPBELL: I was wishing to ask the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, if he is in favour of a deterrent in such schemes, because I notice that the one that he's quoting mentions a deterrent.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that I or anybody else in this House can answer that question at the moment, or can answer that question until we get down to the actual planning of the details of the plan. This is a very important question and is one that will be dealt with at the time that the plan is instituted by any particular province. It goes into the question of the cost, and I don't think that the detail whether you have a deterrent charge or not really has anything to do with the basic principle of whether you adopt a health insurance plan or not.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable member if he considers a deterrent just a detail?

MR. ORLIKOW: Just a detail?

MR. CAMPBELL: Just a detail,

MR. ORLIKOW: Yes, it's just a detail which will be handled in one way by one province and another way by another province. I certainly cannot say how we should deal with it today because I don't know when this government will get on with this job. When I do, maybe we can have a discussion of it then. Now, Mr. Speaker, Gallup polls have shown that the Canadian people want health insurance; Canada's political parties have endorsed health insurance programs and plans; and I have already indicated when and where they did it. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come when we stop talking about it and we get on with the job of starting the job of giving the people of Canada, the people of Manitoba the kind of protection so they will have good health which they want and which they are entitled to.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering - I perhaps drew the wrong inference, but there seemed to be a suggestion in the earlier part of your speech that a case that you referred to of a group having been changed from an employee-employer group back to a family group, that there was some suggestion, as I drew it from what you said, that this was done falsely by the Manitoba Medical Service?

MR. ORLIKOW: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYON: Well let us be actually clear on the point.

MR. ORLIKOW: I think I was very clear and I think Hansard will bear me out. All I said was that from my observation and from the people I talked to, when bills get high M. M. S. starts to look very carefully at the groups involved; and this is a legitimate position for them to take. The closer they watch the cost the more they can keep the general cost of the premiums down. All I'm saying is that M. M. S. is not equipped, and no voluntary plan is equipped to carry people who have very high medical bills. That's all I'm saying. And so, therefore, they are -- I'm not being critical of the fact that they look at all groups. They went through north Winnipeg and I think the Honourable Minister knows it quite well. They went through north Winnipeg several years ago, took a number of groups which were not really employee groups but which they had been very happy to have in the initial stages, groups built around various fraternal and ethnic groups and wiped them out and offered them precisely what I say they offered to this individual, the "H" plan, which is really of no assistance to old people at all.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I looked up the responsibility of the Minister of Health concerning the operation of a plan such as M. M. S. a non-profit plan which the honourable member falls to

MR. PAULLEY: the Minister if he is asking a question?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): I am asking a question. The reason I am asking this is that should there be some grave doubts in the mind of the honourable member as to the validity and practice of the M. M. S., I understand that he can, according to the act under which M. M. S. operates which I looked up the other day, he can, through the Minister of Health, he can ask any question or open any aspect of M. M. S. operation that any member of the House cares to do.

MR. ORLIKOW: I don't know that that was a question, but I'll give a suggestion to that would-be question. I would suggest to the Minister that he might consider doing for M. M. S. what the Manitoba Farmer's Union suggested be done for hospitalization and that is that -- and it is on page 3 of their brief in case you have forgotten it -- when the M. M. S. wants an increase in rates or wants to change the regulations they might very well be required to make their case to the Public Utilities Board before they get permission to make an increase. That would take away all doubts as to the validity of their increases.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Board of the Manitoba Medical Services does these things without reference to the public interest?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest on a point of order here that if any of the honourable members opposite have a question that they would like to ask my colleague that they do so, Sir, through you, but not conduct a debate at this particular moment. They have ample opportunity to

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable the Attorney-General wish to ask a question?

MR. LYON: I know the answer before I get it.

..... Continued next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I am going to confine myself strictly to the amendment to the amendment, and hence I will dispense of the usual courtesies of love-making. Now a great deal has been said, during the course of this debate on the amendment to the amendment, regarding the Liberal Rally at Ottawa. Now I was there, and that rally was called for the purpose, the primary purpose of getting the thoughts of the grass roots as to the various problems that were facing Canada. There were some 26 committees set up, at which were processed the various resolutions which these committees were dealing with. There was one resolution come in regarding a comprehensive medical scheme. Now the Honourable the Minister of Health, on speaking on this matter the other day, spoke of the tremendous costs of it; and I would like to make it abundantly clear that -- and the government knows the Liberals are the opposition in Ottawa -- but I want to make it abundantly clear that even if the Liberals do form the next Government in Canada it's not their intention to bring in that comprehensive medical scheme until the country is in the financial position to carry the load -- (Interjection) -- No, that's true. If anybody was listening to the Honourable Lester B. Pearson the other evening when he spoke over the nation's business, I think he made it abundantly clear that night that this scheme would only be inaugurated when the country was able to face the financial costs of it.

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask the honourable member a question?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: Did not the Honourable Lester Pearson likewise say that we could have a reduction in taxes at the same time?

MR. HILLHOUSE: He suggested a reduction in taxes but that's got nothing to do with this amendment, and I am speaking strictly to your amendment to the amendment. A great deal has been said about this proposed comprehensive medical scheme of the Liberal Party, and the Honourable Member for St. John, who just sat down, said that it was impossible to introduce a comprehensive medical scheme of health insurance in Canada unless it was compulsory, and I suggest to the honourable member that the scheme that was submitted by a resolution to the Liberal Rally at Ottawa is not a compulsory scheme; it's purely voluntary. It doesn't rule out the right of an individual to take the coverage under any scheme that's for sale by any organization or insurance company whatsoever, and even if an individual does not have that type of coverage himself, he still doesn't have to take the benefits of the scheme. The only thing is this, that if an individual does take the benefits of the scheme, the amount of benefit that he receives is added to his taxable income. That's the way the scheme is going to work; so that those people who have no taxable income and who do take the benefit of the scheme, and the amount of which is added to their income, they will only be taxable in the total if it's above their taxable income; but if their income is such that the amount of medical care that they get doesn't bring their income into the taxable bracket, they don't pay anything. Now that's the scheme in essence, and as far as I am concerned, I think it one of the finest schemes that has ever been proposed because it hasn't got that compulsory feature which is obnoxious to most of us; it doesn't rule out the competition of private enterprise; and you don't have to take it unless you want it.

Now the Honourable Minister has criticized the Liberal Opposition, when they were in government, for introducing into Manitoba the M.H.S.P. I wonder if the honourable member recalls that when his own leader was in the opposition he kept urging the government of that day to introduce some type of hospital aid scheme, and I believe, too, that the Honourable First Minister, when he was leader of the Opposition, voted for the M.H.S.P. scheme when it came into this house in 1958. Now there is no one on this side of the house, who was on that side of the house then, wishes to minimize the difficulties that would be encountered when that scheme came into being. We realized and realized fully, that although we had sufficient beds at that particular time to take care of the ordinary needs of the people of Manitoba, the minute such a scheme came into being more hospital beds would be required; and as the scheme got going, still more hospital beds would be required. We realized that and that was the reason, I believe, that in 1959 when the Honourable Leader of the CCF introduced a similar amendment to the Throne Speech, as he has today, why I voted against it; because I felt at that time that the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare -- it was most unfair to try and

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.) . . . saddle him with some other problem when the problem of hospitalization was still to be solved. We appreciate fully, on this side of the house, the fact that it is going to take several years to iron out all the problems involved in a hospital scheme; but there is one thing though that we do feel, and that is this, we feel that if the government had not spent the surplus which was left in the Post-War Emergency Fund the way they had done, that they might have been able to use some of that money to take up some of the shock of the increased premiums.

Now regarding the method of collecting premiums under this scheme, there are several methods that can be used. There is one, a sales tax, and I don't think anyone in this house would support such a method because, in my opinion at least, I think that a sales tax is the most iniquitous type of tax that can be imposed. It's imposed without any thought of ability to pay. Now there is another type that could be used and that is used by the Federal Government in collecting contributions to Old Age Security, and I suggest to the Honourable Minister that he should take that method under consideration with a view to seeing whether the Federal Government would not act as an agent for the Province of Manitoba in collecting premiums in a similar manner. Now I am not suggesting to the Honourable Minister what the premium would be, but I would suggest to him that it would be a maximum premium, the same as it is under Old Age Security today. I think that the maximum premium that any individual has to pay in Canada today is \$60.00 a year -- that is the maximum. I suggest that that method would be an equitable method, because you say yourself that you are paying the premium for 41,000 inhabitants of this Province. You would still have to pay their premiums no matter what type of scheme you had, but you would at least be collecting premiums on the basis of ability to pay, and I think that that is the most equitable method of imposing and collecting any type of premium. Now I appreciate and realize that no changes can be made in this agreement without the concurrence of Ottawa, but I do suggest with all sincerity that when you are discussing with Ottawa the question of variations in that agreement, that you should keep in mind this method of collecting. There is another advantage to that method too. It has been suggested in the newspapers that the premium to be charged would be on a sliding scale, on the basis of ability to pay. Now if that method is adopted by the Provincial Government it means that you would have to make your own means test. It means, too, that you would have to have an additional staff to take care of that matter; whereas if you used the Federal Government as your agent to collect premiums through Income Tax, the means test would be applied by the proper officers of that department; and I suggest that it would be a very easy way of dealing with the situation and would eliminate the main objection that most people have to this premium today, that it is not based on ability to pay, but it is a universal premium flat across the board.

Now the Honourable Minister of Health also suggested, I believe that I am correct, that he would like to see some voluntary aspects to this scheme. Is that right? --(Interjection)-- Did I misunderstand you, that you still wish to keep the scheme as a compulsory scheme? M.H.S.P.?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): I didn't mention that in my address -- (Interjection) -- I just think I made reference, Mr. Speaker, to the important role of the volunteer in future.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Oh, I see, that's what it was. You might also too, Mr. Speaker -- the Honourable Minister of Health might also too consider the method that was proposed at the Liberal Rally at Ottawa for collecting premiums -- to give people an opportunity, if they wish to have coverage under a private scheme they could still have it under a private scheme, but base the amount of premiums that they would have to pay on income.

Now the Leader of the CCF's amendment criticizes the government for not having taken the initiative in proposing a Provincial or a Federal-Provincial comprehensive plan of health insurance. Now I can't support the provincial aspect of it -- that is going it alone. I think any government in Manitoba that ever tried to go alone on this scheme would be committing not only political suicide but financial suicide, and it would be most unwise to embark on such a scheme alone. Now as to taking the initiative in a Federal-Provincial scheme, well I understand that two-dab John has got a Royal Commission studying this question just now, and to pass such a resolution -- (Interjection) -- The Prime Minister. There is a Royal Commission set up to study this scheme and I submit that if we did pass such a resolution that a Federal-Provincial comprehensive plan of health insurance be embarked upon, that the

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.) answer you would get would be that we are waiting on the report of this Royal Commission, so I think as far as the amendment to the amendment is concerned, it is purely academic; it is simply put on the Order Paper for the purpose of establishing a platform for the CCF Party, or the new party, whichever you want to call it.

Now I am going to vote against the amendment to the amendment, but I want to make it abundantly clear that I still think that the day is not far distant in Canada when we are going to have a comprehensive medical scheme; but I don't think that the time is ripe for it now. I don't think that the economy of our country could stand it just now and I do not think the economy of our province could stand it; and I think that the government would be well advised to resist the temptation of embarking on a scheme which might meet with approval of some people but would get you into untold trouble.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): I would like first of all, Mr. Speaker, to say that we see very ample evidence of your good health and your good disposition and I wish you well in your tenure of office, which I think is going to be much longer than those in the two opposition parties are prepared to admit. I would also like to extend my personal congratulations to the new Member from Pembina. Our chamber is now graced with a second lady who I am sure will acquit herself well to her province and to her constituency, and as an aside on the Member from Pembina, I might say that her presence in the House is perhaps an indication that, we can take with a grain of salt or with our tongue in cheek, many of the things which the CCF might have to say at this session, because if they sincerely believe that hospital insurance and the many other matters that are dear to them are issues, they had an opportunity to test them in the by-election in Pembina. The fact that they failed to do so is open, I think, to our own individual interpretation. I might also say that we on this side are proud of the -- (Interjection) -- I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that we are very proud of the efforts of both the member that moved and the member that seconded the Address of the Speech from the Throne, and I would like to add my congratulations to the many that have been given to them previously in this debate and to the many that they will receive, I am sure, as this debate proceeds.

I have been intrigued ever since I became a member of the House with some remarks that were made on March 23rd, 1959 by the Honourable Member from Inkster, on Page 202 of the Hansard of that year, in which he said, "All progressive legislation put in the statute books of this province in the last 25 years was advocated, demanded and created public opinion by the CCF, and in the earlier days by the Independent Labour Party". This, I think, is a pretty wide claim that has been repeated many times, with little variations by himself and by his Honourable Leader, and if the number of CCF resolutions that I have seen presented to this House is any indication of their past performance, then the CCF have looked into their crystal ball and covered the field of practically everything that could possibly happen so thoroughly that no government could possibly bring in legislation that doesn't touch on some of these items that are covered in their resolutions. It is one thing, Mr. Speaker, to sit back and follow the logic of human progress and to come pretty close to what's going to happen five, ten or fifteen years from now, but it's another thing to be able to convince the electors of the province to have sufficient faith in your group or your party to let them form a government and to do something about those things that the people want now. Thus, despite 25 years of pious resolutions, the CCF has failed to do; and I predict will fail to do for many years to come. After all, 25 years ago we used to read the Buck Rogers comic strip, and we are coming pretty close now to those things that this comic strip wrote about some 25 years ago. And those of us who have read Jules Vern's books on science fiction are amazed, I think, to see how close we are coming now to the things that he mentioned, that must have been considered utter insanity at the time he wrote his books. And, Mr. Speaker, if year after year one was to bring in a resolution urging the government to reserve property in the Greater Winnipeg area for the erection of a landing site for a rocket ship from Mars, I would suggest that such a resolution would be laughed out of the House. But that member might live long enough to have the last laugh for it may well be that that might be a very good acquisition for the Province of Manitoba. However, I am advocating no such thing, and so much for the CCF ability to see into the future.

Now speaking to his amendment, and at this point in the debate, Mr. Speaker, I intend to confine the rest of my remarks to the said amendment, and I am sure that this will be strictly within the rules and that it will accommodate my good friends to my right. Perhaps I could

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.).... start my remarks on this matter of a prepaid compulsory medical scheme by reading a paragraph from a letter that was issued by the Welfare Council of Greater Winnipeg. The first paragraph of their letter which deals with the universal compulsory medical scheme is this, "A medical service, both universal and compulsory for Canadians will be raised as an issue in the foreseeable future. This issue could be decided on its merits and necessity or, unfortunately, on the opportunism and motivation of a political event. If permitted, however, it could be resolved to the best advantage of our country if wise men in government, the medical profession, and among citizens at large are able to establish with thoughtfulness and courage the facts pertaining to our national health needs, our ability to pay for them, and the manner of administering and providing the measures required." And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in the field of health, as in no other field, people more than anything else want to see their needs met, and as long as this is done, I don't think it makes any difference to them whether the government operates a plan; whether the plan is a private or a co-operative one; whether the plan is operated by the medical profession; or whether the plan is a partnership of the medical profession and any one of the other three. I am sure that if the facts were known and all the points of views were fully discussed that a poll would reveal, firstly, a desire for such a plan, but a preference for one not operated and financed and controlled by the government. Let us look at the cost of such a plan. Let us also remember that a government-operated plan is one that is state owned, state controlled, state run and state financed. Let us also remember, too, that when the government pays the government controls. He who pays the piper calls the tune. Based on some information that I compiled, along with the help of some statistics from the Department of Health and Welfare, these give us some idea of what the ultimate cost could be of such a plan for the Province of Manitoba. We'll assume for the purposes of my calculation that the scheme includes medical care, drugs, dentures and glasses.

Now dealing with medical care, in the Province of British Columbia for welfare cases a doctor received 50% of his fee. The cost -- average -- \$22.00 per year per recipient. In Saskatchewan the cost averaged \$21.00 per year per recipient for the same thing. In Alberta, I don't have the figures but I understand that it's somewhat less, but the average for the three western provinces is about \$21.00 per recipient. Most plans, however, pay the doctor 75% of his fees. So if we take the \$21.00 average and add 25% we arrive at a figure of \$30.00 per recipient, and if we multiply \$30.00 per recipient times 850,000 for the population of Manitoba, we arrive at a sum for medical care alone of \$25,000,000. As to drugs, the average cost in Saskatchewan for drugs per recipient is \$14.00; and under a compulsory program, since there would be more people included, it would be expected that this would be more than the \$14.00. Dentures would run anywhere from \$50.00 to \$100.00 per recipient. Glasses, we take the wholesale price of lenses and frames at say \$15.00 per recipient. In addition, we have wheel chairs, crutches, artificial limbs, hearing aids and many other medical necessities that we cannot possibly get at their ultimate cost. If we take then these figures we arrive at a total cost estimate of between 50 to 60 million dollars to institute such a plan for the Province of Manitoba, and if we divide that by the population of say 850,000, we arrive at \$55.00 per capita. Now this 50 to 60 million dollars sounds like an awful lot of money, but it compares somewhat favourably with the British plan which I understand averages out to about \$40.00 per capita. And if we add to this 50 to 60 million dollars for a health scheme the 27 to 28 million dollars that it presently is costing the Province of Manitoba for hospitalization, we arrive at a total bill that is more than three-quarters of the present provincial budget. This then, Mr. Speaker, is what this sub-amendment means to the Province of Manitoba, or means in terms of money. It's interesting too, Mr. Speaker, to see what the Manitoba Medical or the Canadian Medical Association says about hospital insurance. Dated November, 1960, the Canadian Medical Association sent out an information bulletin which says that "The Canadian Medical Association believes that the highest standard of medical service should be available to every resident of Canada. Insurance to prepay the costs of medical service should be available to all regardless of age, state of health, or financial status. Certain individuals require assistance by paid medical service insurance costs, and the efforts of organized medicine, government, and all other interested parties should be co-ordinated towards these ends. While there are certain aspects of medical service in which tax-supported programs are necessary, a tax-supported

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.).... comprehensive program compulsory for all is neither necessary nor desirable." And I agree with the statement of the Canadian Medical Service in this connection, and particularly I agree with points 6 and 7 of the principles that they have outlined to support this statement of theirs, and that is, that each patient has the right to have all information pertaining to his medical condition kept confidential except where the public interest is paramount; and that the duty of the physician to his individual patient takes precedence over his obligation to any medical service insurance program.

Health care, Mr. Speaker, is a basic right that I think must be within the reach of all, and I think that we can achieve this aim without a government control of monopoly in this field. We do need, however, the government's financial help in outlying areas where otherwise no medical care would be available. We also need the government's financial help to take care of our welfare cases, and I think that this should be totally a government responsibility. I think that the government and the medical profession have a joint responsibility in the case of indigents or those in the borderline wage category. For others, I think that it should be strictly on a voluntary basis and that the matter of fees should be strictly a matter of negotiation, either between the patient and his physician, or by the physician and whatever scheme, voluntary or otherwise, that the patient cares to belong to. I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that few people want complete state control in this field, and as long as they can get their medical needs met they're going to be satisfied with a scheme that will meet these needs at a reasonable cost. After all, even in our own Manitoba Medical Service there are abuses by the patient member and there are abuses by the medical members, both of which are causing the present board of M.M.S. serious trouble. A state plan, I suggest, would only tend to multiply these abuses.

And I think while we're discussing this sub-amendment, Mr. Speaker, that we might keep in mind that in Great Britain originally only 17% of the doctors agreed voluntarily to sign up for the plan and that this percentage was raised to 47% only after the doctors were told that they would go ahead with the 17% that were prepared to proceed and, in addition, that they would be prepared to buy the goodwill of the practices of the doctors that initially went into their plan. These are things I think, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- I haven't the slightest idea -- (Interjection) -- that may well be.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, there is one most important aspect of this subject that we are all forgetting. Here we are considering the expenditure of some \$50 to \$60 million dollars -- for what? Firstly, to bring medical care within the reach of those of our people whom we think, because of low income and inability to pay large medical bills, are not availing themselves of the high calibre of medical service that we have in this country; and this is good. I think it is commendable and right that we should concern ourselves about these people. Secondly, we are considering the expenditure of these huge sums of money to improve medical services for those who can afford to pay for it. And thirdly, we are considering the expenditure of some of these millions on a comprehensive health scheme that will provide medical frills to those who are well able to pay more than we would charge for this service. What about, Mr. Speaker, the huge under-developed areas of this world with their countless millions of unfortunate people who have no medical care at all? What can we, in this land of abounding riches, do for these people who get no medical care? Might not our national government be well advised to take some of these millions of dollars to improve the lot of others? Even in our own selfish interests, should we not give up some of our own comforts to those who are not long going to be satisfied with lowest class medical care and lowest class other comforts and necessities of life when they can observe, at fairly close range, the abundance that we have around us. If we are going to have legalized Robin Hood, Mr. Speaker, better to use some of it to build where it can do the most good. We have no evidence that such a scheme as we are discussing on this sub-amendment is wanted, provided that we can meet the needs of the people with the sources that are available to us now.

A state monopoly, I maintain, will interfere with the conduct of the affairs of the medical profession. A state monopoly will, I maintain, interfere with the private and confidential relationship that exists now between the doctor and the patient; and it is a well-known fact, and I emphasize again that when the government pays the government controls, and there is a great deal of danger in our being rushed on a matter such as this by matters of political expediency

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.).... or otherwise. There is a great danger, Mr. Speaker, because we cannot easily retreat any steps that we take along this path. We must use, I think, an evolutionary approach to this problem; not a revolutionary one. A complete take-over of this field by the government should be avoided. Such a course will lead eventually to all doctors becoming salaried officials of the state, just as sure as there are indications now that the ultimate in our own hospital plan could be the taking over and actual running of our provincial hospitals by the government.

The Federal Government has set up a commission to study this problem and the Provincial Government has set up a commission to study one important aspect of it. The medical profession has a national committee and provincial committees also studying this problem from their point of view. The final reports of these various bodies will make very interesting reading. In the meantime, it is my opinion that we can meet the objections to our present system; that we can meet the medical needs of our people. In fact, in Manitoba we have made a great deal of progress in this manner with our Medicare program for those who are unable to pay the premiums for themselves. These things we can do, Mr. Speaker, without a government controlled monopoly in this field.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Speaker, in congratulating you, I, like the last speaker, the Honourable Member from St. Vital, am a little more optimistic about your tenure of office and, Sir, if predictions are any good, it is my suggestion that you will be in the south end of the Chamber until such time as you voluntarily retire at an advanced ripe age. There is one more member I would like to congratulate, Mr. Speaker, today, and that is myself. I sit between two charming ladies. As such, I am the envy of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I wouldn't be surprised to see him over here any day. The light will suddenly come upon him. And then I was thinking, Sir, now why did the First Minister put me here? Then looking over the ranks of our own party I came to the conclusion, but he has not confirmed this, that I might be the one who would, of the whole party, least detract from the beauty of our two ladies here. May I again, Sir, congratulate the Honourable Member from Arthur and my seat mate here, the Honourable Member from Cypress, who is now absent, on carefully prepared, well-delivered speeches. It was most refreshing for us all to hear such able addresses from two comparatively junior members of the House.

Now Sir, we have heard a little discussion on rulings this afternoon as to what one may or may not say today; and then the Honourable the Member from Selkirk got up and he said, "Mr. Speaker, I am going to conform absolutely to the rules", and then he proceeded to tell the House what the Liberal Party at Ottawa did not decide. So, Sir, if I am just a little confused, please forgive me. It will not be intentionally.

I now refer to the speech of the Honourable the Leader of the CCF -- (Interjection) -- and since the gentleman has reminded me, I would like to speak of that -- the bet. As he stated, it was done facetiously, Mr. Speaker -- the bet. And like him, I will not divulge the quality of the merchandise or the type of merchandise that was exchanged from the loser to the winner. The number was 12, but if one might speak of the quality of the merchandise, I would remind the Attorney-General that on very rare occasions the scarcity of water in Manitoba could prove a blessing.

Sir, I am grateful for the last speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Vital, for giving us figures on the subject matter of the CCF proposal. The figures are rather startling, and we all realize in this house that in medical care, those who cannot look after themselves should be cared for by the state. That is general thinking, I think throughout, but I am going to ask the Honourable the Leader of the CCF to explain how he will get, or how he suggests that the Treasury gets this enormous annual fund required to support this scheme -- (Interjection) -- No. Well, we have heard that before, but then you never seem to get where you are directing the rule except in one province, which is much misled. Does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition suggest a sales tax? If so, I am going to ask him, upon what items, the amount and so forth.

MR. CAMPBELL: Is the honourable member referring to me, or did he use that term inadvertently?

MR. SCARTH: I thought I said the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's what you said.

MR. SCARTH: I am sorry, I would not wish to confuse the House to that extent.

MR. CAMPBELL: Because I would be glad to answer that question.

MR. SCARTH: I'll go to the Honourable Leader of the CCF. Does the Leader of the CCF suggest there be an increase in the gas or diesel tax? Does he suggest an increase in the Liquor Tax? Incidentally, perhaps coming from River Heights I should not mention liquor stores, but I did anyway, but these, Mr. Speaker, are questions which should be answered and the House should know them. Now anybody can get up and wave his hands around and say, let's have state medicine; let's do this for everybody and anybody. It's a vote catcher, yes, with those who do not think or do not understand; but then if we are going to have criticism, let's have something constructive and let's find out what the CCF have actually in mind to implement their own suggestions. So far they have come up with nothing.

Now the Honourable Leader of the CCF did mention mining. I wish the CCF caucus would engage a tutor, Mr. Speaker, to lecture them on, let us say, certain elementary points regarding to economics and mining and the mining of oil. But I will just give you a small one now. They will, of course, come forward and say in the usual manner when you corner them, let us put on a tax for those exploiting our natural resources. I can just hear it coming up. But I would like to tell the honourable members of the CCF that the mineral tax, I speak now of hard rock, is practically equivalent to that which is maintained in Quebec, Ontario and in Saskatchewan. There are slight variations in certain respects, but basically, the mineral taxes are pretty well uniform. Coming to oil, we extract all our oil in Manitoba from the west and southwest portions. That area was settled some time before 1890, with the result that approximately only 17% of the oil operated lands in Manitoba are owned by the Provincial Government. As opposed to this, in Alberta and Saskatchewan, I am informed that over 90% of the oil lands are government owned; that is, the mineral rights are owned by the Saskatchewan and Alberta governments respectively. So, therefore, if the members of the CCF see a small return to Manitoba from oil and a very much larger return from the other provinces, they should bear in mind that the ownership in the Crown is about 90% compared to 17%.

I am not clear to what the Honourable the Leader of the CCF -- or the points he was intending to make when he referred to the \$2 billion defence monies that we spend in this country. But if it was critical, I am going to suggest that in this country there is no room for complacency, Mr. Speaker, and sometimes I do wish the people of Manitoba and the people of Canada would wake up to the situation. In 1914, Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany could press a button as to whether there would be peace or war. Well, we had war. In 1939, Hitler had 11 or 12 gangsters around him. They decided to go into Poland. We know what happened. We know how many men and children were slaughtered and butchered by that fellow. We have got, today, in the Kremlin about 13 men who are more autocratic and with wider powers than Hitler ever had, and I say, Sir, the only thing that will deter them is that if in this country and all the people realize that we have got to be ready for anything that happens and to hit back just a little harder than they do, if occasion requires. And so, Sir, adding up all that the honourable the member of the CCF has made in regard to his points and argument, may I point out that nothing plus nothing plus nothing still leaves nothing.

MR. SPEAKER: Question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, does my adjournment still stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Do it again.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for La-Verandrye, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Speaker, before proposing this motion I would like to say, Sir, that I, as the Chairman of the Special Committee to consider the Elections Act, appreciated the spirit of co-operation with which all the members of the committee entered into the debate. I would not like to suggest, Sir, that our opinions were unanimous on all occasions; but I do think that the members of the committee did conduct themselves with decorum and I felt that there was a spirit of co-operation amongst all of the members of that committee and I wish to express my personal word of thanks to them. I would move, Sir, seconded by the Honourable Member from Roblin, that this House does concur in the report of the Special Committee

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd.) appointed on the 23rd day of March, 1960, to consider The Elections Act and received by the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba on Tuesday, the 16th day of February, 1961.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I can agree wholeheartedly with what the Chairman of this committee has said as to the good spirit that prevailed, and I think that I can say without any reservation that, in total, I believe that the committee did very good work. I, too, bear tribute to the way that the members took an interest in their work. I can say quite honestly that I think the Chairman himself did an excellent work and, as always, the Clerk of the House, who was also Clerk of that committee, provided us with excellent material and kept things moving expeditiously, in which I am sure the Chairman was a prime mover as well. But there was one matter -- the Chairman has suggested that we were not unanimous in all regards -- there is one matter which I think is of sufficient importance that I find myself constrained to oppose the concurring in the motion at the present time, because I think that this matter is of such importance that it should be debated further in this House and that the committee should reconsider. That is the question of the length of time that is given, under our present Election Act, between the issue of the writ and the date of the election. I should say the minimum length of time that is given. That question was raised in the committee and there was no attempt by the majority there to object to its discussion. We had every opportunity to deal with it, but the fact was self-evident that this had been a matter of government legislation, as recently as just last session, and so those of us who were in the opposition ranks on the committee did not debate it in great length, but some of us made the statement at that time that we would be discussing this question in the House when it met.

I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to do that, very briefly, Mr. Speaker, because at this hour I certainly will not speak as long as I ordinarily would. In fact, I shall content myself with just one major reference in that regard and that is to a brief that was filed with the committee by the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and which we considered briefly during the committee sittings. I want to read from that brief. It was presented to the Clerk of the Committee and the Clerk forwarded it to the members of the committee under date of November 22nd, and just a couple of points here I wish to refer to from that brief. I am quoting now from the last paragraph on the first page of the brief and this, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize once again is the opinion of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce. "Democratic government", and I'm quoting now from the brief, "Democratic government can only exist if elections for the members of its governing bodies are conducted on a basis which is fair to all, which offers to all citizens a convenient opportunity to hear and discuss the policies and issues presented by the candidate and to cast their ballot on election day. It is therefore important that the election procedures should provide for a reasonable opportunity for individuals and groups to select candidates and make their views known. It should also provide convenient and smoothly functioning machinery for the taking of the vote on the day specified for the election." Then, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of brevity, I skip a portion and read from about the middle of the second page. "The first point we would raise is the matter of the length of time between the proclamation of an election and the date when it is to be held." And here I'm quoting again from the brief of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce. "It appears to us that 14 days from the date of official nominations until the date of election allows a reasonable opportunity for the necessary printing and other mechanical arrangements, and also for the candidates to make their positions known. The present act, however, provides that the proclamation of the date of the election can be only 21 days before the date for official nomination. We are aware that the act provides that a longer period may be provided by the proclamation, but we are concerned that an election called on notice of only 21 days before nomination date would leave a completely inadequate period for the selection of candidates and for the setting up of the arrangements needed to allow the candidates and the supporters to publicize their views and discuss the issues upon which the voters must decide." Still quoting, Mr. Speaker, "We therefore urge your committee to provide that the proclamation of an election must, as a minimum, provide notice of at least 35 days from the official date of nomination, which would mean a minimum of at least 49 days between the date of proclamation and the date of the election."

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....

Mr. Speaker, that is the position that our group took when the legislation was before this House a year ago. It's the position we still take. We did not attempt to argue it at any length in the committee but we feel that this should again be brought to the attention of the House. And we feel, also, that it should be reconsidered by the committee and consequently, Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains, that the report of the committee be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back with instructions that Clause C of sub-section (1) of Section 8 of The Elections Act, be further considered.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. LYON: I know that this matter has been discussed before and I'm going largely now on memory, which a lawyer trains himself he should never do without looking up the authority, but I do not have it in front of me, not being aware of the amendment that was to be moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. But I recall, Sir, there was recently a decision in this House, and I think that both Beuchesne and our own rules will bear it out, to the effect that an amendment such as we now have before us is not properly in order by reason of the fact that the committee is no longer in existence and, therefore, you cannot refer back to a committee no longer in existence something which you wish it to further consider. That is the only objection that I make at this time, just on this point of order, to the actual wording of the amendment. I think my honourable friend could move non-concurrence for the reason stated, but I don't think he can add to it the fact that this should be referred back to the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you concur in the opinion of the Attorney-General that the committee is no longer in existence?

MR. CAMPBELL: I think if you will check our own rules you will find that they are very clear on the fact that this motion can be made, and not only our own rules, and I'm speaking of the revised rules, but I think you will also find that Boronow -- Beuchesne rather than Boronow -- Beuchesne will bear out the same contention. But of course, as everyone knows, Beuchesne does not come into the picture unless there is no rule of our own; and I'm quite sure that we have a rule of our own that accomplishes the same thing. I'm sorry to say that the copy of the rules that happens to be in my desk is one where there's a misprinting, and if you will look at Rule 67 -- or the heading of Rule 67, Mr. Speaker, you will notice that the heading is Standing and Special Committees. Then, unfortunately, in this book with which I have been furnished, I do not lay any charge against the government in this regard, but the one that I've been furnished with, Page 13 comes immediately after Page 28, and it takes a little while for me to find the context here. Page 29 carries on with the committees and then when you get to 71, on Page 30, you will notice that the heading is still with regard to Reports from a Standing Committee or a Special Committee. Either a Standing or a Special Committee carries right along to where the member, how he presents the report, concurrence to be moved on a subsequent day, report of the committee shall be signed by the Chairman only; and then 73, a report from a committee shall not be amended by the House but it may be referred back to the committee. That's our own rule, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: This has been a rule which I know has caused me a great deal of trouble, it being quite clear as to what it means. I recall all too vividly, however, having been told when I sat in another place that the motion of the nature proposed by the honourable gentleman was out of order, and at that time the Chair so ruled and it was carried accordingly. I think probably the point of argument is not the power to refer back, although that may enter into it with respect to Special Committees, and our rule may need some interpretation in that respect. But the point at issue then was whether or not it could be referred back with instructions. That was the point. It could be referred back, but not with instructions; and I think that that would be the argument that I would make at first glance, dealing with this matter, that that particular aspect may be the difficulty that I ran into on a previous occasion myself. I think that you can't send it back with instructions. I really think that in the past the general position has been this. First, that as far as the Special Committee is concerned that once it reported it was dead and that no motion to refer back was to be considered. Whether that is compatible with our rule may be open for argument. The second point that I submit to you, Sir, is that if power to refer back to a Special Committee still does exist, then the question arises to whether you should do

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)..... so with instructions; and the point that I would submit, Sir, that instructions are not in order under our previous experience here. But it's a very difficult point and I would hope, Sir, that you might find it possible to consider the matter and let us know at a future date as to what the correct approach to this might be.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite in favour of that procedure. I think it's the right way and in these circumstances am highly in favour of it, but to help in your consideration of the question I would just like to point this out, that we have made the change in our rules, as I mentioned earlier today, that whereas we used to go, when there was not one of our rules that covered the situation, we went by the usages and customs of this House, and those were difficult to define. We've always admitted that. I think that's the point to which the Honourable the First Minister is referring. But when we had this revision, with which you are well acquainted, Mr. Speaker, we changed that, as I mentioned this afternoon and I shall not repeat that, we changed it so that if it's not now covered we don't go to our usages and customs, but we go instead to the House of Commons' Orders, Usages and Customs, and in that connection I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that you look at Boronow -- once again I use the term Boronow -- it's Beauchesne, 4th Edition. If you will look at the -- to save you the time of looking up, I know that you're familiar with this, Mr. Speaker, you will find that Citation 321, on Page 250, is dealing specifically with what Ottawa calls a Select Committee and we call it Special Committee, and if you will follow that through you will find, I think, that this amendment that I have moved is clearly in order. You will also find, contrary to what the Honourable the First Minister has just enunciated, that it can be referred back, either with or without instructions. I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure you can determine the proper procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll be happy to take it under consideration. Is the debate concluded on this? It's now 5:30.

MR. ROBLIN: It's 5:30 and normally we would return again tonight. There are, however, but two bills, private member's bills, on the Order Paper which probably I think the movers thereof might not object if they were held, and I believe the Honourable Member for Inkster is not in his place so we would not proceed with his. So if there was no objection to my so doing, Sir, on the part of anyone in the House, I'd be prepared to move the adjournment. I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.