

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, March 21, 1967

MR. SPEAKER: Before we commence proceedings tonight, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my left where we have a group of 15 ladies known as the Red Circle Group. I understand these ladies take a great interest in public affairs, one of their reasons for being here tonight. They are from the areas of St. James and Assiniboia. On behalf of all the members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here tonight.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would be good enough, on government business now, to call the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 38, an Act to amend The Liquor Control Act; the adjourned debate on Bill No. 56, an Act to provide for the imposition of a tax on purchasers of tangible personal property and certain services; and the third reading of Bill No. 68, An Act respecting insurance of Residents of the Province in respect of the costs of Medical Services; and then thereafter the Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on second reading, Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to dwell too long on this. I think everything that can be said has been said, really, and I wouldn't want to repeat everything that's been said.

I've listened with great interest to the debate because frankly I came into this with quite an open mind. My personal approach to the consumption of alcohol is not such that I feel I am against this; if anything, perhaps a change in some of our liquor laws might even make some of our drinking habits a little more civilized. Who can tell? But certainly I was prepared to listen to what I felt was both sides of the question and there have been some very interesting comments made. I'd like to just dwell on those for a moment, because one of the things I find prevailing all through the debate, and this includes the letters, some of the letters I've been getting - I must admit I'm not as popular as some other members who claim to have gotten 300 and 500 and 600 letters; I've gotten four, not a very heavy mail. Now despite that, even these four or five that I've received, I've found this, that in the letters generally there's an underlying fear, a fear that somehow if we amend this Liquor Act that somehow we're going to be opening Pandora's box to God knows what type of trouble and what kind of problems. The emphasis seems to be on the fact that advertising will somehow create very serious problems in Manitoba. I'm wondering whether this is based on fact or whether it's just a myth, because to suggest that advertising can be equated with greater consumption of alcohol I've yet to see borne out by any statistics. I wonder whether Manitoba consumes less per capita than let's say Ontario, which permits advertising. I'm wondering whether we consume less here than Quebec. I have yet to see statistics that would bear this out, and yet this seems to be one of the most potent arguments against permitting advertising. Now if I have any doubts about advertising, my concern is that if they spend too much money on advertising the price may go up. Somebody's got to pay for this advertising and since advertising these days - I think the purpose of it is not so much to increase the market, because I think the pie's just so large and it's limited by the number of people you have in the province, the purpose of advertising is to perhaps come up with a better jingle to attract more people to be aware of your product so instead of ordering product A they will order product B. I'm not convinced, as I say, that it will increase the number who are consuming alcohol, and if anyone can give me statistics otherwise I'll be glad to reconsider this position.

The fear seems to be centred mostly on radio or on TV advertising, the idea being that this is brought into your living room and somehow is going to have a very great impact on the viewer, and there's no doubt, TV advertising is probably the most forceful and pernicious that we live with today, but I'm wondering whether just straight advertising is that effective. If we're going to be consistent, then perhaps we should also prevent movies or TV shows from being shown which have any scenes in them showing the consumption of alcohol, and I suggest that some of these scenes can be far more enticing to the viewer and whet his appetite perhaps more than commercial advertising, so that if we're talking about advertising, it's not I think the use of the medium but it's the use to which the medium is put that perhaps should be considered when viewing the matter in the light of should there be advertising on TV. As far as newspapers and magazines are concerned, frankly, maybe it's because of my age or because I'm becoming more blase, I find that I read ads in newspapers and magazines less and less.

(MR. MILLER, cont'd) TV is something that has the dual impact of both visual and audio.

I think generally that if we're talking in terms of moderation - and this is the goal that everyone would like to achieve in Manitoba - I think it is a matter of being self-imposed; I don't think by limiting the number of hours by half of what they are today you're going to increase moderation or you are going in any way assist moderation; the people who have a problem with liquor are still going to have that same problem with liquor. And so it boils down, really, to my own view, not to the hours, because I think these people who are complaining about hours, if they are very honest with themselves or look at it very seriously, I think deep down are really talking against any hours; that if they had their way they might be asking really for complete prohibition, because, to be logical, one hour more or less isn't going to make all that difference. So what it boils down to in my mind is the question of the advertising and particularly TV advertising, and even there the incidence of automobile accidents has become a major problem. Is anyone in this House suggesting, or has suggested, that because automobiles have become an instrument of death and destruction that the type of advertising that's put on our TVs showing cars not as pussycats, with a nice quiet purr, they're always tigers and they're ready to leap off and attack; cougars and mustangs and so on; and yet no one has mentioned or suggested that perhaps that type of advertising is not good; and perhaps it isn't. Maybe we have to look at the whole concept of the effect of audio-visual advertising which is so powerful and so all-pervasive, but I think this is the only consideration, or serious consideration, I might give this Bill, looking at it negatively, is the concept of the power of what TV advertising might do, but I would like to at that point broaden it then to include other forms of advertising, of commercial advertising and selling of other products as the example I gave of cars, which I feel are equally disturbing and have perhaps a greater effect on our younger ones than has the consumption of alcohol.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I suppose it's not to be wondered at that a problem that has simply vexed the people of the world through all the time of recorded history, should fail to find unanimity of opinion in this Legislative Assembly. It seems to me that we have a Bill here where, as far as one can judge from the debate that has taken place up to date, is one that is just about as evenly divided as we often get, and I don't propose to attempt to review what the various members have said, either on the side that I find myself ranged with or those who are in the opposition camp, because I would guess that there's no likelihood, in fact I would think no possibility, of each one of us, of any one of us being able to muster arguments that will sway very many members of the House, and after all, we're the ones that have to make the decision on what we do. At one time I thought that I would try and present some of the main arguments as I see it, and I find that they have already been presented in better form than I would likely have done. I thought some of trying to counter the arguments of those who have taken the position that I do not agree with, and I find that that too has been attempted by some other folk, so I thought that instead I would simply speak from my limited experience in this matter, Mr. Speaker, and say that in the years that I have been in the Chamber that I have watched with a good deal of interest, though without ever considering myself to be an expert on what should be done, the various discussions that have taken place.

I recall very well the time when we had what is now referred to as Prohibition, and, Mr. Speaker, if I remember properly the legislation that existed at that time, it was not prohibition. This name has been applied to it through the years but I think there was not ever a time that people who wanted alcoholic beverages couldn't get them. The great difference was that they were not as readily available and as easily available as some people wished them to be, and the person within the province at one time had to send outside of the province in order to secure supplies of liquor. Well I remember those years and I remember the agitation that was carried on for some time to have these restrictions - and they undoubtedly were restrictions - removed and to have the public sale of spirituous liquors. I was in the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, sitting over there where the Honourable Member for Rupertsland sits now, when the Honourable Member for Winnipeg, Mr. J. Kensington Down, carried into one of the back row seats there, what was purported to be thousands upon thousands of petitions asking for a vote on what the sponsors of this program called the Moderation League, and I remember the vote taking place later on. That was acceded to and then there was a further widening later on, and a still further widening, and during the time that I had the honour to head the government of the province there was a rather insistent demand for a review of the whole situation, and the government of the day thought then that it would be well to have a review and have an

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) authoritative study made of this subject and so we, in our wisdom, appointed a committee to study this matter. That's the time-honoured system for politicians, Mr. Speaker, to appoint a committee. That's exactly what we did, and I think that those people who want to refer to us as having been old-fashioned people and rather backward people in some respects, should recall that this was the government that dealt with this very thorny problem at that time - and it was a thorny problem. And those of you who have perused recently at all the copy of the Bracken Commission Report will have noticed that the Commissioners paid some attention to what was said by Members of the Legislative Assembly at the time that the resolution was introduced into this House looking toward the setting up of this Commission, and we were advised by members who were then sitting on this side of the House to be sure, to be careful, that we got good people to act on the Commission, and I think we discharged that responsibility very well, Mr. Speaker, because we asked a former Premier of this province, a former Leader of the Progressive-Conservative Party of Canada, to head that Commission, and we asked to serve with him on that Commission four men and one lady, Mrs. Whiteford, from up in the Virden country, a housewife of the very highest standing and very great capability. We asked General Riley of this city, one of the best known citizens of the city and one of the past military -- District Commander of Military District No. 10, a man with a distinguished record in many public affairs and in two world wars. We asked Dr. Paul L'Heureux, who is still extremely active in his chosen profession; and I don't recall whether he was the actual president of that time of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities or whether he was a past president, but one who had been president of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, Clifford A. McRae, past Reeve of the Rural Municipality of Westbourne. And those five people were given wide terms of reference to make a complete study of the liquor question in Manitoba and to recommend suitable action. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I failed to mention, when talking about the extremely capable Commission that we had and the staff that they assembled, if I did not mention that the gentleman who is now the sponsor of this bill, the Honourable the Attorney-General, was seconded to that committee as the legal advisor, and those who have recently checked up on the report of the Committee will find out that the commissioners paid a high tribute to him for the excellent work that he did. No wonder that my honourable friend the Attorney-General is very conversant with this subject. I don't mean in a personal or a specialized manner, I mean as the legal end of it, because he acted in that capacity throughout the whole time of the Bracken Commission study, and is thoroughly familiar with their work and what they did, and had a good deal to do, Mr. Speaker, with the drafting of the report, and to some extent, at least, an influence on the conclusions that they arrived at. So that altogether I think it was a very capable committee that they assembled and certainly they spent a lot of time and effort on it. I shall not speak of the staff except to say that the man whom they chose and the Commission was given complete carte blanche in choosing their officials, and the man whom they chose as secretary of the Commission was later appointed as the Government Liquor Control Commissioner in the province.

Now, I give that brief review to simply indicate that what was done at that time was a sincere and dedicated effort by extremely capable people who had the time and facilities to make a good study, and they made a good study; and the government of the day passed the Act - a good many of the people are here who were in the House at the time that the Act was passed - and I think that in total, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Act that succeeded that study was closer to the recommendations and implemented more of the suggestions than is customary on occasions of that kind. I do not recall, though I never felt that I was one of the experts on this particular Act, I do not recall any major area where we failed to follow pretty closely, almost exactly, the recommendations of the Commission. Mr. Speaker, at the time that the Commission concluded, the chairman of it, Mr. Bracken, presented to his fellow members of the Commission and to some members of the staff a little brochure that he presented simply as a kind of a personal touch, with what he called his personal comments on a liquor code for Manitoba, and my guess would be, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable the Attorney-General was presented with one of these documents that I now hold in my hand (mine bears the inscription, "To Doug, with my regards. J.B.") and the code that Mr. Bracken subscribes to there is printed in the bound volume of the Bracken Commission Report in Chapter 14, and I thought as my small contribution to this debate at this time that I would read just a few of these comments, and Mr. Bracken makes it plain in the report and in this small brochure itself that these comments are a personal contribution by the chairman; it is not to be implied that these are recommendations of the Commission or that all of them carry the approval of more than a majority. He indicates that they

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) are the opinion of a majority. And anyone who wants to read the Commission Report as a whole can of course find out the places where some members differed on one point or the other, but in general it was a highly unanimous report so far as the main recommendations were concerned.

This little brochure was handed to some of us at the time that Mr. Bracken and his Committee completed their work in November, 1955. That's approximately 11-1/2 years ago, Mr. Speaker, and it's probably interesting to see how some of these rate up. I'm not going to take the time of reading all of these because there are something like 42 or 43 in number, but I thought I would just mention two or three; and the sixth one of them - and I'm starting with the sixth one - is I think worthy of comment at this present time, written 11-1/2 years ago. Here is Mr. Bracken speaking. "Let the present law be judged by its consequences. Put upon the statute books such modifications of it as will correct its inadequacies. Let the revised law be a challenge to the people to respect it, not a temptation to make of it either a matter of ridicule for its critics or a get rich scheme for its beneficiaries."

Mr. Speaker, I have the feeling that this law in total has stood the test of time very well. I harbour the notion that so far as other provinces are concerned that the majority of the provinces of Canada followed very closely the Liquor Act that was introduced in Manitoba at that time and on the recommendation of this Commission. And I have noticed in the remarks of some people in the debate that has taken place to date, what I would consider to be almost a violation of Mr. Bracken's exhortation not to yield to the temptation of making of it a matter of ridicule. I don't think that any one of us, regardless of the views that we hold, should ridicule or be the object of ridicule by others, because this is a problem that's been before the public for a long time. We're far from a satisfactory solution of it yet and we're all entitled to our own opinion.

On the matter of alcoholism, to which the Commission paid a great deal of attention, Mr. Speaker, I thought that perhaps on that one that three or four would be worth reading in sequence: "Establish a sound plan for the rehabilitation of our 10,000 alcoholics." I don't know what that figure would be today, nearly 12 years later - and continuing with Mr. Bracken's words: "By education, prepare the public for a program to help rehabilitate these men and women, most of whom, through society's ignorance or indifference, have been neglected in the past." My guess would be, Mr. Speaker, that we haven't done as well in this field as we should have. If that is correct, then both the former government and this one would have to share some responsibility perhaps. Maybe we could have done more; maybe the question is insoluble.

The next comment is: "Endeavour by legislation as well as by education to discourage the excessive drinking of 10,000 others." I don't know how that figure compares today, Mr. Speaker, almost a dozen years later. Continuing with Mr. Bracken's words: "The truth and the law, operating together, can be made effective checks on the ever-increasing army of liquor addicts." I wonder if they still are increasing. My guess would be that they are.

And then the next comment: "Take steps to reduce the annual increase of 700 addicts, alcoholics, each year." And the last one on that page is: "Help protect the young from habituation. Effective education on the value of abstinence for teenagers should be a required subject in all places of public instruction." My guess is that although there has been an attempt made to carry out that recommendation through the years, that perhaps it has not been fully carried out.

Then, on the consumption of liquor, Mr. Bracken in his personal comments said, "Prevent by all practical means the excessive use of liquor." And this, I think, is a pertinent sentence: "Society is unanimous about that, and can be counted upon to support every acceptable check for its prevention."

And under the heading of traffic and other accidents, Mr. Bracken said: "Make the roads safer for driving. They were not built for the needless wrecking of human lives and human bodies and human nerves by the incompetent driving of drinking men."

Then under General heading Mr. Bracken says, "Remove as far as possible the temptation of a powerful trade to dominate the free choice of the community in its attitude toward the use of liquor." I would rather think that that would be an appropriate comment with regard to the suggestion of increased opportunities for advertising in the province.

The last one that I'm going to quote of these personal comments of Mr. Bracken is as follows: "Lend moral support to the members of the Legislature in their effort to bring about permanent social gain. The paradox of a trade that is in many respects a handicap to society and yet is patronized by nearly two-thirds of the adult population, has not yet been resolved

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) anywhere in the world to the satisfaction of all." And I would think that that is a fair comment, Mr. Speaker, and it's the one with which I began by saying that, according to my reading of that report and some slight reading outside of it, that it would appear that after fifty centuries of recorded history, the question of public policy on liquor is still one of the world's most controversial issues.

I note that in a recent issue of The Parliamentarian, which I assume that all members of the Assembly receive and which I think is well worth taking some time to read, there's a report on an Alcoholic Bill which was passed or introduced in the New Zealand Parliament in September, 1966, and it mentioned, or the Minister mentioned in speaking on the Bill, that alcoholism now ranks among the four major health threats following cancer, mental illness and heart disease, and I remember that Mr. Bracken's Commission, as well, placed alcoholism in the fourth position as far as a health hazard was concerned. Some place - it may have been the Bracken Inquiry Commission Report or it may have been from another source - but some place I came across this quote that, "The liquor industry differs from other industries in that its commercial expansion is not in the public interest."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no solution to offer and I have no doubt that even after the several minor amendments that have been made to the Liquor Control Bill through the dozen years or thereabout since it was placed on the statute books, but likely there are some matters of administration, at least, that the Minister and his colleagues would like to see considered, but as I have listened to the debates here and as I have thought the situation over for myself, I couldn't help but arrive at the conclusion that there are more things, more principles in the Bill with which I disagree than those with which I agree. The ones with which I disagree are the extension of hours in general and particularly the extension of advertising. I think we have too much advertising already and, like the Honourable Member for Pembina, I am concerned about the way in which advertising is subtly sneaked into a lot of TV programs by showing the drinking of one kind and another at social gatherings and sports events and almost anything and everything that is shown on the TV. So my conclusion is, Mr. Speaker, although recognizing the fact that there is undoubtedly some reason for review and for consideration after the length of time that this Bill, this statute, has been on the books without major amendments, yet because it seems to me that in areas that I consider to be the most important, that it goes beyond what I could, in the light of my experience, agree with, I propose to vote against second reading.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fisher, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 65. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to thank the honourable members for allowing this to stand yesterday. I didn't feel too well in the first place, secondly

MR. LYON: 56, I believe you meant to call, Mr. Speaker. I presume that it was Bill 56 because it stands adjourned in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, but I believe you said, Sir, 65 when you meant 56.

MR. SPEAKER: I had the numbers right but in the wrong place.

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may proceed now I would like to make some comments in connection with the Bill 56, which is an Act to provide for the imposition of a tax on purchasers of tangible personal property and certain services, so I think we have the matter straight at this particular time. We also know that we have an amendment on the Order Paper in connection with this Bill which has two subsections. One deals with the regulations that will be made under Bill 56, and the other one is in connection with referring this bill to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments for consideration and report so that outside representation can be heard.

Dealing with the amendments first, I feel that they are both very valid amendments, or portions of amendments, and I certainly intend to support the amendments that are on the Order Paper. I too feel that we have too much of the legislation being referred to regulations and I am just wondering whether there is not more things unsaid than said, because we find so often in a given year that the amendments under the various legislation are about as many and the bound copies of these books are about as thick as the statutes themselves, and this is not only happening once but it seems to happen every year.

Then, too, the regulations that are passed under a given piece of legislation are not there

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) for consideration until almost a year hence, then they are referred to the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations to be perused and approved, and a resolution is then brought in to the House for concurrence. Yet these regulations have the same status of law as any other statute that is passed by the legislators themselves, and therefore I feel that the regulations that are made under the various bills and laws that we make are very important and that, as such, certainly we should have an earlier opportunity of looking at them than a year from now. I imagine a good number of these, even if not all, but a good number of them could certainly have been provided to the members of the House at this particular time.

The matter of referring a bill to a Standing Committee such as the Law Amendments Committee I think is also very valid, so that we as members of the House could hear the representation that would be made from outside people and voicing their objections. Certainly there must be many valid objections made to the Cabinet and to the government as such during this particular time period, which are not made known to the members of the Opposition or probably also to the backbenchers, so that we do not get the full impact, and all the views of the people who are directly concerned with this matter; and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment later on when it is voted on.

Coming to the Bill itself, I personally feel that a tax of this type definitely is a nuisance tax. I know when I go out to other provinces or to other states across the line where they have a tax of this type, I resent it when you buy an article and then find when you go to the counter you have to fork up additional monies, and no doubt this resentment will carry on for years, and the government that imposes it, naturally the people will be thinking about them very often when they have to pay out these additional amounts of money.

I find there are a number of things in the Bill -- I do not want to refer to the different sections but there are a number of them which bring out certain principles and to which I almost have to refer to. The matter of requiring that everyone must have a license in order to do business so that the government will be able to get its sales tax, how will this work out in the case of the denturists? We find that the tax -- these people are not supposed to be licensed and yet I'm sure the government will want them to give the service. The Minister has the power to refuse a license or a certificate. What is the situation?

Then we find, in the first instance, before an appeal can be made first you have a hearing and the hearing is made directly to the Minister, so I feel that this is not quite proper in my opinion, that if someone has a grievance he will have to go to the Minister who is the one who imposed it. I feel this is not quite the proper channel or the proper way of doing things, of handling things. It is only on the subsequent level that they can go to higher authorities and to courts.

What about the matter of public auction sales? Where do they come in? Are they subject to a sales tax? What items that will be sold at this auction sale ought to become subject to such a sales tax.

Then I find another matter - the commission that will be paid to the people collecting tax. This is also a matter that will be dealt with under regulations. We, as Members of this House, won't know for quite some time, will these people be properly compensated for their efforts, for their work in collecting the taxes? I think this is a matter that should be made available to us as members of this House. We should know what the return will be, whether they will be properly rewarded or not. I find that the government will have power to place liens on farm properties and other properties where remittances are not made properly. They can even go as far as seize the books of individual businesses if not proper returns are handed in. I think we are taking a lot of power under this Act and subjecting the business people of this province to pressure and to this nuisance in my opinion.

Then, too, under a certain section - and if you want me to name the section, it is Section 24 subsection (3), in my opinion, the accused are guilty until they prove their innocence, and this is wrong, basically wrong, as I can see it, our laws and the way justice is being handled in this province in Canada. This should not be the way it is proposed in that particular section.

So these are a number of things that I feel we should be informed on, and a number of these things will only come out in the regulations and this will be probably a year from now that we will be able to discuss these matters and then in Committee only. So, Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with some of the other members who have already asked that the regulations be tabled at this particular time so that we know where we stand on a lot of these matters.

I know the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce has voiced concern over increased taxes, and also claiming that costs will just be passed on to the consumer; the consumer will be the one

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) that will be paying for these increased costs. We have letters, and I'm sure other members of the committee of the House have received letters. I received one from the Greater Winnipeg Shoe Repairers Association, a copy of which is addressed to the Honourable Duff Roblin, and they show their situation where they're in a category that is probably just making a bare existence and we're going to tax these people; as a result their business will decrease, and it will be harder for them to get along in the future.

Likewise we all have the petitions. A good many of us have the petitions from the Dry Cleaners and Launderers where their services will also be taxed, and asked for exemptions. And I think many of these are real valid ones and should receive consideration.

What about the hostels? Will they be exempt? This is a matter that I would like to have some clarification on. What about the employment agencies such as Office Overload who hire out girls and men for services? Will these also be subjected to a sales tax? I think these are matters that should be clarified and that we should receive information on.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I think the tax money that will come from this particular tax will be much larger than what is indicated in the budget speech. We find, for instance, that in British Columbia where they have a sales tax and where they do not tax the services, they have 1,900,000 people; the amount they collect in taxes is around \$150 million. This is almost \$80.00 per capita, and while we know that that province is more prosperous and they have higher wages, higher salaries, higher incomes, more prosperity, but still the difference from \$45 to \$80 per capita income seems very large to me, and I think we're underestimating the income that will come from this particular tax. I think it will be much higher, probably in the sixty or even higher -- \$60 million figure or higher.

Then, too, how long will this tax suffice? Will we be in another two years facing an increase in this tax? The Province of Quebec is increasing theirs now and in my opinion, if we keep on spending the way we do, increasing expenditures year by year, and we have increased government expenditures in the last seven years by 400 percent, now on that basis we will have to increase the sales tax in a few years' time, and I think it's about time that we take a closer look at the expenditures of government and reduce them instead of keeping on increasing expenditures year after year.

Then, too, Mr. Speaker, many of the residents of this province as a result of the vote on the referendum will not benefit from this tax at all. At least if government policy is to continue -- and I sure hope they will change their policy in connection with the schools, the one district divisions in particular. I feel that this government is now denying (and especially the backbenchers) their own people the improvement of education because they're going to have to stay with the old grant system; they're not giving them the increased grants which are rightfully theirs.

MR. SPEAKER: Just a minute, please. I don't feel that the honourable gentleman intends to discuss the matter of education. I believe that we have discussed it to a considerable degree and I wondered if he would come back to discussing the motion that's before us.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm discussing the tax bill because what are we going to do with the monies that are derived from these taxes? Where are we going to spend them? And this was the very purpose of this tax bill - to pay for these additional costs of the school grants; and therefore I think I'm quite in order in referring to this particular phase of this tax bill. I feel that the government has to reconsider its policy in connection with these schools that opted themselves out and that did not vote for the one district division. They just cannot afford to maintain their present policy and not giving consideration to these divisions that did not see . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must insist the honourable gentleman come back to the body of the motion which is being discussed and not get us involved in education at this particular time. I appeal to him to agree with the opinion that I am putting forward in the interest of the business before the House.

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Speaker, if you insist, although I feel that I was quite in order. However, I still feel that we should have looked at other alternatives and certainly alternatives other than just taxes. I feel that we in Manitoba and that this government has failed very drastically in connection with the development of natural resources in getting any revenues from them. We know that we're away down on the totem pole in this very matter, that all we're receiving is some \$4-1/2 million compared to the other provinces that are drawing immense amounts of monies in this way, and that here is an area where we wouldn't have to tax our people, where these taxes would be passed on to other parts of this country, to other provinces and probably other people in the world, and it wouldn't be directly reflected on our own people.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) This is where we have failed in Manitoba to such a large degree and I feel that this government is losing confidence and the people as a result.

I had a good many things more to say which are connected with the school matter, but if this is not to be said then I will have to conclude my remarks at this particular time.

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I want to make it perfectly clear to the honourable gentleman that I feel confident that he will be able to discuss matters to do with education before this session is over. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to say a few words on this tax Bill and on the amendment that is before us. I can agree with the amendment because after having a look at it, the first section which says regulations for Bill 56 be immediately be made public, after the regulations we had brought to our attention by the Honourable Member from St. John's and the kind of regulations that were made with regards to the legislative complex, I too am worried as to what kind of regulations we are liable to get in respect to this Bill. There is much in this Bill that gives the Minister tremendous discretionary power and I'm not always certain that - although the honourable gentleman may be and in my opinion is well intentioned, he still is human, he may err - he may have this power and he may not be able to do as I would like to have him do or as many of the members of this House would like to have him do.

Now one thing that's been brought to our attention, and I agree that we should try to keep things going in this House to expedite things, but I do not see that we are consistent in this respect. The Honourable Treasurer has said we should hurry up, he doesn't want to rush anyone but we have to move along; so has the Attorney-General said this; but the other days when I had a vital matter and I brought it to the attention of the Minister of Labour and I asked him if he could expedite this matter because it was a vital matter, his reply was because it is a vital matter we have to go slow. I think in this case we should do the same thing, we should take a real good look at this, slow down a little bit before we rush into something. I haven't had one instance of anyone writing to me - and I've had a number of letters and I shall refer to them in a minute or two - saying this is a good thing. Now if this is such a good thing I would like to see one thing, and there are many backbenchers and there are also many other Ministers besides the Honourable Treasurer, who would close debate if he spoke on this, who could tell us the other side of this story. Apparently only this side of the House is saying that this isn't a good thing. Well maybe some of the other members on the other side would like to say it is a good thing or it isn't, but I haven't heard from them yet. If we're going to have a debate in this House let's have the pros and cons or else let's stop debating and let's just push everything through because we have a majority on that side of the House. I think we need the other side of the question too, Mr. Speaker.

The second part of this amendment refers that we should refer this Bill to the standing committee of law. I can agree with that, Mr. Speaker, because I'm sure that I don't have all the intelligence of my community or the constituency that I represent and I don't think that any of the other legislators in this House have that either. If we have something that's controversial, this is a good place to get a little more expert opinion, to get a little more expert advice on what we should do in matters of this kind, and it would not hurt any of us to listen to a bit of the advice of the people who are going to pay for this if we ever put it into law.

The other thing about this Bill, as long as we do not know the regulations we are buying a pig in a poke. There's just generalities in this Bill, nothing how it will be administered or anything else and this is very hard to take. I for one am not in favour of that kind of a package. Kildonan is a dormitory kind of constituency, a residential area, and we have many young people in there who are just starting out. This tax is going to be very tough on them when they have to buy furniture, homes, and just starting out, this kind of a tax is very very regressive on them. There are also many retired people and old age pensioners. Now these people are living on fixed incomes; adding another five percent tax to the burden they already have just means they eat a little bit less because that tax doesn't buy them any more food.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to mention some of the letters that I've had and some of them are not very good. This one here says, "I protest strongly the proposed tax of five percent" - and he mentions laundry and dry cleaning services especially - "and also on the other area that it's going to tax taxes, because it is an iniquitous tax. We not only live in the coldest city in Canada but we have the privilege of paying the highest prices in North America for the following: tobacco, liquor, gasoline, motor vehicle licences, just to mention a few, now they want to take us to the cleaners too. I for one am fed up and intend to leave this province as soon as I quit work and that time is getting very soon." We've had representations.....

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, would the honourable gentleman be good enough to table the letter he has read?

MR. FOX: Yes sir, if that's what you want.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. For the information of the honourable gentleman, if he wishes to quote a letter he must table it. This is the rule of the House -- if requested.

MR. FOX: I have no objection to it. I'll table this one too and I'll tell you why, because the Premier has already had a copy of it. "Attached is a copy of a petition to the Honourable Duff Roblin" - this is from the Greater Winnipeg Shoe Repair Association and they've got petitions of just under 6,000 customers, and the reason there's such a low number of petitioners is because the season is at a lull and their business. They call this tax a nuisance tax.

MR. PAULLEY:table that also, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOX: Yes, I agree that I'll table that one too. I have about 10,000 of these, Mr. Speaker, in our caucus room. I wonder if I should table all those. Would the Minister want to read them too?

MR. EVANS: Whether it's correct to table them in the House or not, I invite him to send them to my office.

MR. PAULLEY: For what purpose?

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I received a number of letters from students and one of the things that bothers these students is that here we are proposing to further education, we are going ahead and saying we are making real progress in education, we have to develop our educational system and everything else, we are supporting students and we are asking them to promote themselves, we pay for bursaries and everything else, then we turn around and we go ahead and we tax the books that they have to use, and this in essence defeats the purpose that we started out to do in the beginning.

Now we are in essence - and I think this was done facetiously at the beginning, calling this an education tax - but I don't know who we are educating when we are taxing them, whether we are depriving them of an education or whether we are educating them to accept the tax burden.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I would just like to repeat that we have been told that we should expedite this matter and we should speak as much and as soon as possible on it. I would just suggest to the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that some of the other members who are all in favour of this because they haven't said anything to date, should get up and voice their opinion so that we would know what the favourable aspects of this Bill are. Just telling us that they have to have the money, that they have to do it this way, isn't good enough. The Attorney-General the other day was very kind - he gave us a real slick glib talk about how these things have to be done and there was no choice about how we have to implement these things sometimes and that we wouldn't be able to take this into Committee. Well I would suggest that he think this over again. There are many people that would like to voice their opinion and there are only 57 in here. If this goes into Committee I am sure that we will get quite a bit of representation telling us that maybe there are other ways of getting this money without going into the business of a sales tax. And as for expediting it, as I said, the Minister of Labour said the other day when it's a vital matter, go slow, and I think this is what we should do.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, before you place the motion, could I invite my honourable friend to reconsider that? The motion has stood now for two days. Surely he must be prepared at this point with any remarks that he might well make to this Chamber. I am anxious to hear what he has to say. I am not going to raise any procedural objection to doing so, but surely at this stage of this debate my honourable friend, an experienced parliamentarian, should be able to stand on his feet and say what he has to say.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): He's probably waiting to hear what those behind you have to say.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, there are several on the other side that haven't spoken, surely they could

MR. SPEAKER: Do you wish to adjourn?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I have reasons for wishing to have it adjourned tonight, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 68. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate on Bill No. 68, which bears the title "An Act respecting insurance of Residents of the Province in respect of the costs of Medical Services," it gives me a great deal of pleasure because this is a topic which has been

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) to the fore not only here in Manitoba but in other jurisdictions for some considerable period of time.

I was interested the other day when the Honourable the Minister of Health introduced this resolution to hear him say how he, acting on behalf of the Government of Manitoba, had endeavoured to dissuade the government at Ottawa to introduce a Medicare scheme on Medicare legislation. My honourable friend in his presentation kept on repeating how the Government of Manitoba tried to dissuade the Government of Canada from making the proposal that we now have before us, and then my honourable friend went on in his remarks to say that having been unsuccessful in our endeavours to change the plan suggested by Ottawa, we became the reluctant bridegroom and have been forced into accepting the proposition as proposed by the Government of Canada.

I don't know whether it is a truism in every case or not, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to suggest that a reluctant bridegroom doesn't make a very good father. --(Interjection)-- If my honourable friend the Minister of Education didn't quite grasp that, I say that I doubt very much whether a reluctant bridegroom becomes a very good father. You might ask what I mean by that, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- I'm just correlating it to Medicare Insurance and nothing else. I suggest that this is a lack of sincerity in a proposition, and the proposition again, may I suggest, deals with the question of Medicare. I'm not going to get into the bind that my honourable friend from Souris-Lansdowne got into a little while ago --(Interjection)-- oh yes, I'm up to my neck, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable the Minister of Welfare says that I'm up to my neck.

MR. SPEAKER: I was just wondering if the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party was losing a little ground. Maybe the honourable members would give him their undivided attention.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I respect your intrusion, but may I respectfully suggest to you that the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party can adequately take care of himself and any kibitzing from the other side of the House or around him. As a matter of fact, Sir, I welcome it, because it is a firm indicator of the lack of knowledge of my honourable friends opposite as to the proposition that we have before us.

So when I say that the Honourable the Minister of Health the other day made the statements that he did on behalf of the Government of Manitoba, that he as the spokesman for the government attempted to do his utmost to dissuade the Government of Canada from presenting the proposal that we have before us, I say that he was doing a disservice to the people of Manitoba, and I say that having achieved this disservice, how can we really expect either him as the Minister of Health or the government, of which he is the spokesman in this field, to really try to make the proposition workable in Manitoba.

So I say that the Minister of Health is a reluctant bridegroom. He admits that he was coerced into this plan by Ottawa. He admits that he doesn't like it, but he's faced with it. When we consider, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Canada did offer to my honourable friend and the Government of Manitoba not one but three different propositions in respect of this plan, then I say to my honourable friend when he introduces his Bill which only contains one proposition, the most obnoxious proposition insofar as the payment of the plan is concerned, then I respectfully suggest that in this regard at least my honourable friend is trying to impose the least acceptable feature of the plan on Manitoba citizens and ratepayers, and in this I am referring to the Bill as proposed by my honourable friend the Minister of Health and the mannerism in which the health scheme shall be paid for, because he in his Bill only suggests one method and one method alone and that is the premium method of payment.

Unlike the hospitalization costs and provision of the costs in hospitalization, a contribution from the general revenues of the province coupled with a relatively small premium in the Bill that we have to deal with and proposed by my honourable friend the Minister of Health, he says that the costs of the plan insofar as the Manitoba costs are concerned will be raised by a premium and premium alone.

Is my honourable friend as a result of this, Mr. Speaker, attempting to impose on the people of Manitoba a most obnoxious feature to start with? Is my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, substantiating my opening remark about the reluctant bridegroom by making things difficult right from the start? Surely my friend knows that if we raise the \$17 million that is suggested as the cost - or the transfer of payments as I prefer it to be known as - in the field of Medical Services, if we are going to raise this only on a basis of premiums as contained within the Bill, that there will be many people who are not indigents referred to in the Bill of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . my honourable friend, that these premiums will be very difficult to pay and will be relatively higher than they should be or would be if the method of payment was similar to that which we have at the present time under our hospital plan, or similar to that that they have in the Province of Saskatchewan to the west. Premiums, as I understand them in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, only pay for about a quarter of the cost of Medicare in Saskatchewan, and yet my honourable friend in the legislation presented for our consideration infers that premiums will be the basis on which the revenue is raised. No consideration for ability-to-pay; the only way any person according to the Bill presented by my honourable friend can get out or be relieved of the payment of the premiums is if they are declared indigent and recipients of social welfare. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this just simply is not good enough and I ask my honourable friend the Minister of Health to take another look at his proposition.

It was found advisable insofar as hospitalization was concerned to impose on an income tax basis a few percentage points on income tax for hospitalization in order to relieve the high cost of premium payments. My honourable friend in his Bill suggests that the Medicare premiums will become due and payable at the same time or coincidental with the hospitalization premiums. Why doesn't he suggest the similar basis of a contribution to Medical Services on the same basis as to the cost of hospitals.

In direct reference to the Bill itself, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw another point for the consideration of my honourable friend the Minister of Health, and here again I want to talk for a moment on the question of regulations. We have had long and vigorous debates in this House recently over the question of regulations. We have dealt with regulations pertaining to the sales tax, the education referendum and other matters, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable the Minister of Health should take a look at his Bill in connection with the regulations that he is suggesting can be proclaimed and compare them with the Federal Act.

I am particularly concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the provision of what we call insured services. In the Federal Act, Bill C-227 which was given its first reading in Ottawa on July 12th, the question of medical services in the interpretation process of that Bill were described as follows: "Insured services means all services rendered by medical practitioners that are medically required, except any services that a person is eligible for and entitled to under any other Act of the Parliament of Canada or any law of a province relating to Workmen's Compensation." What does my honourable friend in his Bill - in the interpretation section - what is his interpretation of Medical Services? It is this, Mr. Speaker: "Medical Services means all services rendered by a medical practitioner that are medically required but does not include those services excepted by the regulations."

What power - what power under this section of the Act, Mr. Speaker, is given to my honourable friend the reluctant bridegroom. It is in his jurisdiction and his premise to declare what services may be excepted by the regulations. The Bill at Ottawa doesn't say this. The Bill at Ottawa, as I just said, said that insured services means all services rendered by medical practitioners. But here this Bill that we have before us at the present time introduced by my honourable friend adds an exception - except those services that are excepted by the regulations. I think that my honourable friend should clearly indicate the full purport of what he means by that particular clause.

And what about the statement of my honourable friend. It's really amusing to some degree to compare the statement that was made in this House on the 16th of March, 1966, by my honourable friend the Minister of Health and to compare that with the statement that my honourable friend made on the 16th of March, 1967. I guess it's just a mere coincidence that they happen to be exactly a year apart. What did my honourable friend say on the 16th of March, 1966? This was the opening statement on his estimates of expenditure for that year. I am not going to quote fully from the document, but my honourable friend says the preservation of the health of the population is also of prime concern to society, for the seeds of education only attain full fruition in a healthy people. The he goes on to state a little further on, "the Government of Manitoba maintains that medical service insurance should be available to all residents of Manitoba at a cost within their means."

I would like to suggest to my honourable friend that he take a close look at what he said a year ago, that the Government of Manitoba maintains that medical service insurance should be available to all residents at a cost within their means, and I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the costs are only raised on a premium basis, there are many hundreds or indeed thousands of people in the Province of Manitoba who will be in a position where they can ill afford the premiums in respect of Medicare. My honourable friend said a year ago studies

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)...have shown that approximately 25% of the population presently remain uncovered by any form of medical service insurance, and also it has become apparent that 75% who have some form of medical service coverage, a goodly number do not have adequate coverage.

Well, I don't know whether it's of any significance or not, Mr. Speaker, or whether my honourable friend has taken another look at the percentage of people who are covered under Medicare schemes, because whereas in March 16, 1966, my honourable friend said that of 75% who have some form of medical services insurance coverage, a number have not adequate coverage, that 75% has now been reduced in the new edition to 70%, because in his remarks of March 16, 1967, my honourable friend the Minister of Health said, and I quote, "All in all about 70% of our population now has medical service." It's going down according to my honourable friend. In the short space of a year, by comparison of the two documents, from 75% a year ago it's down now to 70%, and my honourable friend further on in his statement of the other day indicates that only 50% of the people in Manitoba have full coverage.

I don't want to belabour the point of the remarks of my honourable friend, but I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the House should take a very close study and a very close look at the proposals of my honourable friend. And what is he doing? He is asking us today to accept and to adopt a Bill that will not come into effect in Manitoba until it is proclaimed.

Now first of all, I was under the misapprehension that at Ottawa they had agreed that this Bill would come in on the 1st of July, 1968. The Liberal administration down in Ottawa deliberately violated, in my opinion, a firm undertaking to the people of Canada that on the 1st of July, 1967, when we are celebrating our centennial, that they would enact a Medicare scheme for Canada, and then because of the financial situation they turned around and said, we are going to postpone this for a year until July 1st, 1968, and the Minister of Health or the Minister of Finance, or both, agreed in Ottawa that if the financial situation changed in the meantime they would bring into effect the Bill or the provisions of the Bill ahead of the 1st of July, 1968. My honourable friend the Minister of Health of the Province of Manitoba in the Bill that is under consideration at the present time, being possibly a little more cagey than they were at Ottawa, because while his statement mentions that we are bringing the Bill into force on the 1st of July, 1968, when one takes a look at the Bill, it says it will come into force on the day it is proclaimed.

Well we have had many Bills, Mr. Speaker, in this House to come into effect on proclamation that have never been proclaimed, and while I'm not charging my honourable friend with the lack of good faith, I merely raise this as a proposition for consideration: Why can't we have a target date firmly stated? I think possibly the reason is because of the nilly-willy, in again out again attitude of the Liberals at Ottawa.

First of all, so far as that outfit is concerned, back in July - or July 12th, 1966, the Liberals at Ottawa gave first reading to Bill C-227. Now I wish to quote from Hansard of Ottawa of October 13 of last year and quote the Minister of Health the Honourable Mr. MacEachen, and he said, "The decision to defer the starting date of Medicare was based" - and mark this, Mr. Speaker, very very closely - and I go back and quote my friend the Federal Minister of Health, Page 8612 of Hansard of October 13th. "The decision to defer the starting date of Medicare was based and continues to be based on the government's assessment of the situation as related to the economic conditions of the country. If the government had to make the decision today, it would be the same decision that we are determined to proceed not later than July 1st, 1968."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the other day - yesterday or the day before - we received the latest report of the unemployment situation in Canada which indicated a considerable increase in the number of unemployed in the Dominion of Canada, which I suggest indicates that the economy of Canada is not advancing to the degree that we would like it to advance. If our unemployment situation worsens, as it has apparently by comparison of January of this year with January of a year ago, where then are we going to stand insofar as the start of Medicare in Manitoba and in Canada? Further postponement? Is that the reason my honourable friend the Minister of Health in his Bill that he has introduced says that this will come into effect on proclamation?

I ask him this specific question: what if the Sharps and the Gordons and the Pearsons and the MacEachens and the Judy LaMarshs in Ottawa --(Interjection)--Yes, that's true my honourable friend and it is a roundabout sort of a deal isn't it? As a matter of fact, it's been a roundabout deal ever since 1919 and I'm sick and tired and I'm sure the people of Canada are sick and tired of roundabout deals. I guess the only ones that gain are those who happen to be

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)....in some honourable professions and are represented in this House - I'm just interjecting into my remarks, and I'm sure it's obvious to whom I'm referring to. But isn't it true, Mr. Speaker, that this has been a sort of a merry-go-round since 1919, and isn't it true that unless we become more conclusive and definite than my honourable friend the Minister of Health in Manitoba, that we can pick up here in our province the same merry-go-round aspect as far as Medicare is concerned as has been going down at Ottawa.

Is my honourable friend the Minister of Health here in Manitoba suggesting that his Bill should come into being on proclamation to give him a way out from providing these necessary services to the people of Manitoba? Is he joining this carousel of Medicare? Why doesn't my honourable friend, despite what he said a year ago in his statement - and I want to quote from my honourable friend of a year ago - "The Federal Government has stated that it will be ready to participate in any plan which qualified on July 1st, 1967" - and his final six words in his declaration of policy of the Manitoba Government on March 16th a year ago said this, Mr. Speaker - "and Manitoba intends to meet that date." That's what my friend said a year ago on March 16th. May I repeat so that the record is clear, "The Federal Government has stated that it will be ready to participate in any plan which qualified on July 1st, 1967, and Manitoba intends to meet that date." What date? Some date in the distant future on proclamation, or on July 1st, 1967? That's what my honourable friend said a year ago, and what does his Bill now say? - on proclamation.

What does the authority at Ottawa say? We hope that we're going to have a Medicare scheme for the 1st of July in 1968. What does the Minister of Finance say? What did the Minister of Health say on October 13th, that because of the economic situation we're going to postpone and delay the start of the Medicare scheme but we'll bring it into effect on the 1st of July in 1968, and sooner if conditions improve. --(Interjection)-- No, of course they may not be there, and I don't trust them any more than I trust this outfit that's here today. I think they're both tarred with the same brush. I say neither of them are really and basically concerned with the introduction of a Medicare scheme for the citizens of Canada. And that, Mr. Speaker, is why I don't trust this government with legislation that says the effects of that legislation will come into effect on proclamation, because we have passed Bills in this House giving them that authority before. I think we passed some of this legislation in respect of civil liberties and other aspects that we referred to the Provincial Secretary, if not in this field certainly in others, that would come into effect on proclamation. And we're reconsidering them today, Mr. Speaker, reconsidering them today because they were never proclaimed.

So again I say, as I have said at the offset, here we have a reluctant Minister in a scheme, who doesn't believe in the scheme to start with according to the document that he laid before us, who tried his darndest to get the federal authority to change the plan from a plan which encompassed the greater percentage, or 90 percent of the population of Manitoba to one that was 80 percent or less, because they don't, as my honourable friends say, believe in a universal compulsory scheme, that we should leave it up to Joe and Harry and Tom and Dick and Mary and the devil take the hindmost. He doesn't believe in this sort of an approach in the field of health and admits that he tried to undermine the proposals of the federal administration. This government, Mr. Speaker, claims now, if reluctantly, even though they have been coerced into a scheme, are forced into the proposition that we have before us.

My honourable friend said that he had no alternative but to adopt the premium policy in respect of Medicare. The Federal Minister of Health doesn't agree with my honourable friend because he says that Manitoba had three choices. They did have the choice of a plan on which the financial aspect or the raising of the required amount of money could be done by premiums plus income tax or out of the general funds. They could have raised all of the monies out of an income tax field. My friend, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is going to try and make it as difficult as he possibly can for the people of the Province of Manitoba by having a premium base and a premium base alone.

And what is going to happen insofar as Medicare is concerned in Manitoba if, as is so typical of the past history, the federal authority reneges once again in their plans? Is this government going to show the gumption and the foresight that was exhibited in Saskatchewan in this event and institute a plan for Manitoba of health care? The whole proposition that we have before us is contingent on federal participation. I'd like to hear from my honourable friend some alternatives, because as I said a few moments ago, Canadian citizens have been promised since 1919 a health scheme and they haven't got it yet. My friend is suggesting one to come in on proclamation.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....

In reference to the plan itself, Mr. Speaker, much ado has been made and much has been said about the relationship of doctor, patient and the freedom of the doctor, and also my honourable friend quite properly the other day in his statement made reference to the valuable work that has been done by the Manitoba Medical Service. I want it clearly understood that I join in a tribute to Manitoba Medical Service. It filled the gap; it did a good job in filling that gap. I want too to pay a tribute to the doctors, both men and women, in the Province of Manitoba who have rendered good service to the population. I make no bones about it, they have done a tremendously good job and will continue to do a good job I am positive. And of course when one is giving thanks to the medical profession per se, it's also included other ancillary services as well, our nurses, the members of the teaching fraternity and our medical schools and hospitals and the likes of that. They're all combining to make a good job, and I'm satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that under a climate of understanding and goodwill they will continue to render the services that are required.

The question arises insofar as the provision of adequate medical personnel is concerned in the Province of Manitoba. There is a fear in some quarters, Mr. Speaker, that if we institute a plan today we're not going to have the medical personnel to take care of our sick and those that require it. What a travesty of justice, Mr. Speaker, that exists, that there is some suggestions that we shouldn't bring in a plan now because of the lack of personnel. Isn't this an indicator of the need for a Medicare scheme? I can appreciate the fact that possibly at the offset of a scheme that people who have never used the services of a doctor may feel it's their right to see a doctor. Well is this so wrong? If there's any fault at all with the lack of personnel in the medical field and its allied services, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that part of the onus and part of the blame lies across on the other side of this Assembly.

I have tried in this House, as indeed other members of this House have too, to try and enjoin the government of the day to provide bursaries and scholarships and other financial assistance to young men and to young women who are capable of entering into the profession and are being held back because of a lack of finances to do so, that the government had a responsibility in this field, and what has the answer been? The answer has been the lack of any concrete action sufficient to induce into our medical profession young men and women who at the present time are debarred because of finances. Not only finances, Mr. Speaker, for actual tuition, but the required finances to allow them to have the wherewithal to meet their expenses during the early days of their practice and it hasn't been forthcoming from the government.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health, there are a number of questions that remain unanswered. I want to know from my honourable friend, where goest thou? Where goest the Government of Manitoba in the event of further delay and procrastination of the federal authority insofar as the Medicare scheme is concerned? I want to know from my honourable friend what he envisions the regulations pertaining to the Act will mean insofar as the provision of medical services in Manitoba, because as I read the Act, he has the right to accept services and decide what services will be covered under the Act.

I note that there is another provision in the Act that gives to my honourable friend the right to encompass in the regulation other services not contained at the present time, and I presume by this that it's reference to such things as tuberculosis and other related fields not presently covered, or possibly to the provision of drugs, optical care, chiropractic care and the likes of that. I want to know from my honourable friend, is he in a position to tell us how these services will be taken care of? I think these are very important matters that my honourable friend the Minister of Health should inform the House on.

Another feature of the Bill that my honourable friend introduced the other day, Mr. Speaker, that I think is worthy of some comment from the Minister is what happens -- I note that in the Bill that there is provision for the taking over of the staff and facilities of the present Manitoba Medical Services plan. I imagine by this that these men and women will come into the Manitoba health plan as employees and carry on the functions that they're doing at the present time. I'd like to know from my honourable friend whether this means that these men and women will come in under the civil service and will they be then restricted from being full Manitobans. Will they be deprived of taking part in the political and economic life of the province as indeed many of our civil servants are at the present time? Will these people who at the present time have freedom of political choice, the freedom to run for public office, on the taking over by the medical plan of my honourable friend the Minister of Health be deprived

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)....of the rights of full participation in the community under The Civil Service Act? I think this is important and that these people should know whether that aspect of The Civil Service Act will apply to them, because you know, Mr. Speaker, a situation that arose here not so long ago so far as the Manitoba Telephone System was concerned, that one of that Crown agency's employees was technically deprived of an opportunity of being a full Manitoban and run for a certain political party and had his job jeopardized because of that. I think this is important, that the employees presently working under the Manitoba Medical Service should have an answer to this question before they're taken over by my honourable friend the Minister of Health.

So I say to my honourable friend in conclusion, I'm not going to oppose his Bill, I can't, because it does contain a principle that we have been fighting for for years. There is the possibility, as I have illustrated, that because there's no firm commitment insofar as the Bill that will be enacted and passed as far as this Assembly is concerned, there is the possibility that after that having been done, it may gather dust in some drawer in the desk of the Honourable Minister's office awaiting proclamation; there is the possibility that the co-partners in this scheme at Ottawa will again procrastinate and delay. There's all of these possibilities, but I guess one has to be a gambler at heart in some respects, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to take the gamble and support the Bill on second reading and then I'm going to pray and I'm going to pray very very fervently that there will no longer be the continuous delay year after year in bringing in to fact a Medicare scheme for the people of Canada and the citizens of Manitoba.

In recapitulation, first promised in 1919; then in subsequent elections promised time after time, a firm promise for July 1st, 1967, the celebration birth date of a hundred years of Confederation; now maybe the 1st of July, 1968; and now maybe one of these days the Government of Manitoba will decide by Order-in-Council, after due consideration, that the Bill introduced by my honourable friend the other day will be proclaimed, and hallelujah, Mr. Speaker, and loud hosannas. On the day of proclamation, I want to be with my honourable friend but I don't want to be very much older.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

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