

I N D E X

Monday, June 22, 1959

	Page
<u>Introduction of Bills</u>	141
Bill No. 35 (Mr. Roblin,) Bill No. 70 (Mr. Alexander), Bill No. 71 (Mr. Alexander).	
<u>Welcome to Visitors</u>	141
Mr. Roblin, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Prefontaine.	
<u>Questions</u>	144
Mr. Gray, (Mr. Carroll) Mr. Orlikow (Mr. Lyon) Mr. Guttormson (Mr. Roblin)	
<u>Bill No. 2, re Economic Development, Mr. Campbell</u>	145
Mr. Paulley	148
<u>Speech From the Throne, debate: Mr. Gray</u>	150
Mr. Johnson (Assiniboia)	151
Mr. Desjardins	153
Mr. Wagner	156
Mr. Guttormson	161
Mr. Evans	162
Mr. Hillhouse, Mr. Evans, Mr. Guttormson	163
<u>Bill No. 34, re Public Schools Act (Mr. Scarth) Second Reading</u>	163
<u>Bill No. 47, re Winnipeg School District (Mr. Scarth) Second Reading</u>	164
<u>Bill No. 48, re Winnipeg Charter (Mr. Cowan) Second Reading</u>	164
Mr. Hillhouse	164
Mr. Lyon, Mr. Hillhouse	165
<u>Adjourned Debate, re Pensioners (Mr. Gray): Mr. Groves</u>	167
Mr. Martin	170
<u>Adjourned Debate, re Vehicle Insurance (Mr. Paulley): Mr. McKellar</u>	172
Mr. Stanes	174

8:00 o'clock, Monday, June 22nd, 1959.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 49. The honourable member for Brandon.

MR. M. E. RIDLEY (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member for Brandon, I would ask the indulgence of the House for this to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the honourable member for Inkster, and the proposed motion and amendment thereto by the honourable member for St. George. The honourable member for St. Vital.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of the fact that I'm a member of a group in this House, all of whom share the concern of the honourable member for Inkster in -- for the well-being of the old age and blind pensioners in this province. I'm proud of the fact too that I belong to a party that does not believe in sending pious resolutions to Ottawa; that can solve this and many other of the problems that we have in Manitoba. We are going to do something about this problem in Manitoba now at this session of the House, and, I'm sure that all of the members will agree that when our new social allowances legislation comes into being, that the necessities and small comforts of life will no longer be denied to those among us, who because of age and other infirmities or handicaps cannot look after themselves. I'm sure as well that our government's plans for elderly persons' housing will go a long way towards correcting the living conditions described by the honourable member from Inkster as existing in the neighbourhood of his office.

Across the board increases in pensions, for increases tied to the cost of living index, as proposed by the honourable member for St. George, in my opinion do not solve the problems of those in need. Many who will receive such increases that do not need them; and in many cases, they will fall far short of the actual needs of our older people.

The original motion and the Liberal amendment are both, in my opinion, not necessary at this time. The government at the last session of the House accepted the motion of the honourable member from Inkster requesting them to consider the granting of cash allowances, medical, dental and optical care for our old age pensioners in need. And now, he and the honourable member from St. George apparently are not willing to wait to see what the government has in mind in this regard. The government hasn't had a chance as yet to give us the details of the legislation that they promised in the Throne Speech.

Are we forgetting too, that the Federal Government is sharing in the cost of this plan to the extent of 50% -- except for the dental, medical and optical care? In effect, if need is shown, and a supplementary allowance is granted of say \$40.00 a month, the recipient will in fact receive \$75.00 a month from the Federal Treasury -- exactly what the honourable member from Inkster is asking in his resolution. And they may even where the Federal Government is sharing to the extent of 50% do better than \$75.00 per month if need is proven. Nobody under this plan will receive more than \$55.00 a month if they don't need it, which is a far cry from paying an additional \$25.00 a month to many people of means who do not need it at all. It is also possible under the government plan for those people in need, in cases of illness or incapacity of some other description, to receive much more than \$75.00 even from the Federal Treasury if we consider their 50% share.

Members in this House, and in the Federal House, have talked about old age pensioners for many years, but nobody has done anything about it until the present Federal Government took office and increased old age pensions from \$40.00 to \$55.00 a month. Now this government is prepared to do more than that in cases where need is proven, and the C.C.F. and the Liberals are still not satisfied. They apparently aren't satisfied that the government is going to keep its word that it made at the last sitting of the House when the resolution from the honourable member from Inkster was accepted. They are apparently not convinced that the social allowance legislation promised will do the things that we say it will. The Liberal administration of the previous government, true, had a plan to give additional allowances to old age pensioners in need through the municipalities. They were going to reimburse the municipalities who granted additional cash allowances to old age pensioners to the extent of 80%. Records of the department show however, that few, if any, of the municipalities availed themselves of this plan, probably

(Mr. Groves cont'd.) . . . because they felt that this was a provincial responsibility. I do not wish to take away any of the credit which the honourable member from Inkster has due for his efforts on behalf of old age pensioners over the years, and I do not wish to suggest that the honourable members of the C.C.F. Party don't sometimes have good ideas -- for they do! But, I do wish to point out that except in Saskatchewan, where they were pretty desperate for a government of any kind, the people of this country, although willing to accept the C.C.F. suggestions for progress, have shown time and time again that they are not willing to entrust the C.C.F. -- to entrust to the C.C.F. the responsibility of putting any good ideas that they have into effect.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I spoke in this House on the matter of old age pensions, it was one of the first speeches that I had made in this Chamber. In fact I think it was the first, and I thought at that time that for a beginner I had done a fairly good job of presenting my views on this problem -- but in closing the debate the honourable member from Inkster jumped on me with both feet. This is what he said, from Hansard, Volume 1, No. 9, Page 32, he said "I'm not so pleased with the honourable gentleman from St. Vital, I would only wish that if he would get his good wife and children, his immediate family, to read his speech, and read it over half a dozen times, then I think he would have received a good lecture from them. As a young gentleman just coming into public life, one day in the legislature, makes this very classic assertion" -- and then he is quoting apparently from what I said -- "His group however no doubt has in mind putting the government on the spot with this resolution. This he failed to do. Putting the government on the spot for what? Asking for a loaf of bread for the old age pensioners? Couldn't he find other things to put the government on the spot -- is this a sympathetic word on behalf of the new member in the house for fifty thousand old age pensioners? And I do not know how many of the fifty thousand have more than the minimum allowance to get, and so, we tried to cash in on everything -- even on an old age pensioner's misery and hardship and tragedy -- no Sir! If you continue this way" -- and the member is talking to me now -- "I'll be sorry for you -- you don't need my sympathy, but I'm not any smarter than you, have no greater education than you, but I am older and I've -- I have seen perhaps a little life -- a little better. Please for your own sake, for the sake of your constituency, for the sake of your family, try to think first before you utter."

I considered that that was quite a violent attack on my first efforts, and on my rights to express my opinion and an insinuation that I was not in sympathy with the problems of those in need. Here is what I said at that time that occasioned that outburst -- "During the recent election campaign our party included in its platform a pledge to provide assistance to old age persons in need. The honourable member for Inkster no doubt had this in mind when presenting his resolution to the House. There is no question about his sincerity, this is quite evident in his compassionate plea to this House last night. His group however, no doubt had in mind putting the government on the spot with this resolution. This they failed to do. The Honourable Minister has indicated that the government will support this resolution, and the C.C.F. has no monopoly on feeling for old age pensioners in need. All of us in this group appreciate that there is a problem here and that the honourable member or the Honourable Minister rather, has indicated that much work has been done and much more will be done in time for action prior to the next meeting of this House." Now, I can't see anything that I said there, Mr. Speaker, or later on in that speech, that would warrant the dressing-down that I took from the honourable member from Inkster. And I would like to assure the honourable member from Inkster that my good wife and those of my children that can read, and my immediate family, did see my speech and I received no lecture from them. And I would also like to remind him that copies of that speech were made and circulated to welfare workers and as many old age pensioners as we knew that were residing in our constituency; and to date I have received no complaints, but on the contrary, have received many compliments. I'm well aware of the -- and a few votes too -- I am well aware of the feelings of those people who face the future with uncertainty; but I would also like to state that except for the fact that he is much older than I, and therefore has a big head start, that I am not prepared to take a back seat in this regard -- for I have spent a great deal of my time working on behalf of my community, and particularly those less fortunate than myself -- and I have always been, and I always will be sympathetic to their needs. And, may I emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that neither the honourable member from Inkster, nor the

(Mr. Groves cont'd.) . . . honourable member from St. George, nor the C.C.F. Party has any monopoly on feelings for old age pensioners and other persons in need.

Now, I'd like briefly to repeat some of the things that I've said before on this subject, and something, some things that I think that the members of this Legislature should keep in mind when considering resolutions or legislation dealing with this subject, and that is that there are in this province -- in fact, in this country in my opinion -- three distinct groups of old age pensioners in need. The first group are those who through circumstances beyond their control arrive at the sunset of their lives destitute. Society must give these people a reasonable standard of living and freedom from the financial worries of medical, dental and optical care. But society must give these people allowances based on need, not flat sums to everybody. The second category of old age pensioners in need we must also look after -- although we find it sometimes very difficult to be sympathetic -- and these are the ones who reach their older years in the same circumstances as the first category, but the reason for them being in those circumstances is entirely different. The reason in this case is that these people didn't care during their productive lives to provide in any way for their old age, and there are many more people in this category than we would care to admit. And thirdly, the class of old age pensioners in need that I call the forgotten class; that is those who have worked in their productive years, who despite low wages, and a depression, raised their families, paid for their homes, and put aside a small amount for their later life. Many of these people are now living on old age pensions -- some of them perhaps supplemented by a small income from their previous employers -- and we must not in any of our social legislation discriminate against this group. There is a case in my constituency in this group of a widowed lady who is supporting a daughter who is mentally incapacitated -- but who also works and has some income -- who, while her husband was alive, they worked, they saved up their money, they paid for a little home, and they accumulated \$1,500.00 in money in the bank. Now this particular family, and many families like them, are being discriminated against in our social legislation, and in this particular case, they are also required, despite the problems in their family and the lack of any income over and above the old age pension, they are required also to pay their premiums for the Manitoba Hospital Service Plan. So, I might remind the members, let's not forget this forgotten class, and let's not discriminate against those who have taken the trouble to accumulate, during their productive years, some funds to look after their old age.

There was a story that many of us learned as children; the story of the grasshopper and the ant. The ants worked all summer, and they accumulated food and they built themselves an ant hill, or a home to look after them in the winter time to keep them warm. The grasshopper meanwhile played his violin and danced all summer long, had himself a good time with no responsibilities and no cares. When winter came the ants were warm, they had shelter, and they had plenty of food to last them through till spring. The grasshopper had no home, he was left out in the cold and he had no food on which to live during the difficult winter months. But the ants had pity on him and they took him in and they cared for him during the winter months.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have a great deal to learn from this story when we're talking about social legislation or old age pensioners as we are in this resolution for we must, when considering aid to old age pensioners in need, consider the matter of need. And let us try in this -- in the legislation in which we hope to do that, to encourage our people to follow the example of the ant and let us not have expensive give-away programs to everybody and thus tend to encourage our people to be like the grasshoppers of the story. Thank you.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member for St. George rose to bring in his amendment to the resolution of the honourable member from Inkster, he paid high tribute to that honourable member for what he described as his sincere crusade in the cause of assisting old people. I, Sir, would like at this time to join with the honourable member from St. George and the honourable member for St. Vital, and others, in his tribute. For many, many long years the plea from the honourable member from Inkster fell upon deaf ears as far as the government of the day was concerned, and it was not until the last session, last autumn, in the first session of the Roblin administration that my friend saw any reward for his labours. It was when the Conservative Government came into power that he solved the travail of his soul and was satisfied, for here was an administration that was ready to give a sympathetic and willing ear to the support of the resolution - and, ultimately, it received the approval of the whole House. Again and again my honourable friend has pleaded eloquently for increased help for needy citizens, but the resolution which he has presented at this current session is of a different calibre - he calls for a general increase in old age pension without any reference to need, and, Sir, if the resolution which he proposed was put into operation and became law, it would mean that every citizen of Manitoba who has reached the age of 70 years would be given a \$20.00 a month increase, and that means that the millionaire would receive just as much of an increase as the hard-working and hard-pressed needy citizen. To my mind, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't make sense. Why should the taxpayer be called upon to swell the bulging bank account of the wealthy and the well-to-do?

The amendment of the honourable member for St. George places restrictions upon increased pensions; he confines it to those who are in need of old age assistance, old age security, disability and the blind, and up to that point, Mr. Speaker, I'm in complete agreement with the amendment, even Sir, as I am in agreement with the honourable member for St. George when he says that all members of this House are concerned with the well-being of the senior citizens. In other words, what he was saying in effect is this, that social conscience and the social consciousness is not the monopoly of any one party. But now we come to the point of disagreement in the amendment which suggests an increase on the basis of the amount sufficient to compensate for the loss of the purchasing power of the dollar due to inflation since the \$55.00 pension was implemented. Of course, I suppose my honourable friend would say "But didn't you notice I said 'At least sufficient' " but to my mind, Sir, that's a weasel word.

The member for Winnipeg Centre state presented some revealing figures to this House the other day. He pointed out that the Consumers' Index for Canada in 1957 was 123.3; and the index for 1959, this present year, was 125.4; a difference of 2.1 per cent; and as he pointed out, on the basis of the \$55.00 pension it would mean the tremendous increase of ninety-two cents per month per pensioner, and I say, Mr. Speaker, why are you going to hold that yardstick over the pensioner's head to compensate him for the loss of the purchasing power of the dollar, etc.? There may be other reasons accounting for the need other than the deterioration of the dollar; it may be sickness, it may be a hundred and one things, and so I see in the amendment, Mr. Speaker, something that's niggardly and parsimonious. It reminds me of the man who wouldn't give his boy an all-day sucker, because it was 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

If we're interested in getting increased aid to the needy citizens, and we are, then let's give it to him without any strings attached, and say there you are my fellow, you need it - take it and go out and enjoy it. All these worthy citizens can be sure of in the terms of the amendment is a liberal ninety cents, and they'll have to watch the sliding scale of the purchasing power of the dollar just as a feverish spectator watches the ticker tape at the broker's office, but as a matter of fact, they will be on the side of the bears rather than the bulls, and they will have sold the market short, and as they watch the ticker tape they will be hoping that the scale of the purchasing value of the dollar will be downward because then they'd get a little more of the profits. This government, Mr. Speaker, recognizes that the most essential -- the greatest responsibility of government life is that which concerns social security, and that has been shown in all the legislation that the government has placed before this House.

I have in my possession here something that was placed on every man's desk at the close of the last session, namely, the estimates of current expenditure and revenue for the fiscal year ending in March, 1960. Now, I was interested the other night in just looking at that once again and I discovered that every fourth page in the 29 pages of facts and figures had to do

(Mr. Martin, cont'd) directly with the Department of Health and Welfare. Unfortunately, the opposition voted against our implementing the election promises and they hindered the pathway of progressive legislation by defeating the administration, and so we were forced to go to the people with a stack of unfinished business and, Mr. Speaker, no pile was higher and weightier than that which reposed upon the desk of the Minister of Health and Welfare. No party in this House, no government in this province has a keener sense of government responsibility in the field of social amelioration than the party occupying the benches, Mr. Speaker, on your right, and as you will notice, have established a bridgehead upon your left. Not for a moment, Sir, are we on this side of the House going to entertain the proposal that your program of giving aid and assistance should be related to the rise or the fall of the purchasing power of the dollar. It may be that within a year the economic horizon will brighten to the extent that the consumers' figures will show a substantial gain in the price value of the dollar and it will stand in a favourable light compared with 1957 or even with 1959.

The policy of this government, Mr. Speaker, is in favour of increased aid for the needy citizens. The Speech from the Throne indicates the attitude and policy of the government in this regard. I'm prepared even to go one step further and say there's not a shadow of a doubt that this government is prepared to stake its very existence on the question of its duty and responsibility to the physically and mentally handicapped citizens, particularly those who have played a noble role in the life of the country and of the community, and as my honourable friend from St. Vital has just remarked, have reached the eventide of life without the adequate means of social security. We hear from our friends on the other side, as it was echoed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, that we must keep the taxes low, that the public must know what the government is going to do to them. Mr. Speaker, this government is all-out to let the people know exactly what this government is going to do for them, not to them.

Then it was suggested that we have a weakness - after the election, the ballots are counted, and what a wonderful count it was, to keep the election going on and on. That's what we intend to do. If we are worthy representatives of our people we don't go ringing doorbells just a few weeks before election and forget them through the intervening years. We'll not carry on a program of propaganda for the six weeks after the election has been called for a vote-catching crusade, but our aim and our purpose is to keep the election going on and on and to work full steam ahead so that what we outlined in the election weeks shall be transformed into acts of legislation upon the statute books of this province. And, Mr. Speaker, there's no solitary evidence that the government has shirked any of its major responsibilities, and what we're discussing here tonight is a major responsibility. When the Minister of Health and Welfare was speaking in the House last autumn in support of the principle of the resolution presented by the honourable member from Inkster, he outlined in comprehensive fashion - I don't know when I've heard anything on that subject more comprehensive than the speech which the Minister delivered from his place in the House on that historic night, and on other occasions - he outlined at that time the policy of the government in the whole field of social amelioration for senior citizens and he said that "it is the government's policy and plan to explore every avenue with expediency in order to make available a better way of life for all our senior citizens in need". The Honourable Leader of the Opposition rose in his place immediately afterwards and congratulated the Minister on his willingness to deal with these problems quickly and he added this word - "If my honourable friends," meaning those who are on the government side of the House, "are willing to assume this obligation, there's no reason why we should protest against it". And then as a sort of a climactic word he says to the Minister "we are willing to give you a chance" and looking across at the treasury benches he says "and we're willing to give the government a chance". But they didn't - they put us out. They wouldn't give the Minister or the government any fair chance.

But today, Mr. Speaker, the story is different. They can't put us out and the First Minister and his colleagues of the treasury benches and in the back benches, for the First Minister looks upon us all as his colleagues in the great enterprise of government, we all have a job to do in the field of social enrichment and betterment and we are going to do it, and there is no logical or humane reason why our friends of the opposition groups should protest against it. If they do Sir, it is for the purpose in indulging in prejudice - party politics. At the last

(Mr. Martin, cont'd)...election the jury of public opinion brought in a decisive and overwhelming verdict in favour of the Roblin administration, and it was a clear indication that the people of Manitoba are confident that by placing the affairs and interest of the citizens in the hands of the present government, they are doing that which history will attest as being a wise and provident thing. The Roblin Government has been at the helm of the ship of state for less than a year, but I'm satisfied and the people generally are, and they said so on the 14th day of May. I'm satisfied that the splendid beginnings will make it abundantly evident to all who have eyes to see and minds to comprehend, that Manitoba is destined to attain in the realm of social happiness and well being, that which shall prove to be an object lesson to the whole wide world.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Seven Oaks that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear your seconder.

MR. ORLIKOW: Member for Seven Oaks.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the C.C.F. Party. Honourable member for Souris Lansdowne.

MR. M.E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that this debate on compulsory automobile insurance will seem quite dull after listening to the honourable member for St. Matthews speak so eloquently on health insurance.

First of all, I would like to say a few words on compulsory automobile insurance operated by the government. This debate, I understand, has been brought in year after year by the C.C.F. Party and I imagine it will be brought in for many years to come. First of all, I would like to say - to inform this House - that while I do not pretend to be an expert on insurance, I do operate a general insurance agency along with my farm. I write fire, hail and automobile. I've listened very attentively to the Leader of the C.C.F. Party propose this resolution and also to the honourable member for Selkirk who so ably replied to him. The Leader of the C.C.F. Party mentioned in his speech the owner of a vehicle and his family are not protected under our Manitoba policy if the driver is at fault. This was his biggest objection to our policy which we have in Manitoba, while in Saskatchewan these coverages are provided in their policy. This - he also mentioned that every car, that every owner would be protected in case of accident because there'd be no danger in getting involved with a car who wasn't insured. These were the principal arguments in his speech in favour of compulsory insurance.

I would like to inform this Assembly the case of the following which compulsory insurance does not cover. It does not cover victims of hit-and-run drivers; it does not cover victims of stolen cars; it does not cover cars operated without provision - permission; it does not cover unregistered cars; and it does not cover out-of-province uninsured cars. Our safety responsibility laws here make things a little difficult for anyone who has an accident who is uninsured, but I think most of us all who have driven for some time realize of those dangers and anyone who is interested in their livelihood will only be too glad to take out insurance to protect themselves. Compulsory insurance also makes it a little difficult each year as a certificate of insurance has to be obtained before obtaining a license to drive a car. The honourable member for Selkirk raised some very good arguments both last spring and also this - in his speech this session in regards to - in his speech against compulsory insurance, and I must say he raised many arguments which I myself as an insurance agent would have put up against this plan. Automobile insurance, in my opinion, is like every other type of insurance and the greater the risk the higher the rate should be. And I feel that this is one of the strong arguments against the Saskatchewan plan which -- all it does is to make the good risk subsidize the poor risk.

In my constituency we have the largest mutual insurance company in Canada, the Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company, which is situated just about 30 miles from Brandon and is a town of 450 population. 75 people are employed in this company and with the yearly salary of around a quarter of a million dollars. This company has agents in every community, I imagine, in nearly all parts of Canada and these agents give advice and service to their policy owners, in contrast to the Saskatchewan plan which only has men located in each locality selling licenses, that are not specialists in the insurance field. The Wawanesa Mutual, in

(Mr. McKellar, Cont'd)...my opinion, is one of the finest industries that we have in the Province of Manitoba. For one reason, that it exists from coast to coast and the name is known everywhere, and in bringing in the compulsory plan under the government, operated by the government, we're destroying one of the things that we have advocated in this party - the small industries spread over smaller communities. And this is one of the things that I think is the big danger of compulsory insurance - that we've been trying to promote. May I say, too, that while this company cannot be opposition to the Saskatchewan compulsory plan, they do provide keen opposition to the package plan which is operated in Saskatchewan, to take up the necessary slack in the coverage which is provided. And I think - I have talked to the manager there and their business has been increasing year after year.

Now, in Massachusetts, which operates on a different basis, the Massachusetts State tells the insurance company what the rates will be. They set the rates each year and the policyholders must take out insurance with these insurance companies. The effect of this has been that year after year the rates go up and we find that year after year the accidents are increasing to such an extent where the small wage earner has found it practically prohibitive to buy insurance. The principal objection, I think, to this plan has been that it will, in the very near future I think, that they will have to leave it up to the insurance companies to set their rates according to the risk that might be involved. I understand, too, that in New York State that a high percentage of the drivers now have to get insurance under the assigned risk plan due to the fact that companies have got to the point where they will not insure cars if they are over ten years old, and in some cases less than that. Many drivers have had to sell their cars on that account. Also, I heard the other day where Minnesota have adopted a law now where it's compulsory to have insurance before you can get a license, but the plan is a little different there and they have to take the insurance companies rates instead of having the state set the rates for them.

I have a little article here, it's by Mr. Ian Davis, Canadian Underwriter correspondent, in regards to the change in the \$200.00 deductible that was changed to \$100.00 deductible effective the first day of April of this year. Some people call it monstrosity - delusion and a snare for the motorist and a travesty on insurance coverage. This may be too extreme. In any event, the Saskatchewan Government's compulsory automobile insurance is an oddity in that it is subject to a \$200.00 deductible except for personal injuries. The deductible even extends to property damage except if a Saskatchewan motorist is involved in an accident outside of his province. The explanation of this anomaly is that other provinces wouldn't accept compulsory insurance as proof of financial responsibility of Saskatchewan motorists. Had the \$200.00 property damage deductible been applicable outside of Saskatchewan, then Saskatchewan motorists venturing outside their borders would have had to buy additional insurance. This would have been bad publicity for compulsory government insurance, so a special concession was made Saskatchewan drivers outside of their province. The big item of insurance news in Saskatchewan, that is in recent days, is the presentation of legislation to the 1959 Session of the Legislature to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act by eliminating the \$200.00 deductible for property insurance. This change will go into effect when the new auto license starts on April first. Deductible still will apply to collision, theft, fire and other claims under the comprehensive category.

The Automobile Insurance scheme is administered by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. In 1958 benefits paid out totalled \$4,000,000.00, a drop of \$74,000.00 from 1957. In December, 1958, the government insurance fund had a surplus of \$4,400,000.00. Suggestions were made that the government should help the farmers and others who were feeling the pinch of inflated costs by not collecting the compulsory insurance premiums for 1959 and coasting along on surplus, but the government had different ideas. In announcing the proposal to eliminate the property damage deductible, the Provincial-Treasurer, Mr. Fines, said the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office expects about a million dollars more annually in claims in consequence of the change. This appears to eliminate any possibility of the government declaring a holiday in 1959 from the so-called license automobile insurance premiums. Mr. Fines admitted the government had been considering - considered reducing rates in view of the surplus but the government, he said, believed the rates already are low and that the wiser course would be to increase the benefits. The increase unquestionably will

(Mr. McKellar, cont'd)...give motorists more coverage for their money. As it is now, with the \$200.00 deductible applicable to both collision and property damage, the driver of the car responsible for the accident had to pay the first \$200.00 of collision damage to his own car and the first \$200.00 of property damage to the other car involved. Thus the combined deductible for this hapless motorist was \$400.00. Innocent parties involved in accidents could not recover the first \$200.00 of property damage to their vehicle from the government, thus they had to get it out of the driver who was at fault. Often they failed to do so. This also worked a hardship on many unoffending motorists.

Private insurance companies have been guarded in their comments on this change. Mr. Hamel, Managing Director of the Saskatchewan Mutual, an independent Saskatchewan company who, along with many other private firms who supplement coverage for Saskatchewan motorists, suggested the change now made precludes the necessity of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office raising its package policy rates in 1959. The package policy provides extended coverage for Saskatchewan motorists. It fills deductible gaps and broadens personal injury coverage. Mr. Hamel suggested that on the basis of the 1958 loss - experience, the government would have had to raise the package policy rates. The elimination of the \$200.00 deductible will help take it off the hook. Instead of having to cover the first \$200.00 of property damage previously collected from the motorist - who now purchases additional coverage - the government will now have to draw this from the compulsory automobile insurance, and so it went on. So you can see that now - that the trouble is that now every claim will be a property damage claim with a \$100.00 property damage deductible and a \$200.00 collision deductible.

I also would like to say that the Honourable Leader of the C.C.F. made a statement in regards to what the rates would be on a car in Saskatchewan under this here compulsory plan and I, too, have made a similar rating on a five-point coverage in our province here which gives for a 1955 car, a number one rating, and the farmer, he will get \$100,000.00 inclusive for \$16.32; \$2,000.00 medical expenses for personal injury - bodily injuries \$5.00; \$100.00 deductible for \$13.60; add fire and theft and miscellaneous coverage for \$ 1.25, making \$36.17. However, I think if I'm not - if I'm correct, that the rate was twenty-some dollars for the Saskatchewan compulsory plan and you had all these deductibles thrown in. I personally think that our plan is better than theirs and also our rates are better than theirs. I also think that this here application - the leader of the -- the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will make music in his ears when he sees this because he and I associated with the same company.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I personally think we have a good system here with our safety responsibility laws and our assigned risk plan and I personally hope we have it for many more years. I do think that it's not perfect maybe in some cases, and maybe some changes could be made to help correct it, but I think it is better than what we see operating in our province to the west - Saskatchewan's compulsory insurance plan.

And I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by the honourable member for Hamiota, that we delete everything after the second "whereas" and substitute the following: "Whereas each year finds an increase in the number of motor vehicles on our highways and whereas claims frequently have been decreasing in the Province of Manitoba, therefore be it resolved that the Manitoba Government be commended for its efforts to reduce traffic accidents through the driver training and driver improvement program. And further be it resolved that the government give consideration to the advisability of expanding the scope of the Unsatisfactory Judgment Fund to afford greater compensation to the widows, orphans and other survivors of motor vehicle accidents."

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, if I may before you put the motion, I would like to ask the member a question, if in order.

MR. SPEAKER: You're in order. You cannot.....

MR. SCHREYER: I simply want to know the source from which he was quoting a minute or two back.

MR. MCKELLAR: The Canadian Underwriter, March 15th, 1959.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. D.M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'd like to say a few words on this particular subject. In addition to the purely insurance aspects of this resolution, there does appear to me to be two factors which I think are worth mentioning. The first is that

(Mr. Stanes, cont'd) . . . apparently the assumption by the honourable members of the C. C. F. is that because it is done in Saskatchewan, it is something worth adopting here. I'm afraid I can't accept that in its face value. Mr. Speaker, the compulsory insurance on vehicles in the British Isles has been extremely successful. It is not a state insurance, but it is a compulsory insurance. Experts in many parts of the world and including our experts here in Manitoba admit that that insurance system is working extremely well, but they also admit that such insurance would not be successful in Manitoba. I do feel, Mr. Speaker, that in looking at other cases in other parts of this country, and in other parts of the world, we should, when we see something working successfully, give it a very close examination and perhaps get some benefits from it, but not necessarily accept it in toto.

The other factor, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention, which was stressed by the Honourable Leader of the C. C. F., was that it would be cheaper. That is true - it would be cheaper because it would be not paying all the taxes, but then surely there isn't a product anywhere that wouldn't be cheaper if it was excluded from paying taxes. So surely if that is the basis for taking over insurance, it can be the same basis for taking over anything. "Ah," says my honourable friends from the C. C. F. "but we restrict ourselves to that which is essential in the interests of the public." But surely, Mr. Speaker, food and clothing is extremely essential in the interests of the public. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that those claims are not admissible in this particular circumstances and cannot be accepted, and we do have at stake here principles which are much greater and go beyond the bounds of just the insurance field and we should look upon them, just not with this subject particularly in view, but rather all the consequences that may come from such a decision of government intervention.

MR. J.G. COBB (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the subject of compulsory insurance, not as an insurance representative or with any great knowledge of insurance, but as one who has had direct contact with the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. It happens that through our business we have a body shop and we are 18 miles from the Province of Saskatchewan, and as a result of that we have had numerous occasions where we had to deal with the problems of the compulsory insurance in Saskatchewan. One of the most vicious things I believe of this insurance scheme is the fact that if you have the insurance, which you do have to have if you are a resident of Saskatchewan, and you leave the Province of Saskatchewan to live someplace else, immediately you cross the border, if you have an accident you have no insurance. We had a doctor move to our town some few years ago from Saskatchewan. He had been a resident there for a great many years. He thought he had insurance. Now before the end of his license year ran out he had an accident which was fairly large, and as a result of that accident he paid the whole thing himself. He thought he had coverage but he didn't have anything. That, I believe, is one of the worst features of the compulsory insurance they have in Saskatchewan. I was very pleased to hear from the Leader of the C. C. F. Party that they are changing their \$200.00 deductible as that figure is something that any person who is touring Saskatchewan leaves themselves wide open for trouble if they happen to get into an accident that is not their fault. I have known people who were in that position. They questioned the R. C. M. P. and were told they might as well forget taking any action because the possibilities of getting anything to recompense them was very very poor.

Now a number of people close to the Manitoba border have felt it necessary to take out board insurance in order to get the protection that they want, because otherwise they were leaving themselves open to a \$200.00 deductible up to the present time.

In the dealings we have had with the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, their dealings there are altogether different than those that are taken by board companies. They have their own adjusting system. As we know an adjustor, it is nothing the same. They come out and they are very bureaucratic in their findings. They do not even give you a definite figure to go to, and if you are the party doing the work for them you are sometimes lucky you get your money because their adjusting service is not defined. Another thing, the people who have the insurance are dependent upon the government releasing the car and I have seen cases where people have had their car finished and ready for them to take, but because of the fact that the government did not get the release through, that car sat there for over one month. These are things that you only get in a system of insurance such as is run by the Province of Saskatchewan. Their adjusting service is so dictatorial that a lot of shops are refusing to

(Mr. Cobb, cont'd): . . . have anything to do with them. We ran into the same situation ourselves and we make it a necessity of anybody doing business with us from Saskatchewan to pay the bill and collect from their own government themselves. It is the only safe way. We had two cases where the bills were up to several hundreds of dollars and we have never got it yet, and that was two years ago. It is one of the poorest things for any province and I hope that the Province of Manitoba never sees anything like it because it is not fair to the people who live there and I defy - the majority of people of Saskatchewan will say that it is not in the interests of those people, generally speaking.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Logan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the honourable member for Pembina and the proposed motion and amendment thereto by the honourable member for La Verendrye. The honourable member for Morris.

MR. H. P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House, I would ask leave to have this resolution stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand. Proposed resolution of the honourable member for Logan, the honourable member for St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Speaker, I would beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that the House do now adjourn.

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